

PROGRAM NARRATIVE

Project Abstract: The San Francisco Juvenile Collaborative Reentry Team (JCRT) will provide coordinated and comprehensive reentry case planning and aftercare services for high need youths in out-of-home placement with the goal of reducing recidivism and placement failure by 50% over five years, increasing public safety. The JCRT will include representation by the Juvenile Probation Department (SFJPD), the Public Defender's Office, and the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (community-based aftercare), and will be overseen by a dedicated judge in the Office of Collaborative Justice Programs (Juvenile & Family Programs) of the Superior Court of California. The initiative will serve 100 unduplicated youths per year. The JCRT will incorporate evidence-based practices such as Team Decision Making with youth and their families, risk-need assessment through the Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument, motivational interviewing, coordination by a collaborative court, and individualized case planning coordinated jointly with supervision and aftercare staff and beginning shortly after commitment. All required performance measures will be tracked by the SFJPD in partnership with the Public Defender's Office and community-based providers of aftercare services.

1. Statement of the Problem

Over the past 15 years, the City and County of San Francisco has established itself as a national leader in developing alternatives to secure detention for juvenile-justice involved youth and in establishing innovative community-based aftercare programs. Following a nationwide trend of declining juvenile arrests, San Francisco's juvenile arrest rate declined 46.3% from 1995 to 2005. Since 1992, San Francisco juvenile detentions have declined 17.6% and detentions per arrests by 20.5%. The number of youth ordered to the California Division of Juvenile Justice

(formerly California Youth Authority) has also decreased dramatically, with only four San Francisco youth sent there since 2006.

San Francisco's success in reducing juvenile arrest, detention, and detentions per arrest mask enduring disparities in arrest and detention rates. The majority of juvenile justice involved youth in San Francisco are African Americans and Latinos originating from specific, low-income communities with high levels of violence and gang activity. The juvenile justice system faces other challenges, as well, including high failure and recidivism rates for youth in out-of-home placements. In 2008, petitions were filed in 1,607 (46.6%) of 3,446 criminal cases referred to the San Francisco Juvenile Court. Of these, 12.7% (205) resulted in out-of-home placement. Of 1,012 unduplicated youth bookings in 2008, 78.6% were for first arrests and 21.4% had prior arrests.¹ In its next phase of reform, San Francisco must devise strategies to better serve these youth in order to reduce recidivism and further reduce juvenile crime.

In 2008, African American and Latino youth comprised 47.9% and 25.0% of juvenile probation referrals, respectively, despite the fact that African American juveniles make up only 12% of San Francisco youth ages 10 to 17, and Latino juveniles make up only 23%. In 2008, 108 of San Francisco's 205 out-of-home placements (53%) ended in placement failure, with African American and Latino youth comprising 72% and 21% of placement failures, respectively (SF Juvenile Probation Department). Between 1995 and 2005, the referral rate for White and Asian youth declined by 56.1% and 49.8%, respectively, while the referral rate for African American and Latino youth declined by only 6.9% and 13.1% respectively. The detention rate for White and Asian youth declined by 52.4% and 41.0%, respectively, while the detention rate for Latino youth declined by only 0.1% and *increased* by 9.3% for African American youth.²

These patterns reflect the disproportionate concentration of crime and violence in San Francisco’s most disadvantaged and underserved communities. Police and juvenile probation data corroborate that juvenile offenders originate from—and return following placement to—San Francisco’s most disadvantaged communities. In 2008, youth living in the Bayview Hunter’s Point, Tenderloin, South of Market, Mission, Western Addition, Potrero Hill, Ingleside, and Visitacion Valley neighborhoods accounted for nearly 75% of San Francisco’s unduplicated juvenile referrals.³ According to data from the Socioeconomic Mapping and Resource Topography (SMART) system, census tracts in these neighborhoods are among the most disadvantaged in the country. Bayview Hunter’s Point has a mean Community Disadvantage Index (CDI) of 9 (more disadvantaged than 90% of census tracts in the country), and five of its twelve census tracts have CDIs of 10 (the most disadvantaged). The following chart shows CDI and educational attainment information for neighborhoods with the highest rate of juvenile probation referrals.

Neighborhood	# 2008 Juvenile Probation Referrals	% of all SF- origin referrals	Mean CDI	Max CDI	Min CDI	% 18-24 year olds w/o HS Diploma**
Bayview Hunter's Point	389	25.2%	9	10	6	34%
Visitacion Valley	182	11.8%	6	10	1	18%
Mission	140	9.1%	7	8	4	26%
Western Addition	101	6.5%	5	9	2	8%
Ingleside/Excelsior	191	12.4%	6	8	2	19%
South of Market/ Tenderloin/Potrero Hill	149	9.7%	7	10	1	25%
Total for all targeted SF neighborhoods	1,152	74.6%	7	9	3	22%
Total for San Francisco*	1,544	100.0%	6	10	1	16%
*Excludes referrals from outside San Francisco and those of unknown origin						
**Mean of all census tracts within each neighborhood						

These same neighborhoods were mapped as gang turf, gang conflict, and shooting hot spot areas (clustered in and near gang turf) by the San Francisco Police Department. Hot spots cover only 2.1% of San Francisco’s 47 square miles, but accounted for 42% of shootings in 2007.⁴

Data documenting outcomes for juveniles committed to out-of-home placement is limited. A recent seven-year study shows outcomes for 449 juvenile offenders age 13 to 17 in Los Angeles, California, who were referred to group homes between February 1999 and May 2000: 12 respondents had died (7 from gunshot wounds); 25% reported that they were in jail or prison for the entire previous 90 days; 27% reported symptoms of substance dependence; 36% reported recent hard drug use; 37% reported having been arrested within the previous year; and 66% reported committing an illegal activity within the previous year.⁵

To improve outcomes for juvenile justice-involved youth in out-of-home placement, San Francisco proposes the **Juvenile Collaborative Reentry Team (JCRT)**, an intentional partnership of key juvenile justice system partners that includes integration of pragmatic, evidence-based reentry practices.

In recent years, San Francisco has reduced use of out-of-home placement in favor of community-based supervision and rehabilitative services for all but the most serious offenses. Some youths nevertheless require structure and intensive services that cannot be provided in their homes. Other youths cannot live at home because they are unsafe, unhealthy, or unavailable to them. For youth requiring out-of-home placement, group homes are seen as a preferable, less restrictive and institutional alternative to detention in county and state operated detention facilities. While this commitment may distance youth from destructive influences at critical times, it also disconnects them from potentially beneficial community, family, and educational supports. Of San Francisco youth currently in out-of-home placement, about 50 are in high-level group homes, 90% of which are out of county (mostly out of state) with an average placement duration of about 12 months. Magnifying the impact of the committed youth's disconnection from family and community is the historical reality that youth reentering from out-of-home placement often

do not receive well-coordinated reentry planning. Barriers to coordinated planning include “siloed” systems, high caseloads, resource shortages, group home locations far from the county of origin, and low skill capacity at group homes to proactively work with youth, families, and the local juvenile justice system on reentry planning. Evidence-based practice research on reentry planning asserts key success factors that include assessing family and support networks in order to reinforce positive connections; beginning transition planning back into the communities at the start of residential placement; a strong partnership with the local court, with the court convening a local reentry team; conducting pre- and post-release review hearings; remaining informed about the progress of each youth in its purview⁶; and use of a relational inquiry tool as part of the assessment.⁷

Strengthening and expanding reentry and aftercare services for high risk youth returning from placement has long been an unmet need on San Francisco’s juvenile justice planning agenda. JCRT presents an opportunity to build on emergent best practices in San Francisco’s juvenile justice system, and ultimately to implement a streamlined and dynamic system of care that can open doors for committed youth to a successful return home.

Through service needs and gaps analysis, we know that, without well-coordinated systems of communication, advocacy, monitoring and follow-through, juvenile offenders in group homes are at high risk for “falling through the cracks,” and thus for recidivism and other negative outcomes. In 2008, 108 of San Francisco’s 205 out-of-home placements (53%) ended in placement failure. Furthermore, juvenile offenders who are booked for repeated placement failures are at risk of commitment to a county juvenile detention facility.

San Francisco’s current reentry system for juvenile offenders relies largely on a network of community based organizations contracted with the City to provide supportive services, including alternative education programs, case management, conflict mediation support groups, leadership development groups, life skills classes, enrichment programs, employment services, tattoo removal, and gender-responsive services. Although formal evaluation has generally shown excellent outcomes for these community-based programs,⁸ there remains the challenge of ensuring that each reentering youth is equipped with a plan—informed by a validated risk-needs assessment—to connect with comprehensive and coordinated services upon release, and to ensure that these connections are sustained. Fragmentation of services and lack of communication among representatives of involved agencies are primary reasons for failure to assess needs and monitor services appropriately.⁹ Evidence-based models such as the Intensive Aftercare Program stress that individualized case planning should begin shortly after commitment, should be coordinated jointly with institutional and aftercare staff, and should include a mix of supervision and intensive services through a network of community providers.¹⁰

The Juvenile Justice Local Action Plan, developed annually by the San Francisco Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council, identifies juvenile justice system goals as well as key system and program gaps to inform priorities for funding allocation. The goals of the system are:

- To reduce the recidivism rate for youth in the juvenile justice system
- To reduce the inappropriate or unnecessary use of secure detention
- To reduce the overrepresentation of minority youth in the juvenile justice system
- To hold youth and families involved in the juvenile justice system accountable
- To hold city departments, public agencies, and community-based organizations involved in the juvenile justice system accountable for performance-based outcomes

- To bring together all relevant city departments, city commissioners, public agencies, community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, youth and families in partnership to frame solutions and services
- To innovatively craft smart strategies for leveraging resources across juvenile/criminal justice departments and committing to sustained, coordinated efforts that strengthen the intersection between associated systems and services
- To prevent delinquent behavior by youth at risk for entering the juvenile justice system

In 2009, the system and program gaps articulated in the Local Action Plan included the need for more collaboration and communication between probation and community based organizations (including more referrals to those organizations), and the need to maximize collaboration and minimize duplication across systems. The Chief of the Juvenile Probation Department (JPD) meets regularly with a 25-member coalition of service providers called the Juvenile Justice Providers Association to discuss systematic hurdles and to move toward appropriate and near-term solutions. Additionally, the Mayor's Office of Community Investment has started a series of working group meetings with public and nonprofit partners to discuss current juvenile justice strategies and make practical recommendations for strengthening beneficial current strategies and for adding local best practice service options for high risk youth. Improved reentry and aftercare services are regularly identified as a local need.

In addition to pulling initiative ideas from completed reentry and aftercare planning, San Francisco can capitalize on a track record of success addressing front end legal needs of youth committed to out-of-home placement. Through the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG) program, the Public Defender's Office has hired a Placement and Education Attorney (PEA) to advocate for the needs of juvenile offenders in placement. The PEA works closely with the JPD

to assess and secure the most appropriate placement to meet the individualized needs of the client. This has resulted in fewer AWOLS and placement failures as well as earlier graduation from placements. The PEA has also developed reentry plans for her clients, which have led to a reduction of Public Defender clients in out-of-home placement and successful termination from wardship probation. The Attorney maintains regular contact with clients in placement to ensure their needs and concerns are addressed with the assistance of a dedicated youth advocate, who also provides case wrap and client management services.

The Attorney also provides educational advocacy on behalf of placement clients as well as other Public Defender clients with special education needs. This includes client representation in Individualized Education Plan meetings, manifestation hearings and expulsion hearings with the San Francisco Unified School District. Educational advocacy has resulted in fewer failures in school placements, reduction in tardiness and unexcused absences, and advocacy to higher level school placements to address the mental and emotional health needs of higher risk youth. The Courts and Juvenile Probation have come to rely on the educational services of the Public Defender Education and Placement attorney, resulting in more youth returning home stabilized and to the most appropriate educational setting.

The Juvenile Probation Department is taking additional steps to address the barriers and gaps identified through evaluation and local action planning. JPD is part of an interagency effort to reduce out-of-home placement and ensure that all such placements are based on accurate, multi-disciplinary assessment. It has implemented the validated Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument (YASI) with all probationers and has trained all probation officers in motivational interviewing techniques. In partnership with the San Francisco Human Services Agency (HSA) and other community organizations, JPD has begun the practice of case conferencing to link

youth returning from out of state and at high-level care group homes to services in the community. A designated probation officer has been working with a caseload of youth being followed continuously, pre-placement through release, to ensure appropriate placement and improved aftercare planning.

The proposed Juvenile Collaborative Reentry Team initiative will formalize and build on these interim system improvements, ensuring accurate assessment, appropriate placement, continuous and coordinated multi-disciplinary reentry planning during placement, and well-coordinated and monitored community-based after care services for youth in out-of-home placement. Threading elements of pragmatic and humane deterrence, proactive rehabilitation and youth development, and strength-based tools and policies into its design, the JCRT initiative will ensure that youth get connected with an appropriate out-of-home placement, receive professional treatment and care while in placement, and are efficiently connected with the JCRT team upon return, incorporating family and community networks into the entire reentry planning process.

2. Impact/Outcomes and Evaluation/Performance Measure Data Collection Plan

The overarching goal of the JCRT is to reduce recidivism among San Francisco juveniles committed to out-of-home placement. We propose to serve 100 youth per year, providing each youth with a uniquely tailored reentry case plan that reflects his or her assessed needs. Data collection will be designed to track individual level OJJDP-required performance indicators such as educational enrollment, vocational training and employment, housing, treatment, and other services needed for successful reintegration into the community. On a systems level, the program will track its own progress in implementing the evidence-based practices described in this proposal.

The goals of the Juvenile Collaborative Reentry Team (JCRT) initiative are:

1. To reduce recidivism for youth returning from out-of-home placement by 50% over five years through comprehensive aftercare service linkages and monitoring, thereby reducing the disparate rates of juvenile crime and recidivism in San Francisco's low-income, minority communities.
2. To improve collaborative inter-agency case planning and coordination for juvenile justice-involved youth in out-of-home placements beginning at commitment through termination of probation.
3. To implement a collaborative enhanced placement court as part of the Office of Collaborative Justice Programs (Juvenile & Family Programs) of the Superior Court of California.

Objectives:

1. Approximately 100 youth per year will be enrolled in the program based on assessment and referral by Probation Officer or Social Worker.
2. 100% of enrolled youth will undergo a full risk-needs assessment at adjudication using the Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument (YASI) to inform appropriate placement and service planning.
3. 100% of enrolled youth will receive an updated assessment as part of case planning at the time of their review hearing, six months prior to release.
4. 100% of families of enrolled youth will receive intensive support beginning three months prior to release.
5. 100% of enrolled youth will have a comprehensive and coordinated individualized reentry case plan that addresses housing, vocational training, completion of education, therapy or

drug treatment, and any additional services they require to succeed outside of placement based on assessed needs.

6. At least 75% of enrolled youth will have successful linkages with aftercare services six months post-release.

As required by OJJDP, the program will track the following performance measures:

- Number of youth released
- Number of youth served by the program
- Number of youth who re-offend
- Percent of youth recommitted to a juvenile facility for a new offense
- Percent of youth sentenced to adult prison
- Percent of youth who violate conditions of release
- Percent of youth who become employed
- Percent of youth who are enrolled in an educational program
- Percent increase in the number of youth who find housing
- Percent of youth assessed as needing substance/alcohol abuse services
- Percent of youth assessed as needing mental health services
- Percent of youth enrolled in a mental health program
- Percent of youth who exhibit a desired change in the targeted behavior
- Percent of youth involved in community activities
- Number of evidence-based reentry programs/practices implemented

All performance data will be retrieved using the Juvenile Probation IT system in coordination with the Public Defender's Office. Utilization and outcomes data for community-based aftercare services will be collected and analyzed in coordination with the Department of Children, Youth

and Families (DCYF) as part of a formal evaluation of San Francisco's community-based violence prevention programs. DCYF has contracted with Davis Ja, a San Francisco-based evaluation consulting firm to perform the assessment, and JPD sits on the advisory panel for the evaluation.

3. Project/Program Design and Implementation

San Francisco has a strong collaborative team in place between the Superior Court/Office of Collaborative Justice Programs, the Juvenile Probation Department, the Public Defender, and the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (a community based organization) for the purpose of building on the City's most promising reentry practices. This Juvenile Collaborative Reentry Team (JCRT) will implement team decision making practices while juvenile offenders are in custody and will ensure closely monitored planning through the reentry process, with coordinated case management and brokered comprehensive services designed to reduce recidivism and maximize positive outcomes for juveniles released in San Francisco. The goal of the proposed program is to improve outcomes for juvenile justice involved youth in "out-of-home" placements, the vast majority of whom come from San Francisco's low-income communities of color. Outcomes for these high-need youth will be improved through the use of validated risk-needs assessment methods, coordinated reentry planning that begins at adjudication, and carefully coordinated and monitored community-based after care services.

San Francisco has proved itself as a national leader in coordinated reentry planning and innovative program implementation. In 2008, the Board of Supervisors enacted legislation to formalize a single Reentry Council for the City and County of San Francisco comprised of representatives from the Mayor's Office, Public Defender's Office, District Attorney's Office, Sheriff's Department, Police Department, Adult Probation Department, Juvenile Probation

Department, Department of Economic and Workforce Development, Human Services Agency, Department of Public Health, Department of Child Support Services, San Francisco Superior Court, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation Division of Adult Parole Operations, and the U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services System. The other seven members of the Reentry Council must be former inmates of the San Francisco County Jail, a California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation facility, and/or a United States Bureau of Prison facility, with at least one having been released from custody within two years of his/her appointment, at least one having served multiple terms; and at least one being age 18 to 24 at the time of appointment.

The Reentry Council provides the Mayor, the Board of Supervisors, the public, and any other appropriate agency with accurate and comprehensive information about programs that serve the reentry population, barriers faced by this population, best practices to meet the needs of this population, and funding sources for programs and practices that address the needs of this population. The Reentry Council will provide policy and implementation oversight to the JCRT initiative, and will lead ongoing efforts to leverage funding and resources to ensure its long-term success and sustainability.

Since 1997, San Francisco's oversight of its juvenile justice systems has been coordinated by the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC), a multi-agency body established to develop the Juvenile Justice Local Action Plan. The Plan identifies the resources and strategies for providing an effective continuum of responses for the prevention, intervention, supervision, treatment, and incarceration of male and female juvenile offenders, including strategies to develop and implement locally or regionally based out-of-home placement options for juveniles.

Proposed Activities. The San Francisco Juvenile Collaborative Reentry Team will implement a coordinated system for assisting youth during the reentry process from out-of-home placements. A dedicated Judge, Reentry Probation Officer, Social Worker, and community-based Reentry case management will assure that youth will be assisted in a comprehensive and monitored transition and community reintegration process. JCRT members will include: the Judge, the Defense Attorney, Reentry Probation Officers, Reentry Social Workers, and Reentry Case Managers.

A critical member of the team will be the youth approaching reentry. At every turn, the youth will be involved in making decisions that will impact services, education, vocational opportunities, and other areas. Reentry judges have found that having the youth sign a contract describing their reentry plan increases the youth's investment in the process.¹²

Also included at every juncture will be the family. Research has shown that involving the family in planning and assisting family members in developing skills to work with the youth has a tremendous impact on successful reentry.¹³ In order to facilitate family support for juveniles in reentry, the JCRT team will involve the family in team meetings at the six month and three month pre-release points, and will work to educate family members on needed parenting and supervision techniques, available services for families and juveniles, and planning tools for vocational and educational services.

Adjudication. Enhanced services will be provided to high need juveniles in out-of-home placement by linking them to the JCRT as early as possible in their commitment. During the pilot, all youth who are determined to be at a Rate Classification Level (RCL) of 12 or higher will be assigned to the JCRT. For juveniles placed in the San Francisco Bay Area, the reentry PO will be assigned to the youth upon placement. For those placed outside of the Bay Area, the

juvenile will be assigned to the JCRT once the case is referred to the enhanced placement court. Including Probation Officers who are not formally part of the JCRT will help to ensure manageable caseloads for the JCRT POs while also introducing the remaining placement POs to the new model. While only two POs will be dedicated to the JCRT, all POs in the unit will participate in the trainings and workshops associated with this new effort.

Once a youth is referred to the JCRT, the dedicated probation and social work staff will connect with youth and their families, conduct the initial assessment, and track their progress while they are in the assigned placement.

Assessment. Upon adjudication, the assigned probation officer will perform the risk-needs assessment and Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument (YASI) with each participant. Results will be used to guide the design of an individual service plan. A follow-up assessment will be conducted in conjunction with the six month review.

San Francisco's JPD has fully implemented YASI for probationers. The comprehensive risk, need, and protective factor assessment instrument is designed for use in juvenile probation and other high-risk youth service settings. The instrument is based on an assessment model first developed for juveniles in the State of Washington where it is used in all 33 juvenile courts in that state. The New York State Division of Probation and Correctional Alternatives later adapted it as a model for risk, needs and strengths assessment to inform services planning in juvenile probation in New York State. Using individualized assessment based on systematic procedures, service providers are in a better position to match the levels and types of interventions to the levels of risk and needs that are presented by individual youth.

YASI has proven to be an effective tool for assessing case management needs based on the information gathered. A recent study two-year validation study was showed that YASI remains a valid and useful tool for predicting outcomes over a minimum period of two years.¹⁴ This systematic assessment will afford greater consistency in data gathering used to develop individual case plans across the state, will increase the probation system's capacity to ensure that the right youth were matched to the right services, and will improve both the county and the state's ability to identify effective services gaps within the larger service delivery network..

Evidence-based practice research shows the importance of assessing family and support networks as part of reentry planning in order to reinforce positive connections. Use of a relational inquiry tool as part of assessment has been shown to reduce recidivism and also build rapport between the professional using the tool and the client.¹⁵

Critical to this program's focus on coordinated case management and team decision making, the YASI tool includes an in-depth assessment of the family environment. Questions address the family history, the adults living in the home, the opportunities for learning, parental caring and supervision, and how the family responds to conflict and applies consequences. Answers will allow the coordinated JCRT team to begin the service planning process with the family immediately after assessment. All team members will be trained in motivational interviewing so that they may use the results of the YASI to begin building rapport around family issues from a strengths-based perspective. Motivational Interviewing has been cited as an evidence-based practice for use with probationers and parolees by the National Institute of Corrections.¹⁶

Other important areas addressed by the YASI include legal history, school history and enrollment status, community and peer relationships, alcohol and drug involvement, physical and mental health history, skills, and employment relationships.

Hearing. JCRT youth will be referred to an “Enhanced Placement” court overseen by a designated judge. The court will focus on the placement and reentry success of JCRT participants, and will play an active role in coordinating JCRT efforts. The JCRT services team will ensure that the case plan reflecting the results of the YASI assessment is in place and introduced to the family through the team meetings that occur six months and three months prior to release. Youth who are unable to attend these hearings will be consulted through coordinated placement visits from JCRT members. Official notice to the court of family engagement will occur 15 days prior to release. The written reentry plan will be approved by the court and signed by the youth, primary guardian, and PO.

Reentry Case Planning. The service team will use the required local six-month review hearings to re-evaluate each youth’s progress and timing for release. At the six-month release marker (coinciding with the review hearing), the PO will update the risk-needs assessment and work with the team, the youth, and the family to prepare a preliminary release plan. The JCRT will meet regularly to consult and coordinate on the youth’s progress, and at three months the team will finalize the plan. Reentry plans may include housing, vocational training, completion of education, therapy or drug treatment, and any additional services a youth may require to succeed outside of placement. At the time the plan is finalized, the case manager will begin the intensive process of preparing the youth and family for reentry. Visits to out of state placements by the reentry case manager will be coordinated with the PO’s regular visits to ensure coordination and consistency. The case manager will update the JCRT on the preparations during the team’s regularly scheduled meetings. The reentry case manager will provide ongoing stabilization assistance with the cooperation of probation, ensuring a stable contact for the youth and an open door to a supportive network in the community. Research on child development demonstrates

that the more relationships youths have with caring adults, the lower their risk-taking behavior and the greater likelihood that they will resist dangerous influences, succeed in school, and exhibit fewer behavior problems, including delinquency.¹⁷

Case planning is a systematic process of establishing goals and developing appropriate activities and interventions to achieve them. Case planning will strive to create comprehensive service continuums tailored to the unique issues and needs of each youth and family. The services team will focus on the strengths, assets, and resources of the individual youth, their families, and community. Case planning will greatly increase the opportunities for successful reentry due to:

- Involvement and commitment of the youth, their family, social network members and professionals in the planning process.
- Identification of roles and activities to help the services team ensure follow-through and accountability.
- The plan serving as a guide for the case, and being used to monitor completion of tasks, activities, and responsibilities, as well as achievement of objectives.
- The goals, objectives, and activities of the plan providing a means of evaluating its impact.

All case plans will include, at a minimum:

1. School assignment and placement prior to release date.
2. Advocacy by defense attorney, social worker, and case manager for current Individual Education Plans for special education youth.
3. Family reintegration and counseling to be provided prior to and after release.
4. Assessment and provision of individualized counseling, such as substance abuse, anger management, behavioral and mental health needs.
5. Consideration of vocational readiness and employment opportunities.

6. Provision of gender specific services to meet the special needs of girls.

Reentry. Once a youth is released, The Reentry Case Manager will employ an intensive case management strategy to carry out the designated case plan. The Case Manager will work primarily with juveniles already released to ensure quality time and services are delivered and devoted to each individual client's personal needs. Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (CJCJ; community-based aftercare) staff will connect their clients to an individualized range of community-based services that are selected to address the reasons the client may have resorted to delinquency in the first place. CJCJ uses a positive and supportive, while assertive, case management approach to ensure that the youth take advantage of available services.

CJCJ staff will work to promote each youth's adjustment into the community by monitoring his or her compliance to the program and providing support to help him or her overcome adversities and avoid patterns that lead to recidivism. Specifically, they will 1) determine the extent to which the service plan is being implemented; 2) assess achievement of case plan objectives; 3) determine service and support outcomes; 4) identify new youth/family needs requiring changes in the service plan; 5) ensure program funds are being properly utilized; and 6) provide consistent, close supervision to promote public safety and ensure compliance. Close contact with the Juvenile Probation Department will be ongoing.

CJCJ staff use face-to-face visits from three times a day (during the first week after referral) to three times a week (second and third months). Staff members act as role models and mentors, providing stable and encouraging support structures for their clients, many of whom otherwise have very limited resources. Some CJCJ case managers have backgrounds similar to the lives of the clients they are serving and are thus quickly able to facilitate trusting relationships with clients. Interactions between the program staff and youth allow the youth to respect the value of

interpersonal support while learning to enhance their self-sufficiency and accountability within the broader community. CJCJ case managers will submit monthly reports to the JCRT updating the team on the youth's progress. Any court reports will be developed by the JCRT and will include the joint recommendations of that team.

This intensive advocacy and case management model is well-suited for high risk or repeat offenders with special needs because the case managers are able to tailor highly individualized plans that are responsive to the youth's needs, progress, and specific interests.

In CJCJ's current programs, case managers develop and implement case plans, maintain frequent contact with youth and their support systems, and broker services from community agencies for needs that the agency cannot meet in-house. CJCJ will have a licensed clinician who can work with youth, families, and the CJCJ case manager for effective case planning, case conferencing, and case monitoring.

Individual, Family, and Group Therapy. CJCJ's mental health director and therapist will provide direct individual, family, and group therapy to youth who have been mandated by the court to participate in weekly therapy. Family therapy will involve parents, foster parents, extended family, and/or other supportive figures in the youth's life. Group therapy may address substance abuse treatment, anger management, gender-specific counseling, violence prevention, and cognitive restructuring and behavior modification. For youth who have socialization as part of their case plan, group therapy also may include structured, supervised, pro-social peer-interaction activities and exercises. Groups may be run by LCSWs at CJCJ or by outside contractors who specialize in the theme or focus of the particular group. Groups will take place twice a month or as appropriate.

Most case plans also will include appropriate other programs and services. Identifying individual service referrals for the youth and family will take into consideration youth/family ethnicity; cultural values, principles and practices; the neighborhood/community in which the youth/family reside; and the youth/family's own desires, preferences, and priorities. The Case Manager will play an important role in monitoring the youth's participation and success in programs that address family functioning and skills development, life skills, education support, legal self-help training, basic needs provision, benefits assistance, vocational training and employment support, and housing planning.

This level of coordinated case management has shown excellent results in the target population of economically disadvantaged, racial minority youths in custody. Demonstration programs that have adapted the Intensive Aftercare Programs model for disadvantaged minority youth, such as the Minority Youth Transition Program in Oregon, have begun to show positive results in reducing high rates of recidivism.¹⁸

4. Capabilities/Competencies

Project Staff Roles and Responsibilities. The JCRT initiative is collaboration between the San Francisco Superior Courts, Juvenile Probation Department (JPD), Public Defender's Office Juvenile Division (PD), and the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (CJCJ). Each department will have dedicated staff working with each youth, continuously from adjudication and placement through reentry and termination of probation. Team members will include.

Judge: One designated judge will oversee the work of the JCRT, presiding over all reentry hearings for juvenile offenders returning from out-of-home placements. The judge will be the lead JCRT convener and will hold monthly team meetings to consult on the JCRT caseload.

Deputy Program Probation Officer (2 FTE): These dedicated POs will provide continuous supervision from the time of adjudication to termination of probation to ensure appropriate placement and comprehensive aftercare planning, in collaboration with the social worker, defense attorney, case manager, parents, and youth.

Placement and Education Attorney (1 FTE): This position representing each youth in placement will participate in all collaborative decision making, including assessing and securing appropriate placements for each youth, devising the reentry plan, and providing educational advocacy.

Social Worker (2 FTE): Social workers will assist the attorney throughout a client's term in out-of-home placement, working collaboratively to develop reentry plans upon vacating of out-of-home placement. They will conduct interviews with clients and/or their family members and other interested parties to obtain a comprehensive assessment of the child's needs; obtain and analyze confidential psychological, medical and social histories; provide crisis intervention and management; identify specific services and resources in the community to address the client's needs; maintain records, logs, and case files; conduct psychosocial needs assessments and prepare written reports and treatment plans in support of the client's position; and visit homes and placements as needed in the course of their work.

Case Manager (Aftercare) (1 FTE): This position will ensure that services identified in the reentry plan are provided to the youth, working with the JCRT team to develop and implement case plans, maintaining frequent contact with youth and their support systems, and brokering services from community agencies for needs that cannot be met in house.

Key Implementing Staff

██████████ is the Managing Attorney for the Juvenile Division of the San Francisco Public Defender's Office. ██████████ has been a Deputy Public Defender in San Francisco since 1978, and

has been practicing in the Juvenile Courts since 1981. She is co-author of the CEB California Criminal Law Procedure and Practice, 5th Edition Juvenile Law and Procedure chapter (multiple editions), and of the CEB California Criminal Law Forms Manual, Juvenile Delinquency section (2001 edition). [REDACTED] served as a technical advisor to the American Bar Association Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention for the Due Process Advocacy Program, a national program to increase children's access to counsel in juvenile delinquency proceedings and to improve the quality of legal services rendered to children. She is a core member of the John D. and Catharine T. MacArthur Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice, an interdisciplinary agency bridging research, policy and practice for at-risk youth. She is a member of the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee of the Administrative Office of the Courts, Center for Families, Children and the Courts. [REDACTED] will lead implementation for the Public Defender's Office and will supervise the Placement and Education Attorney.

[REDACTED] is Chief Juvenile Probation Officer and a charter member of the San Francisco Reentry Council. Prior to this appointment, Chief [REDACTED] served as Deputy Director of Probation and Court Services for Cook County Juvenile Probation Department in Chicago, where he led a number of juvenile justice system reform initiatives. He was responsible for developing and managing the state's first Juvenile Intensive Probation Supervision Program, the state's first Juvenile Intensive Drug Program, and the Home Confinement Program. He was co-author of the successful grant proposal leading to Cook County's selection as a Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative site by the Annie E. Casey Foundation in 1994, and led the Department's participation in this national project, later identifying Cook County as a "national model site." During Chief [REDACTED] 38 year career in Juvenile Probation, he has presented numerous workshops on Juvenile Justice issues for the Office of Juvenile and Delinquency

Prevention, the National Juvenile Detention Association, the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the National Association of Juvenile and Family Court Judges. He was a charter partner of the Illinois Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, where he was a key leader in statewide detention reform. Under the leadership of Chief Probation Officer ██████████, the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department (JPD) locates, develops, and administers programs for the assessment, education, treatment, appropriate rehabilitation and effective supervision of youth under the jurisdiction of the Department. Chief ██████████ holds a Bachelor's Degree in Communications from Loyola University and a Masters Degree in Social Justice from Lewis University.

██████████ is the Executive Director and co-founder of the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice (CJ CJ). His expertise is in the development and analysis of youth and adult correctional policy. He has implemented model community corrections programs and incarceration alternatives throughout the country. In 1993, ██████████ established the Detention Diversion Advocacy Program (DDAP) for serious and chronic youth offenders in San Francisco's juvenile justice system. This program was cited as an exemplary model by the United States Department of Justice and Harvard University's *Innovations in American Government* program. In 1994, ██████████ received a leadership award from the State of Hawaii for his efforts in reforming that state's juvenile correctional system and developing model community-based reentry programs. In August 2007, ██████████ initiated a technical assistance project to assist California counties in developing model intervention programs for high-end youthful offenders. ██████████ is presently involved in the efforts to reform California's adult sentencing and parole practices and serves as an advisor to the State's prestigious Little Hoover Commission.

Judge [REDACTED] is the son of immigrant parents from Hoi Ping, Guangzhou, China. He was born and raised in San Francisco's Chinatown/North Beach district and is a graduate of City College of San Francisco and UC Berkeley and Hastings College of Law. He served as a public defender, private attorney, special assistant to the Mayor of San Francisco, and a Court Commissioner before his appointment to the bench in 2001. Career highlights include participation in the Asian American Residential Recovery Services, the SF Jail Overcrowding Committee, the Police Discipline Task Force, the SF Bail Commissioner Project and the SF Drug Court Program. He has sat in all of the judicial assignments at the Juvenile Court except Traffic. He currently handles the recidivist and placement calendars in Juvenile Court.

Key Implementing Agencies

San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department: The mission of the San Francisco JPD is to serve the needs of youth and families brought to its attention with care and compassion, identify and respond to the individual risks and needs presented by each youth, engage fiscally sound and culturally competent strategies that promote the best interests of the youth, provide victims with opportunities for restoration, identify and utilize the least restrictive interventions and placements that do not compromise public safety, hold youth accountable for their actions while providing them with opportunities and assisting them to develop new skills and competencies; and to contribute to the overall quality of life for the citizens of San Francisco within the sound framework of public safety as outlined in the Welfare & Institutions Code. JPD Probation Services supervises youths who are alleged and have been found to be beyond their parents' control, runaway, or truant, as well as those who have been found to have committed law violations. JPD operates Juvenile Hall, the short-term detention facility for youth in custody awaiting hearings or placement, and Log Cabin Ranch, the post adjudication facility for

delinquent male juveniles. JPD's Private Placement Unit supervises youth removed from their homes by the Court and placed in non-secure facilities, such as foster homes, group homes and residential treatment programs primarily in California as well as Nevada, Colorado and Pennsylvania. The Probation Officers supervise the youth while in placement, monitor suitability of the placements and prepare aftercare plans for youth completing programs. JPD works with the Department of Children, Youth and Families and the Mayor's Office of Community Investment to fund \$10 million in violence prevention and intervention programs for youth and young adults who are involved or at risk of involvement in the juvenile justice system. The range of programs includes intensive home-based supervision in seven neighborhoods, home detention, evening reporting centers, mentorship programs, peer counseling, status offender services, gender specific programming, and pre-placement shelter care and evaluation. In addition, the Focus Vocational Program works exclusively with youth on probation and in custody. JPD is involved in several ongoing systems change efforts that bear directly on the challenges and opportunities described in this proposal. It is one of five City agencies that serve on the Task Force on Residential Treatment for Youth in Foster Care.

SF Public Defender's Office, Juvenile Division: The PD's Office has a long and distinguished history of providing high-quality reentry services as part of its legal advocacy. The reentry unit provides its adult clients with an innovative blend of legal, social, and practical support through three programs: Clean Slate Program, Children of Incarcerated Parents program, and social work services. Reentry social workers work with deputy public defenders to address underlying and contributing social and behavioral health needs. They have extensive knowledge of San Francisco social services and treatment networks, as well as deep relationships with the social services staff and directors to which they connect their clients. They provide legal advocacy,

offering alternatives to incarceration based on a client's individual circumstances and need. A recent evaluation of the reentry unit found that its work resulted in reduced sentence lengths, effective use of alternatives to incarceration, and cost savings for the criminal justice system (LFA 2009). The Public Defender's Office administers San Francisco's allocation of Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG) funds.

Office of Collaborative Justice Programs (Juvenile & Family Programs), Superior Court of California: This office offers a Juvenile Behavioral Health Court through which youth receive an integrated case plan developed by a team of public and private partners, including the Superior Court, Juvenile Probation, Department of Public Health, SF Unified School District, and the Youth Treatment and Education Center. This program has been in existence for nearly ten years.

Mayor's Office of Community Investment: The MOCI partners with the community to strengthen the social, physical, and economic infrastructure of San Francisco's low-income neighborhoods and communities in need. In 2008, MOCI began administering juvenile and criminal justice funds previously overseen by the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice. MOCI seeks to improve public safety and strengthen the efficacy of the juvenile and criminal justice system through collaborative partnerships with city agencies, community based organizations, residents, and state and federal funding agencies. Ongoing juvenile and criminal justice activities include grant making to reduce crime and delinquency among youth and young adults ages 12 to 25, citywide violence prevention planning, and research and public policy development. MOCI administers State Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) funding.

Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice: CJCJ is a non-profit organization that has provided direct services, technical assistance and policy research in the juvenile and criminal justice fields since 1985. CJCJ's mission is to reduce levels of incarceration by implementing well-designed

rehabilitative and support services, and to promote balanced and humane criminal justice policies. CJCJ pursues this mission through the development of model programs, technical assistance, and public policy analysis. Since 1993, CJCJ's Detention Diversion Advocacy Project (DDAP) has provided intensive case-management to the highest-risk youth in San Francisco's juvenile justice system. Case managers develop and implement case plans, maintain frequent contact with youth and their support systems, and broker services from community agencies. In 2002, CJCJ expanded the DDAP model to include direct mental health treatment and expanded program goals to include addressing psychological needs and reducing psychiatric symptoms. CJCJ's licensed clinicians work with youth, families and CJCJ case managers for effective case planning, case conferencing and case monitoring. Early And Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment services include targeted case management, medication support/maintenance, individual, family and group therapy, and linkage to collateral services such as family functioning and skills development, life skills development, parenting skills development, education support, legal self-help training, basic needs, benefits assistance, vocational training and employment support, and housing. DDAP is a past recipient of a Harvard University *Innovations in Government Semifinalist Award* and has been replicated in cities around the nation, including Oakland, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Boston, and Washington DC. An August 2005 US Department of Justice publication on juvenile detention alternatives cited San Francisco's DDAP as a national model. CJCJ has played a leadership role in developing effective community-based alternatives to residential placement. They spearheaded a wraparound system through Title IV-E and SB 163 waivers for youth at all levels of the child welfare and juvenile justice systems which allowed funding streams previously used solely for

residential placement to support community-based alternatives. CJCJ is San Francisco's primary provider of aftercare services for youth in out-of-home placement.

Citations

1. San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department, 2008 Statistical Report, April 2009, 1.
2. Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, "Juvenile Detention in San Francisco: Analysis and Trends 2006," *Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice* (newsletter), May 2007.
http://www.cjcj.org/files/Juvenile_DetentionSF.pdf.
3. *2008 Statistical Report*, 4.
4. Berkeley Center for Criminal Justice, "Homicide and Serious Gun Violence in San Francisco," (Power Point presentation), November 2008.
5. Ramchand R, Becker K. "Seven-Year Life Outcomes of Adolescent Offenders in Los Angeles," *American Journal of Public Health*, v. 99 no. 5 (2009), 863-870.
6. National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, *Reconnecting: The Role of the Juvenile Court in Reentry*, 2005, <http://www.ncjfcj.org/content/view/345/403/>.
7. DiZerega M, Shapiro C. "Asking About Family Can Enhance Reentry," *Corrections Today*, v. 69, no. 6 (2007), 58-61.
8. LaFrance Associates, LLC, *Fresh Directions Volume II, Community Programs Supported by the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department*, June 2005.
<http://lfagroup.com/Expertise/FreshDirections.html>.
9. Armstrong TL, Jackson L. "Overrepresentation of Minorities in Youth Correctional Confinement in the United States: A Promising Aftercare Approach for Ameliorating This Problem," *Youth Crime and Juvenile Justice*, Nicolas Queloz, et al., editors. Staempfli

Editions (2005), SA: Berne, Switzerland.

www.csus.edu/ssis/cdcps/OverrepresentationOfMinorities.pdf.

10. National Council on Crime and Delinquency, *Implementation and Outcome Evaluation of the Intensive Aftercare Program: Final Report*, March 2005.
11. National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.
12. Ibid.
13. Guarino-Ghezzi S, Tirrell C. “Guards or Guardians? A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis of Parenting Styles in Juvenile Correctional Programs,” *Justice Policy Journal*, v. 5, no. 2 (2008).
14. Orbis Partners, Inc. “Long-Term Validation of the Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument (YASI) in New York State Juvenile Probation,” November 2007.
<http://dpca.state.ny.us/pdfs/nyltyasifullreport20feb08.pdf>
15. DiZerega M, Shapiro C.
16. Clark M, Walters S, Gingerich R, Melzer M. “Motivational Interviewing for Probation Officers: Tipping the Balance Toward Change,” *Federal Probation* v. 70, no. 1 (2006).
17. Guarino-Ghezzi S, Tirrell C.
18. Armstrong TL, Jackson L.

Budget Detail Worksheet

Purpose: The Budget Detail Worksheet may be used as a guide to assist you in the preparation of the budget and budget narrative. You may submit the budget and budget narrative using this form or in the format of your choice (plain sheets, your own form, or a variation of this form). However, all required information (including the budget narrative) must be provided. Any category of expense not applicable to your budget may be deleted.

A. Personnel - List each position by title and name of employee, if available. Show the annual salary rate and the percentage of time to be devoted to the project. Compensation paid for employees engaged in grant activities must be consistent with that paid for similar work within the applicant organization.

Name/Position	Computation	Cost
8444 Deputy Probation Officer	\$83,096 x .60 in year 1, \$83,096 in years 2 & 3	\$216,050.00
2910 Social Worker	\$61,204 * .60 in year 1, \$61,204 in years 2 & 3	\$159,131.00
Reentry Case Manager, CJCJ	\$28200 in year 1, \$6562 in yr. 2, \$47,000 in yr. 3	\$81,762.00
SUB-TOTAL		\$456,943.00

B. Fringe Benefits - Fringe benefits should be based on actual known costs or an established formula. Fringe benefits are for the personnel listed in budget category (A) and only for the percentage of time devoted to the project. Fringe benefits on overtime hours are limited to FICA, Workman's Compensation, and Unemployment Compensation.

Name/Position	Computation	Cost
8444 Deputy Probation Officer	Fringe @ .39 of 8444 Personnel Cost	\$84,259.00
2910 Social worker	Fringe @ .43 of 2310 Personnel Cost	\$68,425.00
	Fringe @ .43 of 2310 Personnel Cost	
Reentry Case Manager, CJCJ	Fringe \$7,050 in yr. 1, \$2,188 in yr. 2 & \$11,750 in yr. 3	\$20,988.00
SUB-TOTAL		\$173,672.00
Total Personnel & Fringe Benefits		\$630,615.00

C. Travel - Itemize travel expenses of project personnel by purpose (e.g., staff to training, field interviews, advisory group meeting, etc.). Show the basis of computation (e.g., six people to 3-day training at \$X airfare, \$X lodging, \$X subsistence). In training projects, travel and meals for trainees should be listed separately. Show the number of trainees and the unit costs involved. Identify the location of travel, if known. Indicate source of Travel Policies applied, Applicant or Federal Travel Regulations.

Purpose of Travel	Location	Item	Computation	Cost
NA				
Travel entry 2				
Travel entry 3				
Travel entry 4				
Travel entry 5				
Travel entry 6				
Travel entry 7				
TOTAL				\$0.00

D. Equipment - List non-expendable items that are to be purchased. Non-expendable equipment is tangible property having a useful life of more than two years and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit. (Note: Organization's own capitalization policy may be used for items costing less than \$5,000). Expendable items should be included either in the "supplies" category or in the "Other" category. Applicants should analyze the cost benefits of purchasing versus leasing equipment, especially high cost items and those subject to rapid technical advances. Rented or leased equipment costs should be listed in the "Contractual" category. Explain how the equipment is necessary for the success of the project. Attach a narrative describing the procurement method to be used.

Item	Computation	Cost
NA		
equipment entry 2		
equipment entry 3		
equipment entry 4		
equipment entry 5		
TOTAL		\$0.00

E. Supplies - List items by type (office supplies, postage, training materials, copying paper, and expendable equipment items costing less than \$5,000, such as books, hand held tape recorders) and show the basis for computation. (Note: Organization's own capitalization policy may be used for items costing less than \$5,000). Generally, supplies include any materials that are expendable or consumed during the course of the project.

Supply Items	Computation	Cost
NA		
supply item 2		
supply item 3		
supply item 4		
supply item 5		
supply item 6		
supply item 7		
supply item 8		
supply item 9		
		TOTAL \$0.00

F. Construction - As a rule, construction costs are not allowable. In some cases, minor repairs or renovations may be allowable. Check with the program office before budgeting funds in this category.

Purpose	Description of Work	Cost
NA		
		TOTAL \$0.00

G. Consultants/Contracts - Indicate whether applicant's formal, written Procurement Policy or the Federal Acquisition Regulations are followed.

Consultant Fees: For each consultant enter the name, if known, service to be provided, hourly or daily fee (8-hour day), and estimated time on the project. Consultant fees in excess of \$450 per day require additional justification and prior approval from OJP.

Name of Consultant	Service Provided	Computation	Cost
Evaluation- TBD	Project Evaluation	10,000 x 3 yrs	\$30,000.00
Supply item 1, one line per entry			
Supply item 1, one line per entry			
Supply item 1, one line per entry			
<i>Subtotal</i>			\$30,000.00

Consultant Expenses: List all expenses to be paid from the grant to the individual consultants in addition to their fees (i.e., travel, meals, lodging, etc.)

Item	Location	Computation	Cost
	maximum of three lines		
Consultant expense entry 1, one line per	maximum of three lines		
<i>Subtotal</i>			\$0.00

Contracts: Provide a description of the product or service to be procured by contract and an estimate of the cost. Applicants are encouraged to promote free and open competition in awarding contracts. A separate justification must be provided for sole source contracts in excess of \$100,000.

Item	Cost	
maximum of four lines, additional information should be attached on a separate sheet(s)		
maximum of four lines		
<i>Subtotal</i>		\$0.00
TOTAL		\$30,000.00

H. Other Costs - List items (e.g., rent, reproduction, telephone, janitorial or security services, and investigative or confidential funds) by major type and the basis of the computation. For example, provide the square footage and the cost per square foot for rent, or provide a monthly rental cost and how many months to rent.

Description	Computation	Cost
NA		
TOTAL		\$0.00

I. Indirect Costs - Indirect costs are allowed only if the applicant has a Federally approved indirect cost rate. A copy of the rate approval, (a fully executed, negotiated agreement), must be attached. If the applicant does not have an approved rate, one can be requested by contacting the applicant's cognizant Federal agency, which will review all documentation and approve a rate for the applicant organization, or if the applicant's accounting system permits, costs may be allocated in the direct costs categories.

Description	Computation	Cost
NA		
NA		
TOTAL		\$0.00

Budget Summary- When you have completed the budget worksheet, transfer the totals for each category to the spaces below. Compute the total direct costs and the total project costs. Indicate the amount of Federal requested and the amount of non-Federal funds that will support the project.

Budget Category	Amount
A. Personnel	<u>\$456,943.00</u>
B. Fringe Benefits	<u>\$173,672.00</u>
C. Travel	<u>\$0.00</u>
D. Equipment	<u>\$0.00</u>
E. Supplies	<u>\$0.00</u>
F. Construction	<u>\$0.00</u>
G. Consultants/Contracts	<u>\$30,000.00</u>
H. Other	<u>\$0.00</u>
Total Direct Costs	<u>\$660,615.00</u>
I. Indirect Costs	<u>\$0.00</u>
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	<u>\$660,615.00</u>

Federal Request \$660,615.00

Non-Federal Amount \$197,750.00

2910 Social Worker for Juvenile Collaborative Re-entry Team:

Position Description: The Re-entry Social Worker (RSW) must be passionate about juvenile justice in the area of delinquency juvenile law. The RSW must be highly motivated and show a commitment to working specifically with high risk youth who are leaving residential placements in and out of state. The RSW will be working with the Juvenile Collaborative Re-entry Team to prepare youth and families with re-entry planning and services to ensure successful transition home. The social worker will be responsible for working with the Public Defender Placement attorney and other JCRT members. The social worker is also expected to develop strong collaboratives with community - based youth serving agencies. The social worker will be responsible for the following:

- conducting custodial interviews,
- maintaining on going communication with clients in placement,
- maintaining on going communication with parents and guardians of placement clients,
- attending court appearances on behalf of clients,
- assessing clients in collaboration with JCRT members,
- preparing 6 month re-entry case plans in collaboration with JCRT members,
- ensuring that linkages to services and resources are available to client and family members in re-entry case planning,
- monitoring services and resources during the re-entry phase including advocating for multi-systems such as DHS, and mental health agencies,
- providing educational advocacy such as appropriate school placement and IEP meetings with San Francisco Unified School District

Minimum Qualifications:

1. A baccalaureate degree from an accredited college or university with 24 semesters/36 quarter unit in Social Welfare, Psychology, Ethnic Studies or other behavioral sciences; **OR**
2. A baccalaureate degree from an accredited college or university and one year of social work experience; **OR**
3. Completion of 60 semester/90 quarter units from an accredited college or university including at least 24 semester/36 quarter units in the behavioral sciences, **AND** 2 years of social work experience.

Desirable Knowledge, Skills and Abilities:

Ability to interview persons effectively; obtain facts and evaluate relevant and significant information; and present oral and written reports concisely and clearly.

Substantial experience in the delinquency and dependency juvenile systems is necessary and knowledge of community based agencies servicing youth in the Bay Area.

Multilingual speaking and a MSW degree are preferred.

Knowledge of out of home placements, foster care placements, and residential group homes is preferred.

SAN FRANCISCO JUVENILE COLLABORATIVE REENTRY TEAM LOGIC MODEL

PROBLEM

Disproportionate representation of high-needs minority youth in juvenile justice population and high rates of out-of-home placement failures and recidivism.

SUBPROBLEM(S)

Need for improved collaborative decision making, case planning and monitoring of high-needs youth in out-of-home placement and in aftercare.

ACTIVITIES

1. Assign youth to services team at time of commitment.
2. Conduct YASI Assessment using motivational interviewing before enhanced placement hearing, re-assess at six months and three months before release.
3. Provide Court monitoring beginning six months pre-release.
4. Conduct Team Decision Making meetings with Enhanced Placement Court Judge, Probation, Public Defender, Reentry Case Manager, youth and family six months and three months before release.
5. Create comprehensive service plan for reentry.
6. Provide coordinated case management with intensive services through reentry and stabilization.

OUTPUT MEASURES

100 youth will be enrolled in the program. All will receive assessment, service planning, and coordinated aftercare.

OUTCOME MEASURES

Short term

Participants will:

- Engage in collaborative case planning, along with their families and JCRT staff
- Have a comprehensive plan for reentry that addresses housing, education, vocational training/employment, therapy and/or drug treatment.

Participating agencies will:

- Have implemented formal Team Decision Making procedures, including enhanced placement court
- Have completed motivational interviewing training for all JCRT staff

Long Term

Participants will:

- Enroll in school
- Secure employment or benefits
- Enroll in treatment services and reduce substance use
- Comply with terms of release
- Securing and maintain stable housing
- Maintain family stability

Leading to:

- Lower placement failures
- Lower re-arrest rates

Goal(s)

1. To reduce recidivism and placement failure for high needs youth;
2. To improve inter-agency collaboration and Team Decision Making and promote continuity of care from commitment through termination of probation.

Objective(s)

1. Lower violation and recidivism rates
2. Increased educational enrollment and employment rates
3. Improved social functioning
4. Improved behavioral health treatment rates
5. Improved family and housing stability

San Francisco Juvenile Collaborative Reentry Team Timeline

Project Goal	Related Objectives	Activity	Expected Completion Date	Party Responsible
<p>To improve collaborative inter-agency case planning and coordination for juvenile justice-involved youth in out-of-home placements beginning at adjudication through termination of probation.</p>	<p>Approximately 100 youth per year will be enrolled in the program based on assessment and referral by Probation Officer and/or Social Worker referral.</p>	<p>Design referral procedures to include all juveniles in out-of-home placement on the Juvenile Collaborative Reentry Team.</p>	<p>End of month 2.</p>	<p>Juvenile Probation, Public Defender</p>
	<p>Youth in the program will undergo a full assessment using the Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument (YASI) following adjudication to inform appropriate placement and service planning. Youth will receive an updated assessment as part of case planning six months prior to release (i.e. at time of six-month review hearing).</p>	<p>Implement screening procedures to involve the full JCRT. Begin screening youth according to these procedures.</p>	<p>End of month 2.</p>	<p>Juvenile Probation, Public Defender</p>
<p>To address disproportionate rates of institutional detention and recidivism for low-income youth of color originating from San Francisco's low-income communities.</p>	<p>Families will receive intensive support beginning three months prior to release.</p>	<p>Plan team decision making meetings as youth are enrolled in program. Hold meetings three months prior to release</p>	<p>End of month 3. Ongoing.</p>	<p>Juvenile Probation, Public Defender, Reentry Case Manager</p>
	<p>Participants will have successful linkages with aftercare services six months post-release.</p>	<p>Provide ongoing coordinated case management.</p>	<p>End of month 6. Ongoing.</p>	<p>Reentry Case Manager</p>
<p>To implement a collaborative enhanced placement court as part of the Office of Collaborative Justice Programs (Juvenile & Family Programs) of the Superior Court of California.</p>	<p>Youth served will have a comprehensive and coordinated reentry case plan that addresses housing, vocational training, completion of education, therapy or drug treatment, and any additional services they require to succeed outside of placement.</p>	<p>Implement enhanced placement hearing to review all assessment-based service plans.</p>	<p>End of month 3. Ongoing.</p>	<p>Judge, Public Defender, Juvenile Probation</p>
<p>To conduct an evaluation of services and outcomes by independent evaluator.</p>	<p>Measure relevant data inputs for effect on recidivism and other behaviors.</p>	<p>Provide judicial monitoring of reentry services.</p>	<p>End of month 6. Ongoing.</p>	<p>Juvenile Probation</p>
		<p>Identify evaluator, engage in evaluation process.</p>	<p>Intermediate reporting from end of month 2. Final evaluation in third year.</p>	