

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

On October 11, 2009, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Senate Bill 678, the California Community Corrections Performance Incentives Act of 2009 which was authored by Senator Mark Leno and Senator John Benoit. This CPOC sponsored bill puts a process in place to secure a stable funding stream for probation through a performance-based system. The statute authorizes each county to establish a Community Corrections Performance Incentives Fund (CCPIF) and authorizes the state to annually allocate money into a State Corrections Performance Incentives Fund to be used for specified purposes relating to improving local probation supervision practices and capacities, as specified. This statute requires the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, the Chief Probation Officers of California, and the Administrative Office of the Courts, to calculate the amount of money to be appropriated from the state fund into a CCPIF. The statute further specifies that the calculation is based on costs avoided by the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation because of a reduction in the percentage of adult probationers sent to prison for a probation failure. Specifically, the more successful we are at the front end of the system by decreasing the rate of failure while on probation, the safer our communities and the less costly to the state system in prison commitments. The statute also requires each county using CCPIF funds to identify and track specific outcome-based measures, as specified, and report to the Administrative Office of the Courts on the effectiveness of the programs paid for by the CCPIF.

The statute gives probation broad discretion as to how to best implement evidence based practices in their county to meet the needs of their community and ultimately impact the state prison population. This guide is intended to assist in a Chief's planning process to expend the initial funds appropriated through the budget act as seed money to eventually leverage the most out of SB 678 new statutory provisions.

This guide is designed to assist Chief Probation Officers to develop effective programs, using principles of evidence based practices (EBP) in community corrections, that have a high likelihood of reducing recidivism rates of probationers resulting in a reduction in the number of commitments to prison for probation violations and improved public safety.

The guide identifies 13 questions that a Chief Probation Officer should consider in SB 678 program planning to ensure identifying the appropriate target population, proper training of staff and adherence to EBP principles. The questions are listed in order of importance with question one addressing the most critical part of program planning, question two the second most critical, etc. Beginning with question three, the EBP principle targeted is identified. It is suggested that funds would be best spent addressing the items at the top of the list and if resources are available, to continue down the list. There is one exception to the sequence—outcome measures (question 12). Outcome measurement is required as part of the bill; however, Chiefs may want to consider additional measurements beyond the mandates. This guide provides a “menu” of outcome measures that can be considered. Lastly, the guide provides resource information for each question, by CPOC region, with contact information. The resource information is intended to allow Chiefs to easily view what other counties have implemented or are in the process of implementing and if interested in obtaining more detailed information, to make contact with the person most knowledgeable about a specific county's efforts in each area.

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

QUESTIONS TO ASK

1. Have you identified the population where improved services are most likely to reduce prison commitments without compromising public safety?

IF ANSWER IS NO, RESOURCES THAT MAY BE HELPFUL (BY REGION)

North

Colusa: We will be using the STRONG. We will be reviewing our prison commitments for trends. → **Contact Chief Steve Bordin, 530-458-0656**

Glenn: Yes. → **Contact Chief Brandon Thompson, 530-934-6416, bthompson@countyofglenn.net**

Shasta: Yes. Those offenders with mental health issues, drug offenders, and 18-25 year olds. → **Contact Chelsey Chappelle, Adult Division Director, 530-245-6245 or clchappelle@co.shasta.ca.us**

Sacramento

Amador: Analysis is currently in progress. → **Contact Deron Brodehl, 209-223-6339**

Calaveras: Yes. 18-25. → **Contact Chief Teri Hall, 209-754-6471**

El Dorado: Yes. → **Contact Chief Joe Warchol, 530-621-5958**

Lake: We will be using a static risk assessment to identify risk level prior to implementing the STRONG. We will also be assessing our prior prison commitments to identify the types of violations that resulted in prison commitments. → **Contact Paula Snyder, 707-262-4285, paulas@co.lake.ca.us**

Nevada: Doing a study of commitments. Most likely will be in the areas of VOP commits. → **Contact Program Manager Mike Ertola, 530 265 1209, Michael.ertola@co.nevada.ca.us**

Placer: Yes. Typically 18 – 29. Property & drug. → **Contact Probation Manager Nancy Huntley 916-543-7414**

Sacramento: Sacramento Probation is in the process of implementing a risk assessment tool that will identify high risk adult probationers. → **Contact Supervising Probation Officer Rob Edmisten, 916-875-0043, EdmistenR@saccounty.net**

San Joaquin: Conducting analysis of 2005-2008 prison commitments on VOPs. We will be relying on the use of a validated adult risk assessment tool to determine the level of risk to reoffend. We are in the beginning stages of selecting a tool at this time. → **Contact Asst. Deputy Chief Michael Martinez, (209) 468-9976**

Sutter: We are currently evaluating our past probation revocations, but believe the initial emphasis will be on low level offenders with substance abuse issues. → **Contact Chief Odom, 530-822-7320, codom@co.sutter.ca.us**

Yolo: Analysis is currently in process. → **Contact Adult Division Manager Jim Metzen, 530-406-5326**

Yuba: We will be using the STRONG, studies suggest the 18-25 age group. → **Contact Program Manager Randy Moore, 530-749-7549**

Central

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Fresno: The youthful offender within the 18-25 age range. → **Contact Rick Chavez, 550-488-3419 or Probation Services Manager Kirk Haynes, 559-452-2823.**

Kern: 18-25 years, created High Risk Unit and provide wrap around services.

Mariposa: Yes. 18-25. → **Contact Chief Gail Neal, 209-966-3612**

Merced: Analysis currently in progress. → **Contact Chief Brian Cooley, 209-385-7560**

Tulare: 18 to 25 year olds.

Bay

Solano: Completing an analysis of 2008 prison commitments. → **Contact Chief Isabelle Voit, 707-784-4803**

Mendocino: We expect to use our new risk assessment to help with this. → **Contact Chief Wesley Forman, 707-463-5750**

Contra Costa: We are focusing on the 18-25 year old population. → **Contact Chief Deputy Nancy Valencia, 925-313-4199**

Marin: We are in the process of doing so. This will include reviewing prison commitments from previous 3 years and surveying high risk caseloads for highest incidence of criminogenic needs. → **Contact Kevin Lynch, 415-499-6620**

Alameda: Yes; → **Contact Chief Deputy Bonita Vinson, 510-268-7200**

Monterey: Completing an analysis of 2007/2008 prison commitments. → **Contact Division Director Todd Keating, 831-796-1221**

Napa: Probably 18-25 yr. olds. → **Contact Chief Mary Butler, 707-259-8115**

San Francisco: Focus on 18-25 yr olds who live in SF. → **Contact Chief Patrick Boyd, 415-553-1688**

Santa Clara: We have intensive and specialized caseloads to meet the needs of our high risk clients who are likely to receive a state prison commitment if found in violation of probation. We monitor these clients closely and offer services and interventions to help the offender change their behavior and address their issues relating to criminality. → **Contact Deputy Chief Karen Fletcher, 408-435-1635**

Santa Cruz: Yes. → **Contact Laura Garnette, Adult Division Director, 831-454-3377**

Sonoma: Data from CPOC survey – 10.5% of probationers were sent to prison due to violations, 63% for technical violations and 40% for new law violations. → **Contact Dep. Chief Sheralynn Freitas, 707-565-2732**

South

San Bernardino: Yes, medium risk to recidivate probationers. → **Contact Julie Hovis, Division Director I, 909-387-4211**

jhovis@prob.sbcounty.gov

Los Angeles: Yes, last year our Adult Bureau implemented a caseload restructure to better align our work with that of Evidence Based Practices and to more effectively utilize our deputized resources. We have also decided to focus on the so called Emerging Adult (18-25) probation population, who based on statistics, represent approximately 10% of the population and commit approximately 30% of the crimes. We are also attempting to further validate our focus. We are in the process of running statistical data from our adult probation records to determine which caseload categories have the highest rate of state prison commitments and thereby warrant improved services to reduce prison commitments. Once we have interpreted all the data we will refine/enhance our focus in the development of an intervention program that we believe will have the greatest impact on state prison commitments without

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

jeopardizing public safety. → **Contact Lynne Duke 818-374-2001; lynne.duke@probation.lacounty.gov**

Orange: We plan to identify a target group of probationers (particularly, 18 to 25) that upon initial probation sentencing, present a profile of being at high-risk for terminating to prison. To help us define that group, we will be conducting an analysis of recent probationers who terminated to prison and compare their profiles to probationers terminating satisfactorily. → **Contact Jeff Corp, Director Program Division, 714-937-4502**

Santa Barbara: Aside from high risk offenders with gang terms and conditions and gang enhancements other high risk violent offenders are targeted. We are in the process of determining a potential additional target population for Evidence Based services, pending an assessment of the last 24 months of CDCR commitments. It should also be noted that the department is currently implementing an Evidence Based screening tool, Northpointe COMPAS, which will assist in ongoing identification of the appropriate target population. → **Contact DCPO Karen Wheeler 805 882-3675**

Imperial: Imperial County is planning to implement the 3-question Proxy Screening tool from Hawaii to initially screen 2,800 adult cases. Cases in the medium high to high risk range will then be subject to a 3-4th generation risk assessment tool. The department is currently lining up presentations on the COMPAS, LSI-R, OST (Arizona), STRONG (assessments.com) and the Revised Wisconsin (Iowa, Orange Co, CA). Plans also include an analysis of previous revocations to prison using local Community College. → **Contact Chief Martin**

Krizay, mkrizay@co.imperial.ca.us

San Diego: We are focusing on high risk offenders. → **Contact Natalie Pearl, Natalie.Pearl@sdcounty.ca.gov**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

QUESTIONS TO ASK

2. Has your staff been trained in the basic principles of Evidence Based Practices (EBP)?

IF ANSWER IS NO, RESOURCES THAT MAY BE HELPFUL (BY REGION)

North

Colusa: Yes. → Contact Chief Steve Bordin, 530-458-0656

Glenn: Yes. → Contact Chief Brandon Thompson, 530-934-6416, bthompson@countyofglenn.net

Shasta: Yes. → Contact Chelsey Chappelle, Adult Division Director, 530-245-6245 or clchappelle@co.shasta.ca.us

Sacramento

Amador: Yes → Contact Chief Bonini, 209-223-6229

Calaveras: Yes. We have been on this path for over 3 years. → Contact Chief Teri Hall, 209-754-6471

Nevada: No formal training. Will be scheduling this training year. → Contact Program Manager Mike Ertola, 530 265 1209,

Michael.ertola@co.nevada.ca.us

Placer: Most. Required of STC staff. → Contact Probation Manager Nancy Huntley 916-543-7414

Sacramento: Yes. → Contact Supervising Probation Officer Rob Edmisten, 916-875-0043, EdmistenR@saccounty.net

San Joaquin: Yes, all probation officers have been trained. → Contact Asst. Deputy Chief Michael Martinez, 209-468-9976

Sutter: We started initial MI training last year. Some officers currently assigned to the adult unit came from the juvenile unit where staff has been fully trained in assessments and MI. → Contact Deputy Chief Paras-Topete, 530-822-7320, lparas@co.sutter.ca.us

Yolo: Yes. → Contact Adult Division Manager Jim Metzen, 530-406-5326

Yuba: Yes, very basic. → Contact Program Manager Randy Moore, 530-749-7549

Central

Fresno: Only in juvenile institutions where all staff have been trained as facilitators in cognitive program “Thinking For a Change.”

Kern: Yes. Matrix, ART, Journaling and Risk/Needs Assessment program.

Tulare: All juvenile staff have been trained; adult staff pending.

Bay

Solano: Mandated for all STC staff. → Contact Supervising DPO Jennifer Washington, 707-784-7623

Alameda: Yes. → Contact Chief Deputy Bonita Vinson, 510-268-7200

Contra Costa: Yes, we have been trained in the basics, but some understand better than others. → Contact Adult Manager Yvette McCollumn, 925-313-4154

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Marin: Yes. → **Contact Kevin Lynch, 415-499-6620**

Mendocino: Yes. → **Contact Chief Wesley Forman, 707-463-5750**

Monterey: STC staff has varying levels of training in the principles of EBP. → **Contact PSM Sonja Gattis, 831-755-3777**

Napa: Yes. → **Contact Chief Mary Butler, 707-259-8115**

San Francisco: We are examining options for comprehensive EBP training, and for the collection/analysis of outcome data. → **Contact Chief Patrick Boyd, 415-553-1688**

Santa Clara: We have not yet conducted department-wide training for all staff; however, some staff members have attended training in the basic principles. → **Contact Deputy Chief Karen Fletcher, 408-435-1635**

Santa Cruz: Yes. → **Contact Laura Garnette, Adult Division Director, 831-454-3377**

Sonoma: Provided to all staff in Adult Division; mandated as part of new officer training. → **Contact Deputy Chief Sheralynn Freitas, 707-565-2732**

South

San Bernardino: Yes, all staff several years ago, developing yearly update class. → **Contact Julie Hovis, Division Director I (909) 387-4211, jhovis@prob.sbcounty.gov**

Los Angeles: Yes, deputized staff assigned to the Day Reporting Center. For the remainder, we are in the process of training all Adult Field Services Bureau staff in Motivational Interviewing and Core Correctional Practices. This task should be completed by the end of January, 2010. We have offered training to all probation staff over the last two years in the basics of EBP, in an effort to prepare them for this change. → **Contact Lynne Duke 818-374-2001; lynne.duke@probation.lacounty.gov**

Orange: The department currently has a technical assistance grant from NIC for implementing EBP in community corrections, which has included educating and developing formal training of staff on EBP principles. This initiative was officially launched on May 30, 2008, but the Crime and Justice Institute had been providing informal assistance since fall 2007.

Specific training has included presentations from a variety of EBP experts including Chris Lowenkamp (University of Cincinnati), Bill Burrell (APPA, Temple University), and Crime and Justice Institute experts. We've involved all supervisors in these opportunities. Specific topics have included:

- "What Works"—a discussion of research and program meta-analysis that has identified the key 8 Criminogenic Risk elements, and program components to address those elements.
- Performance Measurement—a presentation by Bill Burrell about setting and measuring outcome targets.
- Leadership Academy
- Facilitative Leadership
- Project Management
- Infusion of EBP concepts in to Annual Training curriculum

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

- Participating in the BPOC revision that will incorporate EBP concepts and tools

→ **Contact Mike Collins 714-667-7723**

Santa Barbara: Institutions have been using the MAYSI for 5+ years and are trained in cognitive behavioral intervention (Samenow) and Aggression Replacement Training (ART®), which should ease the transition of this information to adult services. Field services staff received training in Motivational Interviewing in 2007. An introduction to EBP and a retraining in Motivational Interviewing was delivered to Adult Division personnel in Dec 2009, as a component of the implementation of a new EB Assessment Tool (COMPAS); additionally, 10 staff are scheduled to attend ART® training for trainers in the near future. → **Contact DCPO Karen Wheeler 805 882-3675**

Imperial: Yes, Chief PO has provided stand-up presentations on EBP to management and line staff on multiple occasions.

Assessments.com Project Manager for Juvenile PACT has made numerous formal and informal presentations on the eight principles to effective intervention. The Crime Justice Institute is scheduled to be in Imperial County September 29-30, 2009 to present EBP and strategic planning to all staff and a separate stakeholder meeting that includes judges, BOS, CEO, law enforcement, local attorneys and treatment providers. → **Contact Chief Martin Krizay mkrizay@co.imperial.ca.us**

San Diego: To date all sworn field staff have been exposed to at least 4 hours of EBP training + additional training that is included in our assessment tool training (approximately 2 additional hours). → **Contact Natalie Pearl, Natalie.Pearl@sdcounty.ca.gov**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

QUESTIONS TO ASK

“Assess Actuarial Risk/Needs”

3. Are you using a validated tool to assess risk/needs?

IF ANSWER IS NO, RESOURCES THAT MAY BE HELPFUL (BY REGION)

North

Colusa: We will be using the STRONG by the end of 2010. → **Contact Chief Steve Bordin, 530-458-0656**

Glenn: Yes—STRONG. Contact Chief Brandon Thompson, 530-934-6416, bthompson@countyofglenn.net

Shasta: Not currently. We are part of the Northern California Probation Consortium (NCPC) and the Implementation team for the STRONG risk/needs assessment tool (through Assessments.com) which begins meeting at the end of October. → **Contact Chelsey**

Chappelle, Adult Division Director, 530-245-6245 or clchappelle@co.shasta.ca.us

Siskiyou: Not yet. Waiting for implementation of STRONG. → **Contact Chief Todd Heie, 530-841-4366**

Sacramento

Amador: Using same risk assessment tool as Placer County. → **Contact Deron Brodehl, 209-223-6339**

Calaveras: Yes, but in process of reevaluating our current tool. The tool is the ROPE (Repeat Offender Profile Evaluation – author Brad Bogue) We have a validated to our population Proxy tool. → **Contact Chief Teri Hall, 209-754-6471**

El Dorado: Yes – Risk only! (Require both risk/needs tool.) → **Contact Chief Joe Warchol, 530-621-5958**

Lake: Will be implementing the STRONG with NCPC. → **Contact Paula Snyder, 707-262-4285, paulas@co.lake.ca.us**

Nevada: No it is an old NIC assessment tool. → **Contact Program Manager Mike Ertola, 530 265 1209,**

Michael.ertola@co.nevada.ca.us

Placer: Several. DRI-II for DUI. National Institute of Corrections (NIC) as mandated by PC 1203.016 (h) (3) for alternative sentencing. Wisconsin and SASSI for Adult and Juvenile. → **Contact Probation Manager Nancy Huntley 916-543-7414**

Sacramento: Sacramento Probation is in the process of implementing a static risk assessment tool. → **Contact Supervising Probation Officer Rob Edmisten, 916-875-0043, EdmistenR@saccounty.net**

San Joaquin: We are currently in the process of selecting a validated risk assessment tool to be used with our Adult population. → **Contact Asst. Deputy Chief Michael Martinez, (209) 468-9976**

Sutter: Wisconsin Risk Assessment has been in place since 1986. We will implement the STRONG this FY in coordination with NCPC.

→ **Contact Deputy Chief Paras-Topete, 530-822-7320, lparas@co.sutter.ca.us**

Yolo: Using a risk assessment, not a needs assessment (yet). Implemented the SRA portion of the STRONG. Pending implementation of the ONG (training still needed for staff). → **Contact Adult Division Manager Jim Metzen, 530-406-5326**

Yuba: Static-99 for sex offenders and will be using STRONG in future. → **Contact Program Manager Randy Moore, 530-749-7549**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Central

Fresno: Participating in regional collaborative to evaluate and purchase validated risk/needs assessment tool.

Kern: Yes. Adult: STRONG assessment tool. Juvenile: PACT assessment tool.

Merced: Yes. LSI-R, but participating in planning for a regional consortium for assessment tool which may change focus on which tool will be utilized. → **Contact Zach Robertson, 209-381-1377**

Tulare: Pending implementation of COMPASS. Currently assess risk on adult offenders utilizing the Proxy, as well as the Stat-99 on adult sex offenders.

Bay

Solano: LSI-R (SV) as proxy tool; LS-CMI for those not screened out to banked caseload with proxy. → **Contact Supervising DPO Jennifer Washington, 707-784-7623**

Alameda: Yes. The LS/CMI. → **Contact Chief Deputy Bonita Vinson, 510-268-7200**

Contra Costa: Yes, we are using the CAIS (NCCD) Assessment. → **Contact Adult Manager Yvette McCollum, 925-313-4154**

Marin: Yes, the LSCMI. → **Contact Kevin Lynch, 415-499-6620**

Mendocino: We intend to implement the STRONG in 2010. → **Contact Chief Wesley Forman, 707-463-5750**

Monterey: Assessments.com Static Risk Assessment (SRA) used to establish levels of supervision implemented in July of 2009. Plan to use the needs assessment STRONG on high risk offenders. → **Contact Division Director Todd Keating, 831-796-1221**

Napa: LSI-R as proxy tool; LS-CMI. Cases assigned by risk level with specialized caseloads for DV, Prop 36, gang and sex offenders. → **Contact Chief Mary Butler, 707-259-8115**

San Francisco: Yes, CAIS (NCCD), → **Contact Chief Patrick Boyd, 415-553-1688**

Santa Clara: Yes, Wisconsin Risk and Needs Assessment Tool. We are currently exploring a fourth generation assessment tool for our adult offenders. → **Contact Deputy Chief Karen Fletcher, 408-435-1635**

Santa Cruz: Yes for risk, no for needs. → **Contact Laura Garnette, Adult Division Director, 831-454-3377**

Sonoma: Adult Tool – Static Risk and Offender Needs Guide (STRONG) through Assessments.com. → **Contact Deputy Chief Sheralynn Freitas, 707-565-2732**

South

San Bernardino: Yes, Northpointe Compas. → **Contact Rick Arden 909-38- 5855**

Los Angeles: We have implemented the Level of Service/ Case Management Inventory for our high risk and specialized caseloads. This includes all High Risk, Testing High Risk, Family Violence, Adult Gang and Sex Registrant caseloads. We have recently completed our first inter-rater reliability evaluation of DPOs administering the assessment and are preparing a cadre of staff who can administer booster training for those deputies that have not demonstrated acceptable proficiency in administering the assessment. We hope to have the booster training complete in early to mid-2010. We are also planning the implementation of the Texas Christian University Drug Screen II drug use assessment for use with our narcotics testing population. We have recently completed training on the use of the Spousal Abuse Risk

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Assessment for use by our Family Violence caseloads. → **Contact Lynne Duke 818-374-2001; lynne.duke@probation.lacounty.gov**

Orange: Yes, we use a version of the Wisconsin Risk & Needs that was validated in Orange County and is in the process of being revalidated currently. It is the foundation for establishing supervision level (see Q. 4), developing the case plan and monitoring progress while under supervision. → **Contact Shirley Hunt 714-569-2174**

Santa Barbara: The Adult Risk Screening Tool (ARIST) is completed on all new cases, both intakes and investigations. This assessment aids in determining whether a case will be assigned to a bank caseload (a score of 3 or lower) or be further assessed (a score of 4 or more). Additionally, COMPAS is in the implementation phase effective December 09; therefore, future risk assessments will be made at the investigative stage utilizing a validated risk/needs tool. → **Contact Lee Bethel, Adult Manager, 805-882-3753**

San Diego: Yes, on the adult side we are using COMPAS for all offenders + Static 99 for eligible sex offenders + SARA for DV offenders. → **Contact Natalie Pearl, Natalie.Pearl@sdcounty.ca.gov**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

QUESTIONS TO ASK

“Target Interventions—Risk Principle”

4. Are you providing supervision based on risk with priority given to higher risk offenders?

IF ANSWER IS NO, RESOURCES THAT MAY BE HELPFUL (BY REGION)

North

Colusa: Once we have implemented the STRONG we will begin supervising based on risk. → **Contact Chief Steve Bordin, 530-458-0656**

Glenn: Yes. → **Contact Chief Brandon Thompson, 530-934-6416, bthompson@countyofglenn.net**

Shasta: We are using the old Wisconsin model risk assessment that is part of our IJS 400 client data base. We utilize the risk score from that assessment when making decisions about level of supervision. The implementation of the STRONG will change how cases are assessed and assigned. → **Contact Chelsey Chappelle, Adult Division Director, 530-245-6245 or clchappelle@co.shasta.ca.us**

Sacramento

Amador: Yes. → **Contact Deron Brodehl, 209-223-6339**

Calaveras: Yes, but perfecting the process. → **Contact Chief Teri Hall, 209-754-6471**

El Dorado: Yes. → **Contact Chief Joe Warchol, 530-621-5958**

Lake: Will be doing this by December 2009. Contact Paula Snyder, 707-262-4285, paulas@co.lake.ca.us.

Nevada: Yes, however is outdated assessment tool and local override is used heavily. → **Contact Program Manager Mike Ertola, 530-265-1209, Michael.ertola@co.nevada.ca.us**

Placer: Yes. → **Contact Probation Manager Nancy Huntley 916-543-7414**

Sacramento: Yes. → **Contact Supervising Probation Officer Rob Edmisten, 916-875-0043, EdmistenR@saccounty.net**

Sutter: Not as much as we should be. → **Contact Deputy Chief Paras-Topete, 530-822-7320, lparas@co.sutter.ca.us**

Yolo: Yes. For the cases that are supervised, we try to prioritize those who are high-risk. Only approximately ½ of the population has been assessed using the SRA. → **Contact Adult Division Manager Jim Metzen, 530-406-5326**

Central

Fresno: Without an assessment tool we provide specialized supervision to what we believe are high risk offenders, i.e. Gangs, Violent Offender, Child/Elder Abuse, Chronic Offenders, etc.

Kern: Yes. We evaluate each case for higher risk offenders. Once the assessment tool is fully implemented, the process will be evidence based.

Mariposa: Somewhat. Cases are assigned based on offense type.

Merced: Yes, provide supervision based on risk with focus on medium risk offenders. → **Contact Chris Bobbitt, 209-385-7560**

Tulare: Yes.

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Bay

Solano: Case assignment policy available. → **Contact Probation Services Manager Kelley Baulwin-Johnson, 707-784-6531**

Alameda: Yes, in our current SB-81 pilot program. → **Contact Chief Deputy Bonita Vinson, 510-268-7200**

Contra Costa: Yes, we are currently doing this. → **Contact Adult Manager Yvette McCollumn, 925-313-4154**

Marin: Yes. → **Contact Kevin Lynch, 415-499-6620**

Mendocino: To some degree yes. But our new tool will make it easier. → **Contact Chief Wesley Forman, 707-463-5750**

Monterey: We have recently completed assessing all probationers with the SRA and are in the process of redistributing supervision caseloads according to risk. → **Contact Division Director Todd Keating, 831-796-1221**

Napa: Cases assigned by risk level with specialized caseloads for DV, Prop 36, gang and sex offenders. → **Contact Chief Mary Butler, 707-259-8115**

San Francisco: Supervision is based on case plan. → **Contact Chief Patrick Boyd, 415-553-1688**

Santa Clara: Yes, we dedicate more resources to higher risk clients. The level of supervision, reporting standards and services provided are determined through comprehensive risk and needs assessments. The most serious offenders that pose the greatest risk to the community are placed on intensive supervision and are monitored by specialized units based on crime factors and needs. Other levels of supervision Regular, Minimum and Banked. → **Contact Deputy Chief Karen Fletcher, 408-435-1635**

Santa Cruz: Yes. → **Contact Laura Garnette, Adult Division Director, 831-454-3377**

Sonoma: Presently redistributing workload based on offender's risk to reoffend with the supervision resources focused on moderate-high risk offenders. → **Contact Deputy Chief Sheralynn Freitas, 707-565-2732**

South

San Bernardino: Yes, high risk probationers receive enhanced supervision. → **Contact Julie Hovis, Division Director I (909) 387-4211 jhovis@prob.sbcounty.gov**

Los Angeles: Yes. We have restructured our narcotic testing caseloads and supervision caseloads so cases are assigned based on risk scores. We utilize the Modified Wisconsin to determine the level of supervision that is appropriate for the probationer. The assessments score is determined by factors such as age of first arrest or adjudication, substance abuse, gang membership, prior probation revocations and the nature of the current offence (serious or violent felony). We also have specialized caseloads that address specific types of criminal activity such as gang membership, domestic violence and sex crimes. These types of caseloads are supervised as the highest level of intensity. → **Contact Lynne Duke 818-374-2001; lynne.duke@probation.lacounty.gov**

Orange: Yes, for general probationers, only those adult probationers assessed as high-risk are actively supervised. Low-risk and medium-risk probationers are monitored at an admin or banked standards. The exceptions to this are probationers in the collaborative courts or under DV or SO specialized supervision. Due to the long-term use of our R/N assessment tool, officers are accustomed to risk associated case planning. Future goals include efforts to link risk assessment information more directly with case planning, focusing on Responsivity and higher potency Criminogenic needs. → **Contact Jeff Corp, Director Program Division , 714-937-4502**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Santa Barbara: Yes. The department now has only high risk, specialty, and bank caseloads, having discontinued “medium” level supervision due to budget reductions. A risk assessment has been utilized to determine level of supervision. Beginning December 2009, the validated tool COMPAS is being utilized for this purpose. → **Contact DCPO Karen Wheeler 805 882-3675**

San Diego: Yes, we are currently realigning to provide high based supervision to adults and juveniles. → **Contact Natalie Pearl, Natalie.Pearl@sdcounty.ca.gov**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

QUESTIONS TO ASK

“Enhance Intrinsic Motivation”

5. Has your staff been trained in motivational interviewing? If so, how many hours and what type of training? Do you have policies and procedures involving MI? How are you monitoring the use of MI?

IF ANSWER IS NO, RESOURCES THAT MAY BE HELPFUL (BY REGION)

North

Colusa: The entire staff has received MI training. 16 hours each. No policies or procedures, no monitoring. → **Contact Chief Steve Bordin, 530-458-0656**

Glenn: Yes. → **Contact Chief Brandon Thompson, 530-934-6416, bthompson@countyofglenn.net**

Shasta: We had a small number of staff in the division trained in MI approximately 3 years ago but there has been no follow-up training since that time. MI is a component of the STRONG and all the officers in the division will be trained in MI when they learn the new assessment tool. → **Contact Chelsey Chappelle, Adult Division Director, 530-245-6245 or clchappelle@co.shasta.ca.us**

Sacramento

Amador: Some have been trained, 40 hour, risk and resiliency check up. No policy and/or procedure. → **Contact Chief Bonini, 209-223-6229**

Calaveras: Yes. Three trainings of 16 to 24 hours in the past three years. No finalized document on P&P. Supervisors have recorded and witnessed interviews. → **Contact Chief Teri Hall, 209-754-6471**

El Dorado: Entire field staff scheduled during next 6 months. (Training scheduled) → **Contact Chief Joe Warchol, 530-621-5958**

Nevada: Yes about 8 hours of MI training. No policy or procedure for MI use. No monitoring. → **Contact Program Manager Mike Ertola, 530 265 1209, Michael.ertola@co.nevada.ca.us**

Sacramento: Yes. All staff have been trained in a basic and advanced motivational interviewing course (8 hrs each). After a year, the Department evaluated the use of MI and found several issues with staff being able to bring MI concepts into practice. The Department has developed an MI implementation which includes site specific MI trainings, MI training focused on Supervisory staff, and an induction of MI into new staff training. The Department is in the process of developing a quality assurance protocol to monitor MI use and effectiveness. → **Contact Supervising Probation Officer Rob Edmisten, 916-875-0043, EdmistenR@saccounty.net**

San Joaquin: Yes, all probation officers throughout the Department attended 16 hours of Motivational Interviewing training. No, we do not have policies and procedures in place. We have MI liaisons to ensure staff are using their MI skills; however, we really need to strengthen this program. → **Contact Asst. Deputy Chief Michael Martinez, (209) 468-9976**

Sutter: A little more than half the department has been trained in MI. Juvenile staff completed 16 hours of MI and has completed a total of

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

16 hours of booster training. Booster training is being attempted in two hour sessions once a month. No policies and procedures. Monitor MI with the following: booster trainings, reinforce need/benefit in staff meetings; supervisor's role play routinely, refer to it in e-mails, model it for staff, etc. Able to gauge during role play or observed contacts whether they are using MI. Juvenile staff that transferred to the adult unit have carried these skills with them. Upcoming adult implementation of STRONG will follow this same method. → **Contact**

Supervisor Sam Leach, 530-822-7320, sleach@co.sutter.ca.us

Yolo: Yes. They have had 14 hours of training. We do not have policies and procedures in place, and no monitoring is occurring. We are currently evaluating a more robust implementation and QA design for MI in the adult division. → **Contact Adult Division Manager Jim Metzen, 530-406-5326**

Yuba: Some, no policy and procedure. → **Contact Program Manager Randy Moore, 530-749-7549**

Central

Fresno: Eight staff has received 16 hours of MI training that was paid for through a grant with the Office of Traffic Safety. There are no policies in place at this time.

Kern: Yes. Some have received an 8 hour class and others a 16 hour class, and some have both. We have no policies regarding the use of MI, but the liaisons for the assessment are charged with monitoring staff's effectiveness in using it.

Merced: All adult staff have been trained. → **Contact Assistant Chief Chris Bobbitt, 209-385-7569**

Tulare: All juvenile staff has been trained; adult staff pending.

Bay

Marin: All staff have received at least some MI training. Most staff underwent a 40 hour intro course, and have taken refresher courses. We have 4 staff trained as MI instructors. We do not have policies and procedures related to use of MI, and we are not monitoring it. → **Contact Kevin Lynch, 415-499-6620**

Solano: Mandated courses as follows—MI Foundation Course (12 hours), MI Beyond the Basics (3.5 hours); MI Practice Drills (2.5 hours); MI Facilitating Change (3 hours). Policies/Procedures/Monitoring are being developed. → **Contact Supervising DPO Jennifer**

Washington, 707-784-7623

Alameda: Yes, they have received 16 hours of training in MI. There are currently no procedures or policies regarding MI. We are monitoring the use of MI with quality control through the supervisors. → **Contact Chief Deputy Bonita Vinson, 510-268-7200**

Contra Costa: Yes, most of our staff have received 7 hours of training. We have no policies and do no monitoring of MI. → **Contact Adult Manager Yvette McCollumn, 925-313-4154**

Mendocino: Some have. Those who have not will get it during the implementation of the STRONG risk assessment. → **Contact Chief Wesley Forman, 707-463-5750**

Napa: Yes, all staff received 2 days of training. QA just starting. → **Contact Chief Mary Butler 707-259-8115**

San Francisco: All staff have been provided introductory MI training. → **Contact Chief Patrick Boyd, 415-553-1688**

Santa Cruz: Yes. → **Contact Laura Garnette, Adult Division Director, 831-454-3377**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Sonoma: All Adult Division staff trained in MI with booster sessions planned; mandatory for all new staff; select officer liaisons will coach and rate peers in MI skills beginning in 2010. → **Contact Deputy Chief Sheralynn Freitas, 707-565-2732**

South

San Bernardino: Yes- 40 hours, no policies regarding MI or monitoring. → **Contact Julie Hovis, Division Director I (909) 387-4211**
jhovis@prob.sbcounty.gov

Los Angeles: As indicated in question 2, we are currently training all Adult deputies in Motivational Interviewing (MI) and Core Correctional Practices (CCP). All Supervision and Investigation staff are receiving 20 hours of MI and CCP training. CCP identifies skills necessary to influence behavior. → **Contact Lynne Duke 818-374-2001; lynne.duke@probation.lacounty.gov**

Orange: Virtually all our DPOs have been trained in the use of MI techniques, although the wholesale implementation of MI as a system has been very difficult. We are more actively looking at MI as a series of components that can be used independently. Although we sacrifice the fidelity of the clinical model, our organizational culture directs us to this more pragmatic approach. Our officers are looking more toward an engagement model, focused on interactive communication and participatory goal setting as tools.

Related to MI: Recognizing the importance of the relationship between offender and probation officer, we have recently engaged in an Offender Survey to identify what is working and where we might improve from the perspective of the offenders. The survey results are being tabulated and information is forthcoming. → **Contact Mike Collins 714-667-7723**

Santa Barbara: Yes. In February 2007, field services officers attended a 16-hour module of Motivational Interviewing (138 staff attending). A new module of MI training was built into the implementation phase of Northpointe COMPAS, which took place in December 2009. The training unit monitored completion of the training, and quality assurance was built into the retraining process. SPOs and Seniors will monitor actual usage of the MI techniques; employee performance reviews will address this category to provide feedback and guidance to staff regarding their use of MI techniques. → **Contact DCPO Karen Wheeler 805-882-3675**

Imperial: Chief PO trained three years ago in Yuma County, AZ. Twenty-five (25) MI training slots are available targeting the juvenile division on October 28-29, 2009, as contracted with the roll-out of the PACT (Assessments.com). Business rules and quality control PACT workgroups are developing policies regarding MI. Anticipate using tapes of interviews to monitor fidelity. Also, sending 4-5 adult officers to Yuma County, Arizona for MI training on December 1-3, 2009. → **Contact Chief Martin Krizay, mkrizay@co.imperial.ca.us**

San Diego: Yes, we include MI training in both the adult and juvenile risk assessment tool training. No to the rest of the questions.
→ **Contact Natalie Pearl, Natalie.Pearl@sdcounty.ca.gov**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

QUESTIONS TO ASK

“Target Interventions—Need Principle”

6. Do you require staff to develop meaningful case plans that target at least the top four criminogenic needs? Do you have supervision standards in place that support this casework?

IF ANSWER IS NO, RESOURCES THAT MAY BE HELPFUL (BY REGION)

North

No or no information provided

Sacramento

Amador: Limited adult case plans but PSI and conditions of probation do address a plan. → **Contact Chief Bonini, 209-223-6229**

Calaveras: Yes (beginning case plan training was in April 09). Not yet. → **Contact Chief Teri Hall, 209-754-6471**

El Dorado: Yes. Yes. → **Contact Chief Joe Warchol, 530-621-5958**

Placer: Limited; supervision standards support this – e.g., Drug Court, Prop 36, High-Risk DUI, 273.5. → **Contact Probation Manager Dave Coughran 530-889-6759**

Sacramento: In the process of implementing this process through the use of a validated risk and needs assessment. → **Contact Supervising Probation Officer Rob Edmisten, 916-875-0043, EdmistenR@saccounty.net**

Sutter: Not established in the adult unit, but will be this FY. Work done on the juvenile side will assist with ease of implementation on the adult side. → **Contact Deputy Chief Paras-Topete, 530-822-7320**

Central

Fresno: We do develop case plans for our Targeted Case Management caseloads, but these plans do not center on criminogenic issues. The plans are geared toward medical/social needs.

Kern: Juvenile: Identifies the top 3 criminogenic needs. Adult: Will identify the top 3 criminogenic needs when assessment is implemented.

Tulare: Pending implementation of COMPASS. Supervision standards currently in place.

Bay

Marin: No, but this is a goal of ours → **Contact Kevin Lynch, 415-499-6620**

Alameda: Yes, to all of the above, in our SB-81 pilot program. → **Contact Chief Deputy Bonita Vinson, 510-268-7200**

Contra Costa: Yes, on our intensive supervision caseloads (grant requirements); however, we do not use them in our general supervision adult caseloads. → **Contact Adult Manager Yvette McCollumn, 925-313-4154**

Monterey: We do not currently develop case plans. Once we implement the STRONG we will develop case plans for high risk offenders. → **Contact Division Director Todd Keating, 831-796-1221**

Napa: Have not implemented case plans but are in the planning stages to do so. → **Contact Chief Mary Butler 707-259-8115**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

San Francisco: We are beginning a pilot with the 18-25 age probationers to develop formal case plans based on the CAIS assessment.

→**Contact Chief Patrick Boyd, 415-553-1688**

Santa Clara: We have not yet implemented written case plans. However, we do have supervision standards for each level of supervision we offer. We initially assess clients within the first 30 days and then supervise clients based on their risk and need. The higher risk clients get maximum supervision and contact and the minimum level clients receive minimum supervision. We are able to target our intervention to clients who pose the greatest risk and/or need. →**Contact Deputy Chief Karen Fletcher, 408-435-1635**

Sonoma: Targeted case plan training in February 2010 with plan to address top criminogenic needs. →**Contact Deputy Chief Sheralynn Freitas, 707-565-2732**

South

San Bernardino: Case plans for specialized caseloads, mental health, drug court, yes supervision guidelines. →**Contact Julie Hovis, Division Director I (909) 387-4211 jhovis@prob.sbcounty.gov**

Los Angeles: Deputies assigned to the DRC work to develop case plans base on court ordered conditions of probation and risk factors identified in the LS/CMI assessment, as well as information provided from other participants in the program, which includes the Department of Mental Health Services, the Department of Public Social Services, and the Alcohol and Drug Program Administration. The department is in the process of requiring deputies that supervise high risk and specialized caseloads to develop case plans base on court ordered conditions of probation and risk factors identified in the LS/CMI assessment. These officers also develop case planning as part of the Department's participation in the Targeted Case Management program. →**Contact Lynne Duke 818-374-2001; lynne.duke@probation.lacounty.gov**

Orange: We have routinely linked case plan goals with assessed high risks/needs; however, not in a formal manner and not necessarily targeting the top four. At this point, we are introducing the concept and moving forward with continuing dialogue with supervisors and staff. Many supervisors are becoming more knowledgeable and initiating supervision standards supporting EBP casework guidelines. →**Contact Mike Collins 714-667-7723**

Santa Barbara: The case planning component with developed milestones to measure performance will be integrated into the use of the COMPAS tool in March 2010, once staff have had an opportunity to become familiar with the use of the assessment tool. Lowest current adult caseload ratios for standard high risk offender caseloads is 1:70 and grant funded hybrid adult/juvenile gang caseloads are set at 1:40.

→**Contact DCPO Karen Wheeler 805 882-3675**

Imperial: Not established in adult or juvenile supervision at this time. Case planning is a part of the PACT roll-out in juvenile. No supervision standards in place in adult or juvenile, currently left to the officer's imagination/discretion. →**Contact Chief Martin Krizay, mkrizay@co.imperial.ca.us**

San Diego: Yes, we have standards and We are in the process of improving requirements and the monitoring in this area. →**Contact Natalie Pearl, Natalie.Pearl@sdcounty.ca.gov**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

QUESTIONS TO ASK

“Target Interventions—Need Principle”

7. Are there sufficient, appropriate interventions available in your county to meet assessed needs?

Specifically:

- Anti-social cognition
- Anti-social companions
- Anti-social personality (temperament)
- Family and/or marital
- Substance abuse
- Education
- Employment
- Leisure and/or recreation

IF ANSWER IS NO, RESOURCES THAT MAY BE HELPFUL (BY REGION)

North

Shasta: There are resources in all the areas listed to the left; however, they do not meet the needs of all the probationers we come into contact with. Over the next several months we will be reconnecting with the various agencies and resources to determine what is available, how to access the services for our clients, and what options for services/treatment need to be created. With the implementation of the STRONG we will be able to articulate what resources we need based upon the information provided by the risk/needs assessment.

→Contact Chelsey Chappelle, Adult Division Director, 530-245-6245 or clchappelle@co.shasta.ca.us

Sacramento

El Dorado: Yes. (Resources available but assessment of resources tool needed.) →Contact Chief Joe Warchol, 530-621-5958

Placer: To some degree, all. Less so for anti-social cognition, companions and personality; and employment. →Contact Probation Manager Dave Coughran 530-889-6759

Sacramento: Yes. →Contact Supervising Probation Officer Rob Edmisten, 916-875-0043, EdmistenR@saccounty.net

Central

Fresno: Education and Leisure/Recreation opportunities are sufficient. All other areas lack appropriate resources.

Kern: We have some programs in place, but not all needs can be addressed.

Merced: We currently contract with Behavioral Interventions for a Day Reporting Center which offers some of the needs listed. →Contact Assistant Chief Chris Bobbitt, 209-385-7569

Tulare: Very limited in all anti-social interventions, as well as leisure/recreation

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Bay

Marin: Many of our county's interventions are psycho-educational or psychodynamic; few of them are cognitive-behavioral. → **Contact Kevin Lynch, 415-499-6620**

Alameda: Yes to all, however while there is sufficient job training there are not enough jobs, and there probably are not enough leisure/recreation activities. All of our providers may not have been trained in EBP. → **Contact Chief Deputy Bonita Vinson, 510-268-7200**

Contra Costa: Not enough anti-social cognition interventions due to budget cuts; and not too many resources for leisure and/or recreation. → **Contact Adult Manager Yvette McCollumn, 925-313-4154**

Monterey: We currently have very few if any resources to address anti-social issues. We have substance abuse treatment, but no outcome studies have been conducted to assess their effectiveness. Employment services seem to be currently well funded. We are establishing a Day Reporting Center run by Behavioral Interventions (BI) to address assessed needs and use as a graduated sanction for technical violations of probation. → **Contact Division Director Todd Keating, 831-796-1221**

Napa: Yes. → **Contact Chief Mary Butler 707-259-8115**

San Francisco: We are working with the city's Transitional Age Youth project to identify available services and gaps. → **Contact Chief Patrick Boyd, 415-553-1688**

Santa Clara: Santa Clara clients are referred to services in the county for a variety of programs which offer interventions in the above areas. We work closely with Mental Health and Alcohol and Drug Services to provide many of the above services to clients. Also work with private programs that offer comprehensive services to clients. We do not contract with providers for Adult Services but currently refer clients to providers. → **Contact Deputy Chief Karen Fletcher, 408-435-1635**

Sonoma: No services targeting first 4 listed, Education and Leisure; limited substance abuse services with residential and outpatient waiting lists; very limited employment services. → **Contact Deputy Chief Sheralynn Freitas, 707-565-2732**

South

San Bernardino: Interventions are available however there is little funding to access services.

- Anti-social cognition-Yes
- Anti-social companions-Yes
- Anti-social personality (temperament) -No
- Family and/or marital-No
- Substance abuse-Yes
- Education-Yes
- Employment-Yes
- Leisure and/or recreation-No

→ **Contact Julie Hovis, Division Director I (909) 387-4211 jhovis@prob.sbcounty.gov**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Los Angeles: Specifically:

- Anti-social cognition – see below
- Anti-social companions – see below
- Anti-social personality (temperament) -see below
- Family and/or marital – see below
- Substance abuse – Yes, through the County Alcohol and Drug Program Administration.
- Education - Yes, through ROP, Community Adult Schools, Community College Districts.
- Employment - Yes (Workforce Investment Boards, Once-Stops Centers, LA Works, Homeboy Industries, etc)
- Leisure and/or recreation – see below

The Department has not yet completed an inventory of services available in the county. As part of the designed implementation of EBP, there are plans to evaluate programs and services to determine their adherence to evidence based guidelines. Because the Department does not contract with community based agencies, any evaluation and request to implement evidence based programs or services would be done on voluntary basis, unless funding for services could be secured. → **Contact Lynne Duke 818-374-2001;**

lynne.duke@probation.lacounty.gov

Riverside:

- * Anti-social cognition Need to explore-are services through mental health
- * Anti-social companions Need to explore-are services through mental health
- * Anti-social personality (temperament) Need to explore-are services through mental health
- * Family and/or marital Need to explore
- * Substance abuse Yes
- * Education Need to explore-some services available
- * Employment Need to explore
- * Leisure and/or recreation Need to explore.

Orange: We work closer with DV service providers due to BIP monitor mandates. Unlike many other corrections systems, CA probation has limited capacity to establish fiduciary relationships with service providers, so limited impact on resource curriculum can be accomplished. We have, however, worked with a limited number of providers on broad spectrum program evaluation that encompasses considerations for these criminogenic needs. We have trained a limited number of staff in the use of the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI) but have not formally utilized this intensive program review protocol due to limited resources.

We also have an in-house collaborative involving a variety of community representatives on improving employability, and will be offering training this year to our adult supervision DPOs. We are also actively engaged in the development of a Day Reporting Center for adults that will include educational, vocational and interventions on Criminal Thinking components. → **Contact Mike Collins 714-667-7723**

Santa Barbara:

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

- Anti-social cognition: Yes
- Anti-social companions: Yes
- Anti-social personality (temperament): Yes
- Family and/or marital: Yes
- Substance abuse: For the most part, some of these resources have recently been discontinued.
- Education Yes
- Employment Yes
- Leisure and/or recreation: Need to explore

→**Contact DCPO Karen Wheeler 805-882-3675**

Imperial: Local Behavioral Health Department provides Aggression Replacement Therapy, Family Functional Therapy and a host of other interventions but staff and the court do not have much confidence in the delivery system and results. Anticipate training probation officers to deliver cognitive behavioral curriculums like Thinking for a Change, Crossroads (NCTI) or possibly MRT (Moral Reconciliation Therapy).

→**Contact Chief Martin Krizay, mkrizay@co.imperial.ca.us**

San Diego: We are currently working on developing a community resource directory which will help us to answer this question more specifically. →**Contact Natalie Pearl, Natalie.Pearl@sdcounty.ca.gov**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

QUESTIONS TO ASK

“Skill Train with Directed Practice”

8. Are you using cognitive behavioral interventions? If yes, are you evaluating the effectiveness of these programs?

IF ANSWER IS NO, RESOURCES THAT MAY BE HELPFUL (BY REGION)

North

Shasta: Not internally within the probation department but we refer our clients to outside treatment providers who focus on cognitive behavioral interventions. I also have two staff trained in the cognitive restructuring through NCI but due to lack of staffing they have not been able to conduct groups with the clients. → **Contact Chelsey Chappelle, Adult Division Director, 530-245-6245 or**

clchappelle@co.shasta.ca.us

Siskiyou: Yes – We run groups using The Change Companies Interactive Journaling program. → **Contact Chief Todd Heie, 530-841-4366**
Sacramento

Calaveras: Yes. We have started a CBT program for medium/high risk adults. We have not completed the first group as of this date.

→ **Contact Chief Teri Hall, 209-754-6471**

El Dorado: Yes. No. (Evaluation tool needed.) Contact Chief Joe Warchol, 530-621-5958

Placer: Same as El Dorado. → **Contact Nancy Huntley (916) 543-7414**

Sutter: Limited on the adult side to MRT in Drug Court. CBT for Substance Abusing Adolescents is provided FT by two juvenile staff. This model will translate well for younger adults and there is a desire to expand the program to the adult population. → **Contact Chief**

Odom, 530-822-7320, codom@co.sutter.ca.us

Central

Kern: Yes, programs like ART are in use. We have also contracted with an independent agency to evaluate and monitor our programs.

Merced: Yes, provided by the BI – Day Reporting Center. → **Contact Assistant Chief Chris Bobbitt, 209-385-7569**

Tulare: Pending.

Bay

Marin: Very limited use of C-B interventions → **Contact Kevin Lynch, 415-499-6620**

Solano: Crossroads Life Skills Group for some 18-25 year olds, facilitated by probation staff. Preparing to offer this course in county jail. Not evaluating effectiveness. → **Contact Probation Services Manager Kelley Baulwin-Johnson, 707-784-6531**

Alameda: Yes, as a part of our SB-81 pilot program. → **Contact Chief Deputy Bonita Vinson, 510-268-7200**

Contra Costa: Yes, with a few programs. → **Contact Adult Manager Yvette McCollum, 925-313-4154**

Mendocino: Whenever possible and they are evaluated. → **Contact Chief Wesley Forman, 707-463-5750**

Monterey: Once the DRC is functional, we will be using cognitive behavioral interventions. BI will perform outcome measures and an

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

external evaluation will also be conducted. → **Contact Division Director Todd Keating, 831-796-1221**

Napa: Yes, QA just starting. → **Contact Chief Mary Butler 707-259-8115**

Santa Cruz: Yes. → **Contact Laura Garnette, Adult Division Director, 831-454-3377**

South

San Bernardino: Yes, Thinking for a Change, Cal State S.B. did an evaluation of program for us. → **Contact Julie Hovis, Division Director I (909) 387-4211 jhovis@prob.sbcounty.gov**

Los Angeles: As part of the AB191 grant, the Department is using the California Institute of Mental Health's Teaching Pro-social Skills with probationers assigned to the Day Reporting Center. This demonstration project began in November, 2008. It is the Department's goal to expand the implementation of TPS to other high risk, should additional funding become available. Currently, there is no information available on the effectiveness of the program. However, this will be tracked as part of the program data relayed to the Corrections and Standards Authority, which oversees the grant. → **Contact Lynne Duke 818-374-2001; lynne.duke@probation.lacounty.gov**

Orange: Increasing evidence of the importance of CBT is creating additional opportunities to promote delivery of these education and intervention tools. Several new training classes will be offered this year to field DPOs and supervisors focusing on CBT interventions. We have developed CBT in some juvenile institutional and day center programs (T4C, A.R.T.) and will continue to expand. → **Contact Mike Collins 714-667-7723**

Santa Barbara: Yes, UCSB is now evaluating our Batters Intervention Probation outcomes. Juvenile/Institutions Division outcomes for cognitive behavioral interventions are also measured including rate of re-offenses for Aggression Replacement Training graduates and rate of Juvenile Hall readmissions for Samenow's "Thinking Errors" curriculum participants. Similar measures will be implemented in Adult Division operations. → **Contact DCPO Karen Wheeler 805-882-3675**

Imperial: See #7

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

QUESTIONS TO ASK

“Target Interventions—Responsivity Principle”

9. Do you have “intermediate/graduated sanctions” available to address probation violations that do not warrant prison time? If yes, is their use matched to the characteristics, learning style and abilities of the offender?

IF ANSWER IS NO, RESOURCES THAT MAY BE HELPFUL (BY REGION)

North

Colusa: Yes and No. → **Contact Chief Steve Bordin, 530-458-0656**

Glenn: Yes. → **Contact Chief Brandon Thompson, 530-934-6416, bthompson@countyofglenn.net**

Shasta: Yes. We use alternatives such as work program, NA/AA meetings, counseling, and education/employment referrals. This is an area that needs to be improved and is lacking due to money and available resources. Again, with the implementation of the STRONG we will be able to articulate what resources we need based upon the information provided by the risk/needs assessment. → **Contact Chelsey**

Chappelle, Adult Division Director, 530-245-6245 or clchappelle@co.shasta.ca.us

Siskiyou: Electronic Monitoring. → **Contact Chief Todd Heie, 530-841-4366**

Sacramento

Amador: Yes. → **Contact Deron Brodehl, 209-223-6339**

Calaveras: In progress. → **Contact Chief Teri Hall, 209-754-6471**

El Dorado: Yes. Yes. → **Contact Chief Joe Warchol, 530-621-5958**

Lake: Yes, although they need to be more defined and encouraged. → **Contact Paula Snyder, 707-262-4285, paulas@co.lake.ca.us**

Nevada: Yes. Part B: No formal match up. → **Contact Program Manager Mike Ertola, 530 265 1209, Michael.ertola@co.nevada.ca.us**

Placer: Yes, to some degree. We are aggressively instituting a comprehensive Alternative Sentencing Program and expanding the use of non-court involved interventions. → **Contact Probation Manager Dave McManus 530-889-7924**

Sacramento: Yes. No. → **Contact Supervising Probation Officer Rob Edmisten, 916-875-0043, EdmistenR@saccounty.net**

San Joaquin: We do have a strict graduated sanctions program for our domestic violence offenders. For other violations of probation, we have general guidelines but they need to be refined. → **Contact Asst. Deputy Chief Michael Martinez, (209) 468-9976**

Sutter: Graduated sanctions are used only in regards to jail sanctions or residential TX, with the exception of Drug Court where many more alternatives are available. No, we do not match sanctions to characteristics, etc. → **Contact Deputy Chief Paras-Topete, 530-822-7320,**

lparas@co.sutter.ca.us

Yolo: We have some available, but not enough, and responsivity is not considered at all (yet). → **Contact Adult Division Manager Jim Metzen, 530-406-5326**

Yuba: Yes. Yes. → **Contact Program Manager Randy Moore, 530-749-7549**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Central

Fresno: Post Conviction Drug Court utilizes graduated sanctions, which is part of the Drug Court model. This is the only formalized use of this type of process within the adult division.

Kern: Yes, we use graduated sanctions in both the juvenile and adult divisions and we are looking to add additional resources.

Merced: Yes, through the Day Reporting Center, but currently developing and identifying additional resources. → **Contact Assistant Chief Chris Bobbitt, 209-385-7569**

Tulare: Formalized only with respect to Drug Court, Prop 36 Court and Mental Health Court and not tailored to offender characteristics/learning style/ability.

Bay

Contra Costa: Yes. → **Contact Adult Manager Yvette McCollumn, 925-313-4154**

Marin: Some, but need more. → **Contact Kevin Lynch, 415-499-6620**

Monterey: Our primary graduated sanctions are NA/AA, increased drug testing/appointments with PO, and jail. The DRC will be utilized as a graduated sanction as well. → **Contact Division Director Todd Keating, 831-796-1221**

Napa: Yes. → **Contact Chief Mary Butler, 707-259-8115**

Santa Clara: We work with our clients to address issues of violation and give them the opportunity to get into compliance prior to initiating a violation of Probation. We also attempt to address many minor violations through the use of regular Court reviews. We have reviews for DV, Mental Health, Drug Court and Prop 36 cases, where many of these issues are addressed. We also have a Restitution Calendar for clients who are in violation for non-payment where a plan for payment is sought and the case is monitored. We also use graduated sanctions in our recommendations to the court. → **Contact Deputy Chief Karen Fletcher, 408-435-1635**

South

Los Angeles: Yes. As part of the Day Reporting Center demonstration project, there is a system of graduated sanctions being used that includes additional counseling or group meeting and longer involvement in the program. As part of the restructuring of the adult supervision caseloads, there is a plan build into the final implementation that allows for the movement of probationers to caseloads with higher levels of supervision if the probationer failed to meet the requirements for supervision at a lower level. The Department maintains the Probation Adult Alternative Work Service (P.A.A.W.S.) program, which utilizes work service in the community as an alternative to county detention. There are also plans to explore further sanctions such as referrals for electronic monitoring (house arrest). → **Contact Lynne Duke 818-374-2001; lynne.duke@probation.lacounty.gov**

Orange: Officers have historically used a variety of graduated sanctions informally and on an individual basis. We are currently working closely with external stakeholders and with staff in order to develop a continuum of formalized "swift and certain" interventions as well as incentives for positive progress. → **Contact Jeff Corp, Director Program Division 714-937-4502**

Santa Barbara: SB has a variety of sanctions our officers can recommend based on the needs of the defendant such as drug/alcohol treatment, community work service or increased reporting requirements. The Adult Division is also developing a Probation Reporting and

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Resource Center pilot program to enhance these options. This program is scheduled to open in the north county in January 2010, and SB 678 seed monies will be utilized to fund a similar program for south county, with a target date to begin programming on some level by March 2010, and open full programming in July 2010, when the planned site becomes fully available. → **Contact DCPO Karen Wheeler 805-882-3675**

QUESTIONS TO ASK

“Increase Positive Reinforcement”

10. Are you providing positive reinforcement to probationers?

IF ANSWER IS NO, RESOURCES THAT MAY BE HELPFUL (BY REGION)

North

Colusa: Some positive feedback, mostly sanctions and accountability. → **Contact Chief Steve Bordin, 530-458-0656**

Glenn: Yes. Contact Chief Brandon Thompson, 530-934-6416, bthompson@countyofglenn.net

Shasta: As a whole this is an area we are lacking in however, we do have some specialized caseloads that deal with high-risk DUI and drug offenders that focus on positive reinforcement as part of their designated programs. → **Contact Chelsey Chappelle, Adult Division**

Director, 530-245-6245 or cchappelle@co.shasta.ca.us

Siskiyou: Yes. → **Contact Chief Todd Heie, 530-841-4366**

Sacramento

Amador: Yes. → **Contact Deron Brodehl, 209-223-6339**

Calaveras: Yes but not at the level we would like. → **Contact Chief Teri Hall, 209-754-6471**

El Dorado: Yes. → **Contact Chief Joe Warchol, 530-621-5958**

Lake: On an individual basis by Probation Officers. → **Contact Paula Snyder, 707-262-4285, paulas@co.lake.ca.us**

Nevada: Very little. System is still heavily based in sanction rather than reward. → **Contact Program Manager Mike Ertola, 530 265 1209, Michael.ertola@co.nevada.ca.us**

Placer: Yes, even well before they are probationers. Our PO's are in the jail – OR/Bail/Pretrial release programs. Food Services Certificates & culinary training – probation runs the Kitchen Services in Placer. Half-time termination of probation if all conditions met - no risk. → **Contact Probation Manager Dave Coughran 530-889-6759**

Sacramento: Probation Officers have been trained in effective intervention through the use of EBP principals. For example, four positive reinforcements for every negative statement. → **Contact Supervising Probation Officer Rob Edmisten, 916-875-0043,**

EdmistenR@saccounty.net

San Joaquin: I would say it is somewhat limited and we do not have a formal reinforcement program. We use verbal praise, reduced supervision if in compliance for a period of time and will request to have their cases amended to informal probation if all terms and conditions of probation have been satisfied. → **Contact Asst. Deputy Chief Michael Martinez, 209-468-9976**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Yolo: Yes, and we could do more. → **Contact Adult Division Manager Jim Metzen, 530-406-5326**

Yuba: Yes, and individual basis by probation officer. → **Contact Program Manager Randy Moore, 530-749-7549**

Central

Fresno: Positive reinforcement is always utilized by officer as long as the probationer is conforming to the terms of probation.

Kern: Yes, we use positive feedback, enrichment activities and special privileges and awards when appropriate.

Merced: Yes, but resources are limited.

Tulare: A work in progress.

Bay

Solano: Very little—primarily in Drug Court and Prop 36. → **Contact Chief Isabelle Voit, 707-784-4803**

Alameda: Yes, we hold cognitive group graduation ceremonies and have stipends for completion of program components through community based organizations. → **Contact Chief Deputy Bonita Vinson, 510-268-7200**

Contra Costa: Yes, particularly in our specialty caseloads (DV, Prop 36, Drug Courts). → **Contact Adult Manager Yvette McCollum, 925-313-4154**

Marin: Yes, but it is neither monitored nor institutionalized. It likely varies greatly DPO to DPO. → **Contact Kevin Lynch, 415-499-6620**

Monterey: We try to build on individuals' strengths and accomplishments while enforcing directives of the Court. → **Contact Division Director Todd Keating, 831-796-1221**

Napa: Only for those in our community corrections service center. → **Contact Chief Mary Butler 707-259-8115**

Santa Clara: We offer positive reinforcement for clients who complete Drug Treatment Court and Prop 36 programs by offering earlier termination from Probation and also by reducing or eliminating some or all of their fees. We also recommend in some cases, that Formal Probation be modified to Court Probation. We also have Graduation Ceremonies for completions of drug programs. → **Contact Deputy Chief Karen Fletcher, 408-435-1635**

Santa Cruz: Yes, for those who participate in our Thinking For a Change and Impact Probation classes. → **Contact Laura Garnette, Adult Division Director, 831-454-3377**

Sonoma: Very few incentives, primarily in specialty courts (i.e. DV, DUI). → **Contact Deputy Chief Sheralynn Freitas, 707-565-2732**

South

San Bernardino: Seldom

Los Angeles: Yes, at the DRC. → **Contact Lynne Duke 818-374-2001; lynne.duke@probation.lacounty.gov**

Orange: Collaborative Courts have the highest awareness in this area. We have educated staff on the importance of positive incentives. Individual style and techniques seem to drive use of these approaches.

Two areas of development:

- a) linking Incentives to discussions of Sanctions matrices and including the opportunities to employ incentives (see above)
- b) Earned Early Release—using release from custody and stepped-down supervision as motivational enhancements

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

→Contact Mike Collins 714-667-7723

Santa Barbara: Other than positive verbal reinforcement for compliance, no, with the possible exception that certain misdemeanors may be converted to court probation upon completion of programming and/or restitution. The plan is to creatively increase positive reinforcement options as the department phases in more detailed case planning with established milestones. →Contact DCPO Karen Wheeler 805-882-3675

Imperial: I believe Probation Officers try to give affirmations to probationers, but they are not in the needed proportion compared to sanctions. →Contact Chief Martin Krizay, mkrizay@co.imperial.ca.us

San Diego: In an ad hoc rather than a systematic manner. →Contact Natalie Pearl, Natalie.Pearl@sdcounty.ca.gov

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

QUESTIONS TO ASK

“Engage Ongoing Support in Natural Communities”

11. Is your staff engaging support for each probationer in his/her community?

IF ANSWER IS NO, RESOURCES THAT MAY BE HELPFUL (BY REGION)

North

Colusa: Only on a limited basis. → **Contact Chief Steve Bordin, 530-458-0656**

Glenn: Yes. → **Contact Chief Brandon Thompson, 530-934-6416, bthompson@countyofglenn.net**

Shasta: Due to extremely high caseload sizes this is another area where we fall short. The officers are making referrals to other agencies to assist in developing a support system but internally there has been little effort to provide a support system outside of the probation department. This is an area where we would like to focus on with our local CBO's and the faith-based community to explore options for our clients. → **Contact Chelsey Chappelle, Adult Division Director, 530-245-6245 or clchappelle@co.shasta.ca.us**

Sacramento

Amador: Not all cases. Supervision staff cut to minimum levels. Contact Deron Brodehl, 209-223-6339

Calaveras: Yes. Individually and we have done community involvement through First5 and our behavioral health department. → **Contact Chief Teri Hall, 209-754-6471**

El Dorado: Yes. → **Contact Chief Joe Warchol, 530-621-5958**

Lake: On an individual basis. → **Contact Paula Snyder, 707-262-4285, paulas@co.lake.ca.us**

Nevada: Yes. → **Contact Program Manager Mike Ertola, 530 265 1209, Michael.ertola@co.nevada.ca.us**

Placer: Not comprehensively. With family, employer, treatment providers – yes. → **Contact Probation Manager Nancy Huntley 916-543-7414**

Sacramento: The Department has developed resources in the community for offenders to receive evidence based treatment which is assessable and takes responsibility into account. → **Contact Supervising Probation Officer Rob Edmisten, 916-875-0043,**

EdmistenR@saccounty.net

Yolo: Not with all cases. With such a dearth of supervision staff, there is no where near the support that is necessary. In the few cases that are supervised on small caseloads, then support is provided. → **Contact Adult Division Manager Jim Metzen, 530-406-5326**

San Joaquin: Not as much as they should. → **Contact Asst. Deputy Chief Michael Martinez, 209-468-9976**

Yuba: Yes. → **Contact Program Manager Randy Moore, 530-749-7549**

Central

Fresno: Support beyond the structure of the probationers' family is highly unlikely.

Kern: Yes, we have numerous resources in the community, educational and vocational services, mentoring, and educational field trips.

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

Merced: Limited, as able to do so.

Tulare: Level of support varies based on level of supervision.

Bay

Marin: Yes, but it is neither monitored nor institutionalized. It likely varies greatly DPO to DPO. → **Contact Kevin Lynch, 415-499-6620**

Alameda: Yes. → **Contact Chief Deputy Bonita Vinson, 510-268-7200**

Monterey: We maintain as many collateral contacts as we can who may have a positive influence on a probationer. → **Contact Division Director Todd Keating, 831-796-1221**

Napa: Limited. → **Contact Chief Mary Butler 707-259-8115**

San Francisco: We are working with the City's Transitional Age Youth. → **Contact Chief Patrick Boyd, 415-553-1688**

Santa Clara: Many of our Mental Health and Drug Treatment clients are offered support through a peer group, advocate and/or sponsor.

We have not engaged support for each of our probationers but they are offered in some of our specialty caseloads. → **Contact Deputy Chief Karen Fletcher, 408-435-1635**

Santa Cruz: Only those on intensive caseloads. → **Contact Laura Garnette, Adult Division Director, 831-454-3377**

Sonoma: Very limited community engagement; this will be a future focus as we implement EBP. → **Contact Deputy Chief Sheralynn Freitas, 707-565-2732**

South

San Bernardino: Seldom

Los Angeles: Not at this time. The department is exploring efforts to develop connections and support for adult probationer in the community. This may be accomplished through agreements with local Community and Faith Based Organizations. → **Contact Lynne Duke 818-374-2001; lynne.duke@probation.lacounty.gov**

Santa Barbara: Yes, to the degree resources are available; however, due to diminished resources and the demands of specialty courts, the neighborhood supervision strategy was shelved. There are limited Mental health resources and the number of drug detox beds is insufficient. The strategy will be to work toward cultivating more accessible and affordable community resources as a component of the Probation Reporting and Resource Center. → **Contact DCPO Karen Wheeler 805-882-3675**

Imperial: Yes, I believe they do, but focus is still too narrow on offenders, especially with adults. Juvenile PO's do a better job working with families, schools and other support systems. → **Contact Chief Martin Krizay, mkrizay@co.imperial.ca.us**

San Diego: Again in an Ad hoc rather than a systematic manner. → **Contact Natalie Pearl, Natalie.Pearl@sdcountry.ca.gov**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

QUESTIONS TO ASK

“Measure Relevant Processes/Practices”

12. Are you measuring outcomes?

Minimum required by SB 678 (See Appendix A for definitions):

- The % of persons on felony probation who are being supervised in accordance with EBP
- The % of state moneys expended for programs that are evidence-based, and a descriptive list of all programs that are evidence-based
- Specification of supervision policies, procedures, programs, and practices that were eliminated
- The % of persons on felony probation who successfully complete the period of probation

Other measurements to consider:

- Reduce recidivism as measured by felony convictions from initial placement on probation, tracking for three years.
- Increase employment rates for offenders on probation.
- Increase the rate of participation in treatment programs for offenders on probation.
- Increase the percentage of victim restitution collected.
- Percent of newly sentenced probationers who had a risk and needs assessment administered during a specific period.
- Percent of probationers who had a change in their risk score during a specific period.
- Percent of medium and high-risk probationers who had a case plan developed during a specific period.
- Percent of probationers revoked to jail for technical violations during a specific period.
- Percent of directly supervised high risk probationers who successfully completed treatment during a specific period.
- Percent of directly supervised high risk probationers with substance abuse needs who were referred to treatment during a specific period.
- Percent of directly supervised medium risk probationers who successfully completed treatment during a specific period.
- Percent of directly supervised medium risk probationers with substance abuse needs who were referred to treatment during a specific period.
- Percent of directly supervised probationers who were not convicted of a new felony offense during a specific period.

IF ANSWER IS NO, RESOURCES THAT MAY BE HELPFUL (BY REGION)

North

Colusa: No, No, No, and No. → **Contact Chief Steve Bordin, 530-458-0656**

Shasta: We track the successful/unsuccessful completion of program referrals, fluctuation in caseload size, commitments to CDCR, as well

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

as the successful/unsuccessful termination of probation. With the implementation of the STRONG we will be able to track additional information such as effectiveness of program referrals, the need for additional or different resources, and target underserved populations with information available in the risk/needs assessment database. → **Contact Chelsey Chappelle, Adult Division Director, 530-245-6245 or clchappelle@co.shasta.ca.us**

Sacramento

Amador: No, No, No, Yes. → **Contact Deron Brodehl, 209-223-6339**

Calaveras: Yes for the first bullet, just getting going on the others. → **Contact Chief Teri Hall, 209-754-6471**

El Dorado: •Yes. •No. •No. •Yes. (Will need additional resources to evaluate EBP funding & specifications.) → **Contact Chief Joe Warchol, 530-621-5958**

Placer: Currently, only % successfully completing probation. → **Contact Probation Manager Nancy Huntley 916-543-7414**

Sutter: Not measuring EBP participants or money, as current availability is too limited except for juveniles. Not sure how to answer bullet #3. Other than Prop 36 and Drug Court, we have no adult programs currently. We have a rough figure for the number of probationers who successfully complete probation. → **Contact Chief Odom, 530-822-7320, codom@co.sutter.ca.us**

Yolo: 1. Not yet, but working on the case management system to do so, 2. Not yet, 3. Not yet, 4. Yes → **Contact Adult Division Manager Jim Metzen, 530-406-5326**

Yuba: No, No, No, Yes, only small % successfully complete probation. → **Contact Program Manager Randy Moore, 530-749-7549**

Central

Fresno: Only in grant funded programs, and then only minimally. We will obviously be building these types of outcome measures into our SB 678 protocols.

Kern: We will track all required outcomes, although some measured outcomes are already being recorded and measured.

Tulare: Pending, Pending, Pending, Yes.

Bay

Alameda: Yes to all; SB81 pilot program in fourth point. → **Contact Chief Deputy Bonita Vinson, 510-268-7200**

Marin: Yes. We track the rate of successful completion of probation and are working to create mechanism for tracking recidivism, both while on probation and 3 years after completion. → **Contact Kevin Lynch, 415-499-6620**

Napa: Just starting. We do track number of probationers who successfully complete probation. And we track programs. → **Contact Chief Mary Butler 707-259-8115**

Santa Clara: Yes, we measure the % of persons on felony probation who are supervised on each level of supervision and the % of clients on each specialized caseload. We do not receive any state moneys for any adult program at this time. We have not eliminated any programs. Yes, we measure the % of persons on felony probation who are successful. Contact Deputy Chief Karen Fletcher, 408-435-1635

Sonoma: We do not currently have services that would qualify supervision as EBP; recidivism data not reliable. Twenty-four percent of total terminations were convictions for new law BD). → **Contact Deputy Chief Sheralynn Freitas, 707-565-2732**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

South

San Bernardino: Yes-recidivism rates, prison commitments. → **Contact Julie Hovis, Division Director I (909) 387-4211**

jhovis@prob.sbcounty.gov

Los Angeles: We are in the process of developing the means of collecting information on outcomes. Our current data collection systems must be updated in order to gather and organize the information needed to accurately measure Evidence Based outcomes. **Minimum required by SB 678:**

- The % of persons on felony probation who are being supervised in accordance with EBP

76%: With the exception of specialized caseloads, Proposition 36 and PC1000 cases, all other caseloads in the Department have taken the initial step of determining assignment and level of supervision according to risk. Assignment to specialized caseloads, which include Sex Registrants, Family Violence, and the Adult Gang caseload, are assign based on additional criteria such as the charge, court ordered conditions of probation, circumstances of the arrest, and/or legal requirements. The probationers assigned to these caseloads are of all risk levels. The sizes of specialized caseloads are reduced to allow for more intensive supervision of probationers assigned to these units. Prop 36 and PC1000 cases have always been assigned to separate caseloads, regardless of risk score.

- The % of state moneys expended for programs that are evidence-based, and a descriptive list of all programs that are evidence-based

\$1.6 Million: The only state money that is currently being expended on evidence based programs is the money allocated under AB191. The total amount is \$5 million over three years. The figure indicated above is an average over the three year if the grant.

- Specification of supervision policies, procedures, programs, and practices that were eliminated :

The Probation Department eliminated the policy of testing all probationers with random narcotics testing orders, from the court, at the same rate. The rate of testing is now determined by the probationer's risk level. In the coming months the Department will be implementing an assessment tool to assist in determining the overall need for testing. This will eliminate those probationers that use illicit substance as a result of criminal behavior or associations from testing caseloads. The goal is to allow testing officers more time to concentrate on the supervision of those probationers in serious need of treatment services.

- The % of persons on felony probation who successfully complete the period of probation

Yes: As part of the Dashboard Project and the DRC demonstration project, the Department is developing the means of tracking information such as the number of probationers that successfully complete probation. The Dashboard will allow the DPO to monitor the progress of

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

probationers assigned to his caseload, as well as track the percentage of probationers that complete their grant successfully. →**Contact Lynne Duke 818-374-2001; lynne.duke@probation.lacounty.gov**

Orange: Yes, we have a set of standard outcomes that are being reported on a regular basis including % of probationers terminating without a new law violation. (Other outcomes focus on employment, court services, victim assistance and employees.) We are rapidly moving toward this goal from several attack points—

- a) A development committee is working on establishing meaningful and measurable program goals, focused on engagement and risk reduction.
- b) We are exploring other programs that look at resource usage (bed days, risk reduction, recidivism) and discussing how these measurements may be used.
- c) We are linking IT support to promote transparency of these measurements.

→**Contact Mike Collins 714-667-7723**

Santa Barbara: While we have the ability to measure % of successful completion of probation at this time, new outcome measures will be established in order to assure SB 678 compliance. Santa Barbara County Probation IMPACT data system has the capacity to meet and exceed SB678 requirements. →**Contact DCPO Karen Wheeler 805-882-3675**

Imperial: Data/performance measure workgroup is currently developing a whole laundry list of data requirements and performance measures for all operations of the department. →**Contact Chief Martin Krizay, mkrizay@co.imperial.ca.us**

San Diego: Yes, we have department wide performance measures. →**Contact Natalie Pearl, Natalie.Pearl@sdcounty.ca.gov**

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

QUESTIONS TO ASK

“Provide Measurement Feedback”

13. Are you providing outcome measurement feedback to probationers and staff?

IF ANSWER IS NO, RESOURCES THAT MAY BE HELPFUL (BY REGION)

North

Shasta: There is some caseload specific discussion regarding outcome measures but currently we are lacking the appropriate database to report such information. We look forward to having a lot more information to share with the staff with the implementation of the STRONG.

→ **Contact Chelsey Chappelle, Adult Division Director, 530-245-6245 or clchappelle@co.shasta.ca.us**

Sacramento

Amador: Yes, to staff. → **Contact Deron Brodehl, 209-223-6339**

Calaveras: Yes to staff and we will to offenders through a community report of some sort. → **Contact Chief Teri Hall, 209-754-6471**

Placer: Same as Calaveras. → **Contact Probation Manager Nancy Huntley 916-543-7414**

Central

Kern: Depending on the program, we involve the client, parents, staff and community partners. This is done in our juvenile programs. At this current time, we do not share information to our adult clients.

Tulare: To staff only and limited. Refining evaluative process for expansion.

Bay

Marin: Not on a routine basis → **Contact Kevin Lynch, 415-499-6620**

Alameda: Yes, in our SB 81 pilot program. → **Contact Chief Deputy Bonita Vinson, 510-268-7200**

Contra Costa: Yes, with the use of our assessment tool. → **Contact Adult Manager Yvette McCollumn, 925-313-4154**

Monterey: We have provided outcome measurement feedback to probationers and staff in Treatment Court caseloads such as Drug Court and Prop 36, but not general caseloads. → **Contact Division Director Todd Keating, 831-796-1221**

Santa Clara: We do provide outcome feedback to staff in terms of monthly statistical reports and annual reports. However, we have not yet made any reports available to probationers. → **Contact Deputy Chief Karen Fletcher, 408-435-1635**

Santa Cruz: Specified cases only. → **Contact Laura Garnette, Adult Division Director, 831-454-3377**

Sonoma: Data will be available after aggregate data is collected over the next 6 months using new assessment tool and will be shared with staff on regular basis. → **Contact Deputy Chief Sheralynn Freitas, 707-565-2732**

South

San Bernardino: Staff Only. → **Contact Julie Hovis, Division Director I (909) 387-4211 jhovis@prob.sbcounty.gov**

Orange: The outcome feedback to probationers primarily occurs on an individual basis, specific to their own outcomes. To this point,

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

feedback to staff on outcomes is at the department level (QAS occurs more at the individual officer level.) However, we are currently working on developing "transparency" in this area that would make outcome information available and visible at every level from individual all the way up to department, including unit, division, etc. (NOTE: The department-level outcomes are posted for the public at least once a year on the probation internet site.) We are ensuring that proper feedback mechanisms are built in to program design as we move forward. We have recently revised the performance evaluation system to incorporate performance competencies directly related to desired abilities and characteristics. →**Contact Jeff Corp, Director Program Division, 714-937-4502**

Santa Barbara: Only to staff at this time but new County Reoccurring Performance Measure system will be web based and includes limited public access. The department also periodically surveys clients as to their opinion of services delivered as well as their overall experience with the department and their assigned officer, so there may be an opportunity to provide information to clients in this manner.

→**Contact DCPO Karen Wheeler 805-882-3675**

San Diego: Yes through performance measures + management reports to staff – not to probationers at this time. →**Contact Natalie Pearl, Natalie.Pearl@sdcounty.ca.gov**

12/21/09

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

APPENDIX A

RECOMMENDED DEFINITIONS: SB 678 PERFORMANCE OUTCOME MEASURES

Section 1231(c) PC– Evaluation of effectiveness of the CCPIF programs- (Mandated minimum measures)

Recommendations Prepared by CPOC Probation Performance Measure Committee (PPMC)¹

Foundation for Recommendations:

- For each mandated outcome, develop "core" statewide operational definitions that all departments report.
 - Additionally, each county should develop local, county-specific measures for each performance outcome
- Statewide "core" definitions must be at the most basic level, i.e., measure definition that majority/all probation departments can report on immediately to a measure that all could collect data and report on in 3 years.
- Definition must be meaningful both in terms of the SB678 legislative intent and how probation functions.

678 PERFORMANCE OUTCOME	RECOMMENDED STATEWIDE CORE DEFINITION OF MEASURE
<p>% of persons on felony probation who are supervised in accordance with EBP</p> <p><i>EBP = Supervision policies, procedures, programs and practices demonstrated by scientific research to reduce recidivism among individuals under probation, parole, or post release supervision. [Section 1228(d)]</i></p>	<p><u>RECOMMENDATION:</u> Definition is based on local probation department capacity to report in Year 1, Year 2, Year 3, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of felony probationers assessed for risk level using an objective/validated risk assessment tool <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – May include a proxy brief assessment if it is an objective, validated tool • # of felony probationers being supervised based on risk level (determined by an objective, validated risk/needs assessment), i.e., assessed high-risk receive most intensive supervision & resources with step-down gradations to assessed low risk = minimal supervision & least resources. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – May need a sub-measure for specialized caseloads if specific risk assessment tool applied to identify "high-risk" (i.e., static 99 for S.O.) • # of felony probationers supervised on high risk caseloads who have a completed assessment and a case plan <p>(Long-term Goal for the report definition of this measure)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of felony probationers supervised on high risk caseloads with a case plan that targets the probationer's top 1 to 3 criminogenic needs as identified in the objective assessment <p><u>GENERAL QUESTIONS/ISSUES TO RESOLVE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the "denominator" for computing these measures? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Snapshot of all felony probationers as of June 30th? – Use "eligible" for probation (pre-sentence: remove prison stips. & persons not eligible for probation) • Are there situations where the measure is 100% (i.e., in OC, all new probationers are assessed)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – May still be useful until all departments have implemented an assessment tool • How to treat specialized caseloads -- Collaborative courts (adult drug court, DUI, mental health, etc.) and Prop 36 where general risk may be medium, even low, but resources and supervision could match high-risk levels? <p>Consider by another measure of "EBP" i.e., research evidence to show reduced recidivism for program?</p>

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

678 PERFORMANCE OUTCOME	RECOMMENDED STATEWIDE CORE DEFINITION OF MEASURE
<p>% of persons on felony probation who successfully complete the period of probation</p>	<p><u>RECOMMENDATION:</u> Define in the broadest sense</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successfully completed = all felony probationers terminating from probation <u>minus</u> No Fault and Unsuccessful terminators (per definitions below) <p>Probation Term(Revocation) categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No fault terminations; probationer terminates by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 1203.9 transfer out – Deceased • Unsuccessful: felony probationers terminating from probation by <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Revocation/termination to prison – Revocation/termination with local jail time – Revocation/other (Cal. Rehab Center, Patton State Hospital, etc.) • Successfully completed – all other felony probationers terminating from probation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – i.e., total felony probationers terminating minus no fault terminations minus unsuccessful terminations/revocations. <p><u>QUESTIONS/ISSUES TO RESOLVE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should an additional sub-definition be added to the measure, i.e., successful terminations with new law violations versus no new law violations? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – # of successful terminations with no felony new law violations while under probation supervision (or...any new law violations)
<p>% of state money expended for programs that are evidence based and a descriptive list of those programs.</p>	<p><u>RECOMMENDATION:</u> Define "program" in the broadest sense to include practices as well as formal programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County 678 \$\$ spent on implementing evidence-based programming and practices during reporting period • "Evidence-based" refers to programs and practices that have research results showing reduced recidivism. • Broad definition would include funding to support assessment and case planning tools (purchase, validation, etc.), training related to proven practices (i.e. motivational interviewing, T4C, CBT, FFT, etc.), and other practices that may meet the EBP standard (i.e., mentoring, EBP resource directory development, etc.) <p><u>GENERAL QUESTIONS/ISSUES TO RESOLVE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the "evidence-based" standard?" How does a program reach an EBP standard? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Program modality has research evidence behind it? (use of assessment tools, CBT, FFT...) <p>How much research evidence is sufficient? (i.e., one study? Cited by "experts"?)</p>

SB 678 IMPLEMENTATION GUIDE

<p>Specification of supervision policies, procedures, programs and practices that were eliminated</p>	<p><u>RECOMMENDATION:</u> <i>Is this a performance measure? Or is it a descriptive measure that is applicable only during the first several funding years?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report of "non-ebp" practices and programs removed/eliminated during the report year, i.e., Supervision of offenders by offense replaced with supervision assigned by risk level <p><u>GENERAL QUESTIONS/ISSUES TO RESOLVE</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What's the ongoing measure after the first year(s)?
--	---

These recommendations are the product of a CPOC Southern Region Probation Performance Measure Committee conference call held on 10.23.09. The following individuals participated in the conference call:

Imperial County:	Pete Salgado
Orange County:	Shirley Hunt, Jeff Corp
San Bernardino County:	Anesa Cronin, Eric Raley, Cory Woods, Lindsay McHenry
San Diego County:	Natalie Pearl
Santa Barbara County:	Karen Wheeler
Ventura County:	Pat Neil