



## CPOC Annual Data Survey 2016-2017

### 1. Introduction

The CPOC Survey is a way to collect uniform information about probation departments in California. The survey covers Adults and Juvenile Services. The CPOC Adult and Juvenile Services Committees partnered with CAPSA (California Association of Probation Service Administrators) to further refine and improve definitions by adding scenarios and examples.

If you have questions, please email [research@cpoc.org](mailto:research@cpoc.org) and someone will respond by the following Tuesday via a digest email that goes out to all contacts for the survey. This assures others with similar questions receive a unified response.

The 2017 survey is due August 31, 2017.

The survey asks for two types of information. Information from counts of certain types of events during the last Fiscal Year: July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017 and one day population snapshots meant to be a point in time count of a particular status on the last day of the fiscal year, June 30, 2017.

If a question doesn't apply to your county, put a "NA" in the response box. If you don't know, or cannot access the answer, leave it blank, however all blank responses will require further explanation at the end of each subsection.

Unfortunately, the software doesn't allow the survey results to be printed after you finish, but CPOC can email you a printed version upon request. It is also a goal of the project to share data with counties in the Fall 2017 to look at results and ensure accuracy. Recent year's data is also available on CPOC's website: <http://www.cpoc.org/dataviz>

The Survey has been split up into two sections. Adult Services and Juvenile Services. Choose a section below, complete the section, and you will be routed to that section of the survey. This allows for doing the survey in phases, or delegating the adult or juvenile section. Each section is divided into pages that deal with specific aspects of adult or juvenile probation topics.

If you are unclear about any of the code sections contained in this survey, please click on the attached link:

<http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes.xhtml>

When you complete the survey for the Adult or Juvenile section, you will see a confirmation page. CPOC will not receive your entries until you hit "submit" on the "Thank you" page.

**As you complete each page of a survey section, your results will be saved and you can come back to complete the survey, as long as it is from the same computer. The software will save your progress as long as you click on "next" after each page. You can go back and change your responses to previous pages.**

**If you would like to complete another section, reopen the survey link and choose the other section.**

\* 1. What county are you reporting for?

\* 2. What is your name?

\* 3. At what email address would you like to be contacted?

4. Which section would you like to work on?

Adult Services

Juvenile Services



## CPOC Annual Data Survey 2016-2017

### 2. Adult Services-Population

**One day snapshot count as of June 30, 2017.**

**Fiscal Year Count is for the period July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017**

**This is the number of offenders, not cases.**

#### CPOC Supervision Hierarchy

**1) PRCS-Post Release Community Supervision PC 3450**

**\*Those adults sentenced to State Prison and released to begin their PRCS supervision by the local county.**

**2) MSO: Mandatory Supervision PC 1170(h)(5)**

**\*Those adults who began their mandatory supervision portion of their sentence, following their jail/custodial sentence.**

**3) Probation: Granted under PC 1203 & PC 1210.1**

**\*Those adults who were granted formal probation on either felony or misdemeanor level convictions.**

**5. Number of adults under supervision on June 30, 2017.**

\*The intent of this question is to count the number of adults (not cases) on active formal supervision as of June 30, 2017, in your department. If an adult is under multiple types of supervision at the time of the count, utilize the CPOC hierarchy. Active formal supervision does not include those out to warrant (all types) or on court probation or diversion, but should include those in revoked status pending a violation hearing. If an individual is pending transfer pursuant to 1203.9 of the Penal Code, but the transfer process is not complete as of June 30, 2017, they should be included in this count.

PRCS

Mandatory Supervision

Total of those on Probation  
(Misdemeanor and  
Felony)

6. Number of adults under probation supervision where highest charge is a misdemeanor on June 30, 2017.

\*This question is a subset of the probation population in Question #5. The intent of this question is to identify the number of adults on active formal probation, where their highest charge is a misdemeanor in your department. Active formal supervision does not include those out to warrant (all types) or on court probation or diversion, but can include those in revoked status pending a violation hearing. If an individual is pending transfer pursuant to 1203.9 of the Penal Code, but the transfer process is not complete as of June 30, 2017, they should be included in this count. This question is not intended to count diversion cases.

Probation

7. Number of adults who began Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) in your county during the fiscal year.

(Examples are listed after the question)

\*Hierarchy rules do not apply to this question and thus individuals may be counted in more than one supervision category.

The intent of this question is to determine the number of adults who began Post Release Community Supervision in your county during the fiscal year.

The first part of this question seeks to identify the number of PRCS offenders physically released from CDCR (Example #1) and those placed on PRCS following a paper commitment (Example #2). Do not count offenders if they were already on Post Release Community Supervision in your county.

The second part of this question seeks to identify the number of PRCS offenders that were transferred to your county from other jurisdictions (Example #3). If an offender was transferred into your county on a PRCS case and they were already on PRCS supervision in your county, the offender would still be coded under this section (PRCS Transfer-In All).

The third part of this question is a subset of the second part and only seeks to identify offenders that were transferred into your jurisdiction on a PRCS case and were not on Post Release Community Supervision in your county when the transfer was accepted (PRCS Transfer-In New) (Example #4)

PRCS (CDCR Releases)

PRCS (Transfer-In All)

PRCS (Transfer-In-New)

Examples for Question 7

Example 1: On July 1, 2016, John Doe was released from CDCR to your county to begin a period of Post Release Community Supervision. Mr. Doe would be coded in CDCR Releases.

Example 2: On July 1, 2016, Susan Smith was sentenced to state prison, but based on the amount of time she has already served, she was immediately directed to report to probation to begin a period of Post Release Community Supervision. Ms. Smith would be coded in CDCR Releases.

Example 3: On September 4, 2016, Larry Cable's Post Release Community Supervision case was jurisdictionally transferred to your county. It should be noted that Mr. Cable was already on Post Release Community Supervision in your county when the PRCS transfer case was accepted. Mr. Cable would be coded in Transfer-In All.

Example 4: On September 4, 2016, Larry Cable's Post Release Community Supervision case was jurisdictionally transferred to your county. It should be noted that Mr. Cable was already on Post Release Community Supervision in your county when the PRCS transfer case was accepted. Mr. Cable's case would not be coded in Transfer-In New, as Mr. Cable was already on PRCS supervision when his second PRCS (transfer) case was accepted.

8. Number of adults who began Mandatory Supervision in your county during the fiscal year.

(Examples are listed after the question)

\*Hierarchy rules do not apply to this question and thus individuals may be counted in more than one supervision category.

The intent of this question is to determine the number of adults who began Mandatory Supervision (MS) in your county during the fiscal year

The first part of this question seeks to identify the number of MS offenders who completed the county prison portion of their sentence (if ordered) and were released onto supervision (Example #1). Do not count offenders if they were already on Mandatory Supervision in your county.

The second part of this question seeks to identify the number of MS offenders that were transferred to your county from other jurisdictions (Example #2). If an offender was transferred into your county on a MS case and they were already on MS supervision in your county, the offender would still be coded under this section (MS Transfer-In All).

The third part of this question is a subset of the second part and only seeks to identify offenders that were transferred into your jurisdiction on a MS case and were not on Mandatory Supervision in your county when the transfer was accepted (MS Transfer-In New). For cases that should not be coded under this part, see Example #3.

Mandatory Supervision  
(Grants)

Mandatory Supervision  
(Transfer-In All)

Mandatory Supervision  
(Transfer-In New)

Examples for Question 8

Example 1: On July 1, 2016, John Doe was released from county prison to begin the mandatory supervision portion of his sentence. Mr. Doe would be coded in Mandatory Supervision (Grants).

Example 2: On September 4, 2016, Larry Cable's Mandatory Supervision case was jurisdictionally transferred to your county. It should be noted that Mr. Cable was already on Mandatory Supervision in your county when his Mandatory Supervision transfer case was accepted. Mr. Cable would be coded in Transfer-In All.

Example 3: On September 4, 2016, Larry Cable's Mandatory Supervision case was jurisdictionally transferred to your county. It should be noted that Mr. Cable was already on Mandatory Supervision in your county when the Mandatory Supervision transfer case was accepted. Mr. Cable's case would not be coded in Transfer-In New, as Mr. Cable was already on Mandatory Supervision in your county when his second Mandatory Supervision (transfer) case was accepted.

9. Number of adults who began Probation Supervision in your county during the fiscal year.

(Examples are listed after the question)

\*Hierarchy rules do not apply to this question and thus individuals may be counted in more than one supervision category.

The intent of this question is to determine the number of adults who began Probation Supervision (Felony or Misdemeanor) in your county during the fiscal year.

The first part of this question seeks to identify the number of offenders who were placed on Probation supervision in your county (Example #1). Do not count offenders if they were already on probation supervision in your county.

The second part of this question seeks to identify the number of Probation offenders that were transferred to your county from other jurisdictions (Example #2). If an offender was transferred into your county on a Probation case and they were already on Probation supervision in your county, the offender would still be coded under this section (Probation Transfer-In All).

The third part of this question is a subset of the second part and only seeks to identify offenders that were transferred into your jurisdiction on a Probation case and were not on Probation Supervision in your county when the transfer was accepted (Probation Transfer-In New). For cases that should not be coded under this part, see Example #3.

Probation (Felony and Misdemeanor Grants)

Probation (Felony and Misdemeanor Transfer-In All)

Probation (Felony and Misdemeanor Transfer-In New)

Examples for Question 9

Example 1: On July 1, 2016, John Doe was granted probation supervision. Mr. Doe would be coded in Probation (Felony and Misdemeanor Grants).

Example 2: On September 4, 2016, Larry Cable's Probation Supervision case was jurisdictionally transferred to your county. It should be noted that Mr. Cable was already on Probation Supervision in your county when his Probation Supervision transfer case was accepted. Mr. Cable would be coded in Transfer-In All.

Example 3: On September 4, 2016, Larry Cable's Probation Supervision case was jurisdictionally transferred to your county. It should be noted that Mr. Cable was already on Probation Supervision in your county when the Probation Supervision transfer case was accepted. Mr. Cable's case would not be coded in Transfer-In New, as Mr. Cable was already on Probation Supervision in your county when his second Probation Supervision (transfer) case was accepted.



### 3. Pretrial Supervision

10. How many Supervised Own Recognizance, (ie pre-trial release), people did the probation department supervise on June 30, 2017?

\*This is a one day snapshot of all the adults supervised by probation released on their own recognizance under a pre-trial release program. This question intends to capture defendants on supervised own recognizance even if they fall under other forms of supervision.

11. How many people were placed on Supervised Own Recognizance, (i.e. pretrial release) under supervision of the probation department during the fiscal year?

\*\*This can include offenders with other statuses (PRCS, MS, Probation).





#### 4. Flash Incarceration

12. How many bookings for a Flash incarceration occurred during the fiscal year?

\*The intent of this question is to identify all the flash incarceration bookings during the fiscal year, regardless of the booking reason (new charges, etc). If John Doe received 3 flash incarcerations while on PRCS supervision, the goal is to count all 3 flashes.

PRCS

Mandatory Supervision

Probation

13. How many individuals were Flash incarcerated during the fiscal year?

\* If John Doe received 3 flash incarcerations while on PRCS supervision during the reporting, Mr. Doe would only be counted once under this question.

PRCS

Mandatory Supervision

Probation



## CPOC Annual Data Survey 2016-2017

### 5. Adult Services-Warrants

14. Number of adults with outstanding warrants as of June 30, 2017.

\*The intent of this question is to capture the number of unique adults with outstanding warrants on a case supervised by the probation department as of June 30, 2017. Since those under supervision can be out to warrant on multiple warrant statuses, the CPOC supervision hierarchy applies. If John Doe has an outstanding warrant in his PRCS case that was issued on May 3, 2016 and his Probation case that was issued on July 10, 2016, only code him once under PRCS. Do not include warrants for matters not supervised by the probation department.

PRCS

Mandatory Supervision

Probation

15. Of the offenders on outstanding warrants as of June 30 2017, the number that were issued between July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017.

\*This is a subset of Question 14 and only seeks to capture adults (or offenders) as of June 30th who have outstanding warrants that were issued during FY 16-17.

From the above example, John Doe would not be counted in this section since his PRCS warrant was issued on May 3, 2016.

PRCS

Mandatory Supervision

Probation



## CPOC Annual Data Survey 2016-2017

### 6. Adult Services- Intake and Investigations and Departmental Reports

#### Count for the entire fiscal year, July 1, 2016- June 30, 2017

16. Number of presentence investigation reports completed.

17. What other reports are completed by officers/staff during the reporting period? Report the two highest based on volume if applicable other than those in #16.

#1

#2

18. Of the report type selected in question 17, how many were completed?

\* The intent of questions is to capture the work completed by all of your department's officers and staff during the reporting period of July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017. Example: If a supervision officer is writing a supplemental report following a violation of probation, this report is captured under this question.

#1

#2



## CPOC Annual Data Survey 2016-2017

### 7. Adult Services: Case Completions

**Count all offenders who ended supervision for any reason during the entire fiscal year, July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017. Ending Supervision is defined to include 1) Offenders with outstanding warrants should not be counted as terminated; 2) Number is based on the offender, not the number of cases. This number should imply a count of single supervision terms. If there is a break in supervision, this would be counted again.**

19. Number of adults who ended formal supervision during the fiscal year.

(Examples are after the question)

\*The goal of this question is to determine the number of adults who ended PRCS, Mandatory Supervision, and/or Formal Probation (3 supervision categories) for any reason (including any terminations due to new legislation such as Prop 47 or Prop 64). However, a closure due to a warrant or revoked status are not considered closed under this question. The hierarchy rules are not intended to apply to this section and thus your offender may be coded in more than one supervision category (Example #1). There may be situations where your offender could be counted more than once in a single supervision category (Example #2).

The second part of this question is a subset of the first part and seeks to identify only those adults who ended supervision in your county and were transferred to other counties pursuant to 1203.9 of the Penal Code for Probation and Mandatory Supervision and those PRCS offenders transferred to another county. The hierarchy rules are not intended to apply to this section and thus your offender may be coded in more than one supervision category (Example #3).

PRCS-All	<input type="text"/>
Mandatory Supervision-All	<input type="text"/>
Probation-All	<input type="text"/>
PRCS-Only Transfer-Outs	<input type="text"/>
Mandatory Supervision-Only Transfer-Outs	<input type="text"/>
Probation-Only Transfer-Outs	<input type="text"/>

Example 1: John Doe was terminated (#1) from formal probation cases on July 1, 2016, based on a new felony conviction. He is sentenced to county prison pursuant to PC 1170(h)(5)(a). Based on the number of credits and overpopulation issues, he is time served from his county prison sentence on October 3, 2016. On December 6, 2016, Mr. Doe is convicted on a felony violation of forgery and is sentenced to county prison with a period of mandatory supervision per PC 1170(h)(5)(b). On January 10, 2017, he is released onto mandatory supervision. On May 10, 2017, Mr. Doe is terminated (#2) from his mandatory supervision case based on a new felony conviction and is sentenced to a county prison per PC 1170(h)(5)(a). Under this example, Mr. Doe should be coded in Question #24 once under Probation and once under Mandatory Supervision.

Example 2: John Doe was terminated (#1) from formal probation on July 1, 2016, based on a new felony conviction. He is sentenced to county prison pursuant to PC 1170(h)(5)(a). Based on the number of credits and overpopulation issues, he is time served from his county prison sentence on October 3, 2016. On December 6, 2016, Mr. Doe is convicted on a felony violation of forgery and is sentenced to formal probation. On May 10, 2017, Mr. Doe is terminated (#2) from formal probation based on a new felony conviction and is sentenced to county prison per PC 1170(h)(5)(a). Under this example, Mr. Doe should be coded in Question #24 twice under Probation, since there were two distinct probation supervision periods.

Example 3: On December 1, 2016, Susan Hills's formal probation grant was transferred pursuant to PC 1203.9 from Mono County to Placer County. On December 8, 2016, Ms. Hill's PRCS case was transferred from Mono County to Placer County. Ms. Hill should be coded once on the PRCS "Only Transfer Outs" and once on Probation "Only Transfer Outs" category (separate supervision categories).

20. In the adult section please provide information about which questions were difficult to answer and why? If you answered NA, please explain why it did not apply to your county.

21. Comments for Adult Services Section



## CPOC Annual Data Survey 2016-2017

### 8. Juvenile Supervision: Population

**Include those on warrant status.**

22. Number of Juveniles supervised by Probation as of June 30, 2017.

Count of individuals in your county under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court.

\*The intent of this question is to count the number of youth (not cases/referrals) under the care and supervision of the probation department and/or the Court as of June 30, 2017. This question does not count the number of youth pending disposition for a new criminal referral and is intended to capture those with a dispositional status, included those on informal probation pursuant to W&I 654. If a youth is on warrant status following a disposition, they will be included in the count.

Example: The probation department received a referral from the Sheriff's Department on 16 year old John Doe, for a Penal Code Violation of Section 11377(a) H&S, a misdemeanor. Mr. Doe had not been previously on any form of juvenile supervision and is current pending a dispositional hearing set for August 3, 2017. Since Mr. Doe's matter is still pending and he is not currently on supervision, he will not be counted in this question.



## CPOC Annual Data Survey 2016-2017

### 9. Juvenile Services

**Include those on warrant status.**

23. Of the total of youth being supervised from #22 as of June 30, 2017, number of youth who fall under the following petition types:

\*The intent of this question is to break down the type of supervision for each youth counted in Question #27. If a youth is on wardship pursuant to W&I 602 for a felony and misdemeanor offense, that youth shall be coded under "W&I 602 Felony Criminal Offense".

W&I 450: Non Minor Dependent or adults that qualify to get foster care reimbursement

W&I 601: Status Offense (Truancy or Curfew)

W&I 602: Felony Criminal Offense

W&I 602: Misdemeanor Criminal Offense Only

W&I 654: Informal Probation

W&I 654.2: Court places minor on informal probation

W&I 725(a): 6 month of non-wardship probation

W&I 790: Deferred Entry of Judgment

Other Status

24. Number of youth who came under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court during fiscal year.

\*The intent of this question is to identify all youth who came under the jurisdiction of the court during the fiscal year based on the following W&I categories; 602 wards, 725a, 790, and AB1628 DJJ Re-entry Parolees.





## CPOC Annual Data Survey 2016-2017

### 10. Juveniles- Specialized Supervision

**For this section provide the number of 602 Wards who are under supervision in specialized caseloads as of June 30, 2017. Include those on warrant status.**

**\*The intent of Questions 25-31 is to capture youth on supervision pursuant to W&I 602 that were being supervised on specialized caseloads as listed below as of June 30, 2017. This population is a subset of Question #23 and includes those in warrant status. It should be noted that if you have non-specialized caseloads that mix gang, sex offender, mentally ill youth, etc, then they are not included in these supervision counts.**

25. Youth under Sex Offender supervision.

\*The intent of this question is to identify the number of youth on wardship supervision pursuant to W&I 602 that were also being supervised on a specialized sex offender supervision caseload (including those in warrant status). This population is a subset of Question #23. Sex offenders supervised on mixed caseload categories are not counted in this question.

In order to calculate the caseload ratio, take the total number of sex offenders being supervised on a specialized caseload and divide that by the total number of budgeted officers (temporary vacancies should be counted) managing those specialized cases. Example: 75 Sex Offenders and 5 Officers = a ratio of 15 Sex Offenders to 1 Officer. Round to the nearest whole number.

Number of Youths

Actual Caseload Ratio

26. Youth under Gang supervision.

\*The intent of this question is to identify the number of youth on wardship supervision pursuant to W&I 602 that were also being supervised on a specialized gang offender supervision caseload (including those in warrant status). This population is a subset of Question #23. Gang offenders supervised on mixed caseload categories are not counted in this question.

In order to calculate the caseload ratio, take the total number of gang offenders being supervised on a specialized caseload and divide that by the total number of budgeted officers (temporary vacancies should be counted) managing those specialized cases. Example: 140 Gang Offenders and 6 Officers = a ratio of 23 Gang Offenders to 1 Officer. Round to the nearest whole number.

Number of Youths	<input type="text"/>
Actual Caseload Ratio	<input type="text"/>

27. Youth under Mentally Ill Offender supervision.

\*The intent of this question is to identify the number of youth on wardship supervision pursuant to W&I 602 that were also being supervised on a specialized Mentally Ill offender supervision caseload (including those in warrant status). This population is a subset of Question #23. Mentally Ill offenders supervised on mixed caseload categories are not counted in this question.

In order to calculate the caseload ratio, take the total number of mentally ill offenders being supervised on a specialized caseload and divide that by the total number of budgeted officers (temporary vacancies should be counted) managing those specialized cases. Example: 21 Mentally Ill Offenders and 2 Officers = a ratio of 11 Mentally Ill Offenders to 1 Officer. Round to the nearest whole number.

Number of Youths	<input type="text"/>
Actual Caseload Ratio	<input type="text"/>

28. Youth under Electronic Monitoring/Home supervision.

\*The intent of this question is to identify the number of youth on wardship supervision pursuant to W&I 602 that were also being supervised on a specialized Electronic Monitoring/Home Supervision offender supervision caseload (including those in warrant status). This population is a subset of Question #23. Electronic Monitoring/Home Supervision offenders supervised on mixed caseload categories are not counted in this question.

In order to calculate the caseload ratio, take the total number of Electronic Monitoring/Home supervision offenders being supervised on a specialized caseload and divide that by the total number of budgeted officers (temporary vacancies should be counted) managing those specialized cases. Example: 48 Electronic Monitoring/Home Supervision Offenders and 5 Officers = a ratio of 10 Electronic Monitoring/Home Supervision Offenders to 1 Officer. Round to the nearest whole number.

Number of Youths

Actual Caseload Ratio

29. Youth in out-of-home placement.

\*The intent of this question is to identify the number of youth on wardship supervision pursuant to W&I 602 that were also being supervised on a specialized Out-of-Home Placement offender supervision caseload (including those in warrant status). This population is a subset of Question #23. Out-of-Home Placement offenders supervised on mixed caseload categories are not counted in this question.

In order to calculate the caseload ratio, take the total number of Out-of-Home Placement offenders being supervised on a specialized caseload and divide that by the total number of budgeted officers (temporary vacancies should be counted) managing those specialized cases. Example: 16 Out-of-Home Placement Offenders and 2 Officers = a ratio of 8 Out-of-Home Placement Offenders to 1 Officer. Round to the nearest whole number.

Number of Youths

Actual Caseload Ratio



## 11. Juvenile Services-Warrants

### Count the number of youth who absconded or failed to appear and a warrant was issued

30. Number of juvenile wards with outstanding warrants as of June 30, 2017.

\*The intent of this question is to capture the number of youth on wardship supervision pursuant to W&I 602 that were also in warrant status as of June 30, 2017. This is a subset of Question #23.

W & I 602 Wards

31. Of the youth with outstanding warrants, the number that were issued between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017.

\*This is a subset of Question #30 and only seeks to capture the number of youth on wardship supervision pursuant to W&I 602 on warrant status as of June 30, 2017, and had a warrant that was issued between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017. If the juvenile's warrant was issued outside of this date range, they are not coded under this question.

W & I 602 Wards



## CPOC Annual Data Survey 2016-2017

### 12. Juvenile Services-Intake and Investigation and Departmental Reports

32. Count for the entire fiscal year, July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

Choose the top three types of reports done by investigators in your county.

Only enter data for the top three types of reports.

\*The intent of this question is to capture the work completed by all of your department's officers and staff during the reporting period of July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017. Example: If a supervision officer is writing a dispositional report following a violation pursuant to W&I 777, this report is captured under this question.

241.1 W & I

Protocol Reports

Dispositional Reports

Fitness Reports

Detention Reports

Placement Reports

Review Reports



## CPOC Annual Data Survey 2016-2017

### 13. Juvenile Services-Referrals

**This section is asking for information for the entire fiscal year. Numbers are for referrals, not youth. Put referrals in one category only to avoid double counting. Count only the highest charge level.**

#### 33. Count of Referrals.

\*The intent of this question is to capture the number of referrals received by probation during the reporting period July, 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017. If a criminal referral from law enforcement has more than one charge indicated; pick the highest charge (i.e. Felony trumps Misdemeanor) and code the referral group accordingly. If a W&I 777 violations is solely based on a new criminal charge, then the new charge trumps the W&I 777.

Example. On January 1, 2016, John Doe was declared a ward of the Court pursuant to W&I 602. On December 3, 2016, Mr. Doe was arrested and booked into the Juvenile Hall for a violation of section 211 of the Penal Code, a felony. Two referrals were processed, one for the 211 PC and one for failure to obey all laws based on the 211 charge (W&I 777). In this case, only the 211 PC referral would be counted. However if the W&I 777 referral also included violation behavior independent to the 211 charge, then it could be coded separately.

Felony referrals

Misdemeanor referrals

Infraction referrals

W&I 777 Violation  
Referrals



#### 14. Juvenile Services: Case Closure

**This survey section requests information about ALL youthful offenders who are no longer under supervision of the juvenile court for any reason, including normal termination during fiscal year July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017. For this measure include only individuals who are in following categories. (602, 725a, 790 and AB1628-DJJ re-entry parolees)**

**Please round responses to the nearest whole number.**

34. Number of individuals terminated from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court during fiscal year.

\*The intent of this question is to identify all youth who ended supervision under the following W&I categories; 602 wards, 725a, 790, and AB1628-DJJ Re-Entry Parolees. If a youth ended supervision during the first part of the reporting period and was subsequently referred to probation to end supervision at the end of the reporting period, you would count that individual twice, as they are two distinct periods of supervision.

35. Number of terminated individuals who were sentenced to DJJ while under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court in your county.

\*The intent of this question is to capture the number of youth that terminated supervision and were committed to DJJ. This question is only intended to capture youth that were adjudicated and committed to DJJ under the juvenile system and not those youth that were found unfit in Juvenile Court and remanded to the Adult Court for sentencing.

36. Number of terminated individuals who were sentenced to DJJ as the result of a crime committed while under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court in your county.

\*The intent of this question is to capture the number of youth that terminated supervision and were committed to DJJ based on a sustained petition/adjudication for a new criminal offense. This question is only intended to capture youth that were adjudicated and committed to DJJ under the juvenile system and not those youth that were found unfit in Juvenile Court and remanded to the Adult Court for sentencing. This is a subset of question 35.

Example 1: On June 1, 2016, Sam Smith was declared a ward of the Court pursuant to W&I 602. On January 1, 2017, the Probation Department received a subsequent referral for a violation of Penal Code Section 187(a) PC. The Court set a fitness hearing to determine if Mr. Smith would continue in the juvenile court or be process in adult court. Mr. Smith was found fit to proceed in juvenile court and later admitted to the 187(a) PC charge. On June 3, 2017, wardship was continued and Mr. Smith was committed to DJJ. Mr. Smith would be counted under these circumstances.

Example 2: On June 1, 2016, Sam Smith was declared a ward of the Court pursuant to W&I 602. On January 1, 2017, the Probation Department received a subsequent referral for a violation of Penal Code Section 187(a) PC. The Court set a fitness hearing to determine if Mr. Smith would continue in the juvenile court or be process in adult court. Mr. Smith was found unfit to proceed in juvenile court and his case was remanded to Adult Court. On March 30, 2017, Mr. Smith entered a guilty plea to a violation of Section 187(a) PC. On June 3, 2017, Mr. Smith was sentenced to State Prison, to be housed at DJJ until his 18th birthday. On June 10, 2017, Mr. Smith's wardship was terminated. This case would not be counted.

37. In the juvenile section please provide information about which questions were difficult to answer and why? If you answered NA, please explain why it did not apply to your county.

38. Comments for Juvenile Services Section





## CPOC Annual Data Survey 2016-2017

15. Thank you!

**This is the last page in the survey. By clicking "Done" below, your results will be sent to CPOC.**

**Please share any thoughts about this survey below. In the winter, a workgroup will review comments and make any changes to the survey for the following year. These changes can be about improving ease of use, training, or anything else you think we should know.**

39. Were there questions that were asked that are not relevant to this survey? Please refer to specific question numbers.

40. What questions would you like to see added or considered for next years survey?