

ANNUAL STATISTICAL REPORT

Fiscal Year 2022-23



COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
PROBATION DEPARTMENT

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT

Annual Statistical Report Fiscal Year 2022-23

Contents

List of Figures	ii
List of Tables	iii
Executive Summary.....	1
FY2022-23 Key Points of Information	2
Juvenile Services:	2
Juvenile Custody:	2
Adult Services:.....	2
Juvenile Services	3
Referrals to Juvenile Probation.....	3
Youth under Supervision.....	8
Supervised Juvenile Outcomes	10
Race and Ethnicity in the local Juvenile Justice System.....	11
Coastal Valley Academy	13
Coastal Valley Academy Outcomes.....	15
Juvenile Hall	17
Secure Youth Treatment.....	22
Adult Services.....	23
Court Services	23
Pretrial Services Program.....	24
Community Supervision Services	28
General Supervision	28
Specialized Caseloads.....	28
Post-Release Caseloads.....	28
Adults on Community Supervision.....	29
Community Supervision Outcomes.....	33
Appendix A: Glossary of terms as used in this report.....	36

List of Figures

Figure 1. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by Fiscal Year, FY2018-19 - FY2022-23	4
Figure 2. Middle and High School Enrollees FY2018-19 - FY2022-23	4
Figure 3. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by Crime Type, FY2022-23.....	5
Figure 4. Referrals from Law Enforcement by Race/Ethnicity, FY2022-23.....	6
Figure 5. Youth Referred to Probation by Area of Residency, FY2018-19 - FY2022-23.....	6
Figure 6. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by result, FY2022-23.....	7
Figure 7. Disposition of Filed Petitions, FY2022-23	8
Figure 8. Juvenile Population on the Last Day of Each Quarter, FY2020-21 - FY2022-23	8
Figure 9. Youth under Court-ordered Supervision by Region of Residency, June 2023	9
Figure 10. Youth on Court-ordered Supervision by Crime Type, June 2023.....	10
Figure 11. Juvenile Recidivism Rate, FY2018-19 -FY2022-23.....	10
Figure 12. Juvenile Recidivism by Case Severity, FY2022-23	11
Figure 13. CVA Enrollments and Exits, FY2016-17 - FY2022-23.....	13
Figure 14. Age of Youth enrolled in Coastal Valley Academy (duplicated), FY2016-17 to FY2022-23	14
Figure 15. Enrollment in CVA and Group Homes/STRTP, FY2015-16 – FY2022-23	15
Figure 16. Recidivism outcomes for CVA Participants, March 2017 to June 2023	16
Figure 17. Number of Bookings into Juvenile Hall, FY2018-19 - FY2022-23	17
Figure 18. Average Daily Population at Juvenile Hall, FY2018-19 - FY2022-23	18
Figure 19. Juvenile Hall Bookings by Type, FY2022-23	19
Figure 20. Booked Youth by Area of Residency, FY2022-23	20
Figure 21. Booked Youth by Race/Ethnicity, FY2022-23.....	20
Figure 22. Booked Youth by Age Group, FY2022-23.....	21
Figure 23. Mean and Median Number of Days Detained, FY2019-20- FY2022-23.....	21
Figure 24. Individuals referred by Quarter, FY2021-22- FY2022-23	25
Figure 25. Number of New Monitoring Clients by Quarter, FY2021-22- FY2022-23	25
Figure 26. Individuals on Pretrial Monitoring, Last Day of Each Quarter, FY2021-22- FY2022-23	26
Figure 27. Number of Program Participants, Last Day of Each Quarter, FY2020-21 to FY2022-23.....	27
Figure 28. Clients by Program/Caseload, June 2023	29
Figure 29. Probation Population, Last Day of Each Quarter, FY2020-21- FY2022-23.....	30
Figure 30. Number of New Probation Grants by Quarter, FY2020-21- FY2022-23	30
Figure 31. Probationers by housing status, June 2023	31
Figure 32. Probationers by Risk Level, June 2023.....	32
Figure 33. Probationers by Crime Type, June 2023	32
Figure 34. Number of Individuals Who Closed Probation, FY2018-19 - FY2022-23	33
Figure 35. Recidivism Rate among Probationers, FY2018-19 - FY2022-2023.....	34
Figure 36. Closing Status among Probationers, FY2022-23.....	35

List of Tables

Table 1. Juvenile Referrals by Referring Agencies, FY2022-23	5
Table 2. Recidivism by Risk Level, FY2022-23	11
Table 3. System Decision Points by Race/Ethnicity, FY2020-21 to FY2022-23	12
Table 4. Relative Rates for System Decision Points for by Race/Ethnicity, FY2020-21 to FY2022-23	12
Table 5. Bookings by Arresting Agency, FY2020-21	18
Table 6. Bookings by Length of Detention, Released Youth, FY2020-21 to FY2022-23.....	22
Table 7. Investigation reports by type and fiscal year, FY2021-22 to FY2022-23	23
Table 8. Recidivism among Probationers by Risk Level, FY2022-23	34

Annual Statistical Report Fiscal Year 2022-23

Executive Summary

The Probation Department is responsible for providing community corrections services, which are mandated by law. This Annual Statistical Report provides basic information and statistics about the Department services including Juvenile Services, Juvenile Custody, and Adult Services.

- Juvenile Services is responsible for the supervision of youth placed on probation and home detention by the Court; school-based prevention and intervention services; and making dispositional recommendations to the Juvenile Court.
- Juvenile Custody is responsible for the staffing and operation of the 30-bed County Juvenile Hall, the 30-bed Coastal Valley Academy, and the 5-bed Secure Youth Treatment Facility.
 - The Juvenile Hall is a 24-hour detention center, housing youth awaiting court proceedings, awaiting out of home placement into foster care, or serving a time limited period of commitment.
 - Coastal Valley Academy provides educational and residential treatment services for wards of the court who cannot be safely maintained in the community.
 - The Secure Youth Treatment program provides long-term treatment and housing for the population of youth with serious and violent offenses previously committed to the state Division of Juvenile Justice prior to the enactment of SB 823 in 2021.
- Adult Services is responsible for the supervision of offenders placed on probation by the Court or released from prison under Post-Release Community Supervision and for making sentencing recommendations to the Court. The Department has several specialized supervision caseloads, including specialty court caseloads.
- The Adult Services Division also provides Court Services, collaborates with the Superior Court on the Pretrial Services Program, and provides monitoring and support for the Mental Health Diversion Program.

As part of delivering quality community corrections services, the Probation Department utilizes evidence-based practices when supervising offenders. The Probation Department supervises offenders based upon “risk, need, responsivity” principles:

- **Risk principle:** prioritize supervision and treatment resources for higher risk offenders
- **Need principle:** target interventions to criminogenic needs
- **Responsivity principle:** consider offender’s characteristics when developing treatment plans and approaches and adjust treatment intensity to risk and need levels.

The Probation Department’s implementation of evidence-based practices requires a commitment to the collection and utilization of accurate data. The collection of statistical data is foundational to evidence-based practices and supports the Department’s decision-making regarding policies, programs, and resource allocation. There is ongoing effort to provide consistent and clearly explained data.

FY2022-23 Key Points of Information

Juvenile Services:

- In FY2022-23, 11.5% of youth on court-ordered supervision and diversion recidivated (committed a new law violation) between the start and end of the supervision term. This was below the Department's target of 30%.
- In FY2022-23, 53.7% of juvenile referrals were closed or diverted from the juvenile court system by Probation. This exceeded the Department's target of 40%.
- Over the past five years, the number of referrals submitted to Juvenile Probation has declined by 32.9%, though in the past two years referrals have increased by 44.9%, likely due to lifting of COVID-related restrictions.
- An analysis of racial and ethnic disparity, reviewing several decision points in the local juvenile justice system, is included in this report on page 12.

Juvenile Custody:

- Between March 2017 and June 2023, 69 youth enrolled in the Coastal Valley Academy (CVA) treatment program, including three youth referred by another Probation Department.
- The use of group homes/short term residential therapeutic programs (STRTPs) as a placement option has decreased significantly since CVA was launched.
- During the same period, 77% of CVA youth showed some reduction in risk score from pre- to post-assessment on the Youth Level of Service Case Management Inventory assessment.
- There were 115 bookings, representing 85 unique youth, in the Juvenile Hall during the fiscal year. This was slightly higher than the 103 bookings during the previous year.
- In FY2022-23, 27.8% of the bookings were for probation violations, 61.7% were for new offenses, 7.0% were for warrant returns, and 3.5% were for court remands.
- Three youth were committed to the Secure Youth Treatment Facility during the fiscal year and one youth completed his confinement time.

Adult Services:

- In the Pretrial Services Program, 474 individuals were referred by the San Luis Obispo Superior Court for assessment and possible release and 128 individuals were released on pretrial monitoring.
- The Department dedicates four officers to treatment court programs. As of June 2023, there were 117 participants in these programs, including Mental Health Diversion Court, the only pre-plea treatment court program.
- In FY2022-23, 29.7% of adults on formal supervision and 32.2% of post-release offenders recidivated (committed a new law violation) between the start and end of the supervision term. This was below the Department's target of 45%.
- Formal probationers decreased by 19.6%, from 1325 in the first quarter of FY2020-21 to 1065 in the last quarter of FY2022-23. Post-release probationers decreased by just 4.5% during the same period.

This data may be used by researchers, grant writers, students, and citizens with an interest in knowing more about the Department and the justice-involved population we supervise. Additional information about departmental programs and services can be found at:

<http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/departments/probation.aspx>

Juvenile Services

Who Probation Supervised in FY2022-23

- 177 youth were supervised throughout the year
- 112 youth were supervised on June 30, 2022
- Average current age was 17.0 years
- 14.7% were female
- 85.3% were male
- 40.0% were White
- 47.4% were Hispanic
- 2.1% were African American
- 2.1% were Asian or Pacific Islander
- 8.4% were other or unknown

Referrals to Juvenile Probation

The following statistics reflect the processes that bring youth to Juvenile Probation when they are alleged to have committed a criminal offense or a violation of probation. The process begins with a referral to Juvenile Probation from a law enforcement agency or another county's juvenile justice system, citing the behavior. Additionally, Juvenile Probation files notices with the Juvenile Court, under Welfare and Institutions Code 777, when an existing youth violates a term or condition of court ordered supervision.

Over the past five years (FY2018-19 - FY2022-23), the number of referrals submitted to Juvenile Probation has declined by 32.9% (Figure 1). In the past two years (since FY2020-21) referrals have increased by 44.9%, likely due to the lifting of COVID-related restrictions. Probation violations were up slightly in FY2022-23 from the previous year. The referrals received in FY2022-23 were for 372 new law violations and 44 probation violations and involved 310 individual youth.

The San Luis Obispo County youth population has decreased slightly (4.4%) since FY2019-2020, as measured by middle and high school enrollment (Figure 2).

Figure 1. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by Fiscal Year, FY2018-19 - FY2022-23





Figure 2. Middle and High School Enrollees FY2018-19 - FY2022-23




Referrals to Juvenile Probation are submitted by local law enforcement agencies, transferred in from another county, or processed as a probation violation by Juvenile Probation (Table 1). ‘Other Agencies’ includes law enforcement entities such as: Alcoholic Beverage Control Department, CA Department of Parks and Recreation, and San Luis Obispo County District Attorney.

Table 1. Juvenile Referrals by Referring Agencies, FY2022-23

Agency	# of Referrals	Agency	# of Referrals
Arroyo Grande Police Dept.	32	Cal Poly & Cuesta College Police Depts.	0
Atascadero Police Dept.	46	San Luis Sheriff's Office	81
Grover Beach Police Dept.	16	CA Highway Patrol	18
Morro Bay Police Dept.	11	Probation Dept.	42
Pismo Beach Police Dept.	36	Other Agencies	4
Paso Robles Police Dept.	83	Other Counties	6
San Luis Police Dept.	41	Total	416


Among the 416 annual referrals, there were 44 referrals for probation violations and 372 referrals for alleged new law violations. The referrals for new law violations are broadly categorized into: Against Persons, Against Property, Drugs/Alcohol, Weapons, Probation Violation or Status offenses, and Public Order offenses (figure 3).

Figure 3. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by Crime Type, FY2022-23




Figures 4 and 5 describe the 293 individual youth for whom a referral for an alleged new law violation was received by Juvenile Probation during the year. The majority of the referred youth were male, 74.7%; female, 25.3%. The racial and ethnic breakdown of those youth referred to Probation by law enforcement is shown in Figure 4. Further analysis of race and ethnicity in the local juvenile justice system can be found on page 12 of this report.

Figure 4. Referrals from Law Enforcement by Race/Ethnicity, FY2022-23



More youth have been referred from the North County region than from other regions over the past five years (Figure 5). This year, North County youth represented 45.8% of referrals from law enforcement compared to 18.8% from the SLO/Coast region, 19.8% from South County and 15.6% Other, which includes transients and out-of-county youth.

Figure 5. Youth Referred to Probation by Area of Residency, FY2018-19 - FY2022-23




Juvenile referrals for new charges (excluding cases transferring from another county) can be counseled and closed or diverted by Juvenile Probation to Traffic Court or to informal diversion pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) section 654. Referrals on behalf of youth who present a need for juvenile court involvement are sent to the District Attorney’s Office for consideration of filing a petition with the

Juvenile Court. At the end of the fiscal year, 50 (13.8%) of referrals made during the year were pending either Probation action or DA action. Of the remaining 313 referrals, more than half, 53.7%, had been counseled and closed or diverted by Probation (figure 6).

When cases are counseled and closed by Probation, the Department will ask that the youth write an essay or letter of apology, complete community service hours or participate in needed services such as restorative practices or drug and alcohol counseling. When youth are diverted pursuant to WIC 654, they are put on a diversion contract, typically including payment of victim restitution, and other required actions. If the youth does not complete the contract, their case can be sent to the District Attorney for consideration of filing a petition with the Juvenile Court.


Figure 6. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by result, FY2022-23



In FY2022-23, from the 145 juvenile referrals processed by the District Attorney’s Office, 128 petitions were filed in Juvenile Court. These filings involved 90 youth as some youth had multiple petitions filed during the year.

During the court process, juvenile petitions can be sustained, wherein the charge(s) are found or admitted true; or can be dismissed for a variety of reasons. They can also be transferred to another county based on the youth’s residency. Of the 128 juvenile petitions filed in the Juvenile Court in this year, 73.4% were sustained (Figure 7).


Figure 7. Disposition of Filed Petitions, FY2022-23



Youth under Supervision


Over the last three fiscal years, the total number of youth under supervision increased by 25.8%, from 89 in the first quarter of FY2020-21 to 112 youth in the last quarter of FY2022-23 (Figure 8). Within the same period, youth under court-ordered supervision (pursuant to WIC sections 654.2, 725(a), 725(b) and 790 increased by 8.0%, from 88 to 95 youth. The number of youth supervised on Juvenile Probation’s diversion (pursuant to WIC section 654) increased from one youth to 17 youth.

Figure 8. Juvenile Population on the Last Day of Each Quarter, FY2020-21 - FY2022-23



As of June 30, 2023, almost half the youth on court-ordered supervision (46.3%) lived in the northern region of the county, while 20.9% and 16.4% lived in the southern and San Luis Obispo/coastal regions of the county respectively (Figure 9).

Figure 9. Youth under Court-ordered Supervision by Region of Residency, June 2023




Note: "Other" is out-of-county youth.

Effective supervision practices include the use of a validated risk-need assessment tool, the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI), to determine a youth's likelihood to commit any new criminal offense and to identify issues that could be addressed through treatment and supervision. Youth are grouped according to their risk level, typically based on their YLS/CMI score (High, Medium, Low) but sometimes based on a supervisor-approved override of their score to ensure the youth is being supervised appropriately.

As of June 2023, there were 95 youth on court-ordered supervision. Of these, 91% of youth were supervised according to their assessed risk level and 9% based on supervisor-approved override. Including these overrides, youth were categorized as 36.8% high risk, 37.9% medium risk, and 25.3% low risk to reoffend.

These 95 youth can also be grouped by the type of offense that led to being under supervision (Figure 10). The majority of the supervised youth have committed crimes against persons or against property.


Figure 10. Youth on Court-ordered Supervision by Crime Type, June 2023



Supervised Juvenile Outcomes

Outcomes are measured at the close of court-ordered supervision. In FY2022-23, a total of 61 court-ordered juvenile probation cases closed. Of those 61 total youth, 88.5% ended supervision without having a new petition found true or obtaining an adult conviction before their supervision ended, i.e., without recidivating. Seven youth, 11.5%, did have new charges adjudicated in either juvenile or adult court (Figure 11).

Figure 11. Juvenile Recidivism Rate, FY2018-19 -FY2022-23




Risk-based supervision is based upon the use of the YLS/CMI risk and needs assessment tool. Table 2 shows the recidivism rate among youth on court-ordered supervision and Figure 12 reflects recidivism according to the severity of the youth’s case, felony or misdemeanor.

Table 2. Recidivism by Risk Level, FY2022-23

Risk Level	# Closed	# Recidivated	% Recidivated
High	9	5	55.6%
Medium	17	1	5.9%
Low	35	1	2.9%
Total	61	7	11.5%

Figure 12. Juvenile Recidivism by Case Severity, FY2022-23



Race and Ethnicity in the local Juvenile Justice System

Tables 3 and 4 compare race/ethnicity for the various decision points in the local juvenile justice system. In other sections of the report, data are presented for the 2022-2023 fiscal year. For this section, analysis was conducted for a three-year time period from July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2023. This time period was used in order to arrive at larger numbers for the analysis but some of the numbers are still very small and should be interpreted with caution. During this time, 696 unique youth were referred to the department for new crimes. Of those, 177 were booked into Juvenile Hall and 272 youth had a referral sent to the District Attorney’s office. Of those who were referred to the District Attorney’s Office, 236 had a petition filed in court, and 163 of those youth were placed on some form of court-ordered supervision. The number and percent of youth at each decision point are shown in Table 3 and the relative rate index is shown in Table 4. Asian, Pacific Islander and Native youth were necessarily combined with “other” due to very small numbers.

Table 3. System Decision Points by Race/Ethnicity, FY2020-21 to FY2022-23

Race/Ethnicity	Population Age 12-17 (2020)	Decision Points									
		Referred to Probation		Booked in Juv. Hall		Sent to the DA		Filed by the DA		Court Ordered Supervision	
White	9706	285	41%	56	32%	115	42%	99	42%	81	50%
Hispanic	6041	329	47%	107	60%	128	47%	112	47%	69	42%
African American	452	29	4%	6	3%	10	4%	8	3%	4	2%
Other	1182	53	8%	8	5%	19	7%	17	7%	9	6%
Total	17,381	696	100%	177	100%	272	100%	236	100%	163	100%

The relative rate index is one of many ways to compare the experiences of different groups of youth within the juvenile justice system. When groups are treated equally to white youth, they will have a relative rate of one (1). National data showed that the 2019 national relative arrest rate for African American youth was 2.4, meaning that they were almost two and a half times more likely than white youth to be arrested. The relative arrest rate for Asian youth during the same time period was 0.3, meaning that Asian youth were less than half as likely as a white youth to be arrested. Table 4 shows relative rates for several decision points in the local juvenile justice system for the period of July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2023.

Table 4. Relative Rates for System Decision Points for by Race/Ethnicity, FY2020-21 to FY2022-23

Race/Ethnicity	Referred to Probation	Booked in Juv. Hall	Sent to the DA	Filed by the DA	Court Ordered Supervision
White	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Hispanic	1.85	1.66	0.96	1.02	0.75
African American	2.19	1.05	0.85	0.93	0.61
Other	1.53	0.77	0.89	1.04	0.65

Notes:


1. Racial and ethnic data categories collected by the Probation Department differ from those collected by the US Census Bureau (Table 3). Thus, assumptions have been made about how to match these categories to each other.
2. Very small numbers of youth at some of the decision points means that there is a broader range of possible variability for given percentages or relative rates.

Coastal Valley Academy

The Coastal Valley Academy (CVA) is a program that provides residential treatment for wards of the Juvenile Court who cannot be safely maintained in the community. The program is designed to serve youth, aged 14 to 18 years. These youth likely would have been sent to group home placement prior to CVA’s inception. The program utilizes evidence-based interventions to improve the youth’s decision-making skills and to enhance involvement in pro-social activities. The program has two phases: an intensive in-custody phase and a supportive in-community phase. The program’s goal is to safely return youth to the community after reducing their risk of future delinquent behavior.

Between March 2017 and June 2023, a total of 69 youth enrolled in the program and five youth have participated twice, for a total of 74 duplicated enrollments and 63 exits (Figure 13). At program start, 92.3% of youth were assessed as high risk to reoffend, 6.2% were medium risk and 1.5% were low risk. Of the 69 unique youth who enrolled in the program, 58 have exited. Of those youth who have exited the program, 51.7% completed successfully and 48.3% exited unsuccessfully.

Figure 13. CVA Enrollments and Exits, FY2016-17 - FY2022-23




Note: FY2016-17 includes only four months, March – June.

Of youth enrolled in the program between FY2016-17 and FY2022-23, the majority were male, 76.8%, female, 23.2%. They were 50.7% white, 42.0% Hispanic, 4.3% African American, and 2.9% Asian.

Figure 14 shows the age at program start for youth enrolled in the program. Youth who enrolled more than once were counted more than once because they may have enrolled at different ages. The average age at program start was 16.1 years of age.

Figure 14. Age of Youth enrolled in Coastal Valley Academy (duplicated), FY2016-17 to FY2022-23



The CVA program is designed to reduce the risk of future delinquent behavior. Accordingly, the goal is to provide intensive intervention while youth are in the custody phase, as measured by the number of hours spent in programming focused on criminogenic needs. The standard for hours spent in this type of programming is:


- 90 minutes of cognitive behavioral intervention curriculum (two 45 sessions) per week
- 100 minutes of skills group per week
- 50 minutes of individual counseling per week
- 50 minutes of family counseling per month

The actual number of hours differs, based on the needs of each youth but in total youth are expected to complete approximately 100 hours during the in-custody phase and 50 hours while under community supervision in the aftercare phase.

Youth in CVA also participate in activities and programming which do not count toward their intervention hours, but which build prosocial skills, physical fitness, public speaking, meeting facilitation, and independent living skills.

Figure 15 demonstrates how the use of group homes/short term residential therapeutic programs (STRTPs) as a placement option has decreased since CVA was launched in March 2017. Between July 2014 and June 2017 (three years), 51 youth were enrolled in group homes. In the five years since CVA opened, only five youth have been enrolled in a group home/STRTP. Meanwhile, the number of youths enrolled in CVA has increased.

Figure 15. Enrollment in CVA and Group Homes/STRTP, FY2015-16 – FY2022-23



Coastal Valley Academy Outcomes

In addition to participating in treatment and programs mentioned above, CVA participants attend an on-site school administered by the County Office of Education. Among the 58 youth who have exited the program since it began in March 2017, 50 youth could reasonably be expected to have graduated high school during the program. Of these, 42 (84.0%) received their high school diploma.

As mentioned above, the CVA program is designed to reduce the risk of future delinquent behavior. Risk of delinquent behavior is measured at the start and end of program participation utilizing a validated risk-need assessment tool, the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI). YLS/CMI scores were available for 35 of 58 youth who exited the program.

- 77.1% of youth showed some reduction in risk score from pre- to post-assessment on the YLS.
- The average risk reduction was 8.7 points on a 35-point scale, an improvement of 24.8%.
- Average risk reduction for youth who successfully completed the program was 12.8 points (36.8%).


Youth in the program are given the Texas Christian University Criminal Thinking Scales (TCU) survey at program entry and exit. The survey has six subscales: entitlement, justification, power orientation, cold heartedness, criminal rationalization, and personal irresponsibility. The overall average is recorded as well as the number of scales on which the youth scored in the ‘high’ range. It is important to note that this tool is used only to measure how well the program has achieved its intended outcomes, not as a case management tool. Results below are for 30 youth who have been given the survey since it was implemented in 2019.

- Nineteen (19) of 30 youth (63.3%) showed improvements in their criminal thinking.
- Fourteen (14) of 30 youth (46.6%) reduced the number of sub-scales on which they scored in the ‘high’ range by at least one.

Note: Results of this tool should be interpreted with caution. Texas Christian University has revised the tool so as not to inadvertently contribute to racial disparities. The Probation Department has implemented the new version, but these results are from the old version of the tool.

Recidivism for the CVA program is measured from the date the youth exit the in-custody portion of the program to the end of their probation term to better capture the impact of the program. Of the 51 unique youth who exited the program and ended their probation term, 35 youth or 68.6% did not have a new juvenile court adjudication or adult conviction. Sixteen youth or 30.6% had a new juvenile court adjudication or adult conviction. Of those 16 youth, nine had felony offenses and seven had misdemeanor offenses (figure 16).

Figure 16. Recidivism outcomes for CVA Participants, March 2017 to June 2023



Juvenile Hall

The Juvenile Hall is a 24-hour detention center. This facility houses youth while they are awaiting court proceedings, awaiting out of home placement into foster homes, Short Term Residential Therapeutic Programs (STRTPs), or awaiting commitments to the Coastal Valley Academy or Secure Youth Treatment Facility.

In FY2022-23, there were 115 bookings into Juvenile Hall (Figure 17), involving 85 individual youth. The average number of bookings per youth was 1.4. Between FY2018-19 and FY2022-23 the total number of bookings decreased 55.9%. In the last year, the total number increased 11.7%, from 103 to 115 bookings. The average daily population in FY2022-23 was 9.1 youth detainees (Figure 18).

Figure 17. Number of Bookings into Juvenile Hall, FY2018-19 - FY2022-23





Figure 18. Average Daily Population at Juvenile Hall, FY2018-19 - FY2022-23




The Juvenile Hall admits youth directly from arresting agencies as well as youth arrested by probation officers for violations of their conditions of probation (Table 5). The Juvenile Hall also receives in-custody transfers from courts in other counties. ‘Other Agency’ may include: CA Highway Patrol, CA State Parks and Recreation, and CA State Parole. More than half, 61.7%, of the annual bookings were for allegations of a new criminal offense (Figure 19).

Table 5. Bookings by Arresting Agency, FY2020-21

Agency	# of Bookings	Agency	# of Bookings
Arroyo Grande Police Dept.	2	San Luis Police Dept.	9
Atascadero Police Dept.	2	Cal Poly/Cuesta Police Dept.	1
Grover Beach Police Dept.	10	San Luis Sheriff’s Office	14
Morro Bay Police Dept.	4	Probation Dept.	36
Pismo Beach Police Dept.	3	Other Agencies	8
Paso Robles Police Dept.	7	Other Counties	1
Total Bookings: 115			


Figure 19. Juvenile Hall Bookings by Type, FY2022-23



Figures 20, 21 and 22 describe the general demographics of the 85 individual youth booked into Juvenile Hall during FY2022-23, including area of residency, race/ethnicity, and age. The majority of the booked youth were male, 85.9%; 14.1% were female.

Each time a youth is booked into the Juvenile Hall, they are given a questionnaire related to their sexual orientation, gender identity and expression (SOGIE). These questionnaires showed that during the last fiscal year, 87.0% of bookings identified as “boy or man”, 10.4% identified as “girl or woman,” and 1.7% indicated that they identify as “other.” One of 115 bookings did not report their gender identity at intake. In terms of sexual orientation, 94.8% of booked youth identified themselves as heterosexual, 1.7% as bisexual, 2.0% lesbian, 0.9% as questioning and 0.9% were left blank.

Figure 20. Booked Youth by Area of Residency, FY2022-23



Note: 'Other' includes non-minor transients and out-of-county youth.

Figure 21. Booked Youth by Race/Ethnicity, FY2022-23





Figure 22. Booked Youth by Age Group, FY2022-23



During FY2022-23, there were 117 releases from detention, involving 87 individual youth. Among the 117 total releases, the mean (average) length of detention was 33.7 days, up from 24.3 days in the previous year. The median ('middle' value) was 16 days (Figure 23). The longest period of detention was 587 days. Table 6 provides further details about the length of detention.

Figure 23. Mean and Median Number of Days Detained, FY2019-20- FY2022-23




Table 6. Bookings by Length of Detention, Released Youth, FY2020-21 to FY2022-23

Length of Detention	FY2020-21		FY2021-22		FY2022-23	
	# Youth	Percent	# Youth	Percent	# Youth	Percent
0 – 2 days	35	33.0%	35	33.0%	38	32.5%
3 – 6 days	9	8.5%	9	8.5%	15	12.8%
7 – 14 days	8	7.5%	8	7.5%	5	4.3%
15 – 22 days	11	10.4%	11	10.4%	13	11.1%
23+ days	43	40.6%	43	40.6%	46	39.3%
Total	106	100%	106	100%	117	100.0%

Secure Youth Treatment

As noted on page one of this report, Juvenile Custody is responsible for the staffing and operation Juvenile Hall, Coastal Valley Academy and the Secure Youth Treatment Facility/program. The Secure Youth Treatment program provides long-term treatment and housing for the population of youth with serious and violent offenses previously committed to the state Division of Juvenile Justice prior to the enactment of SB 823 in 2021.

During this fiscal year, there were three youth committed to the Secure Youth Treatment program. Of those, one youth completed his term of confinement, and moved to community supervision. The other two youth remained in custody at the end of the fiscal year.

Adult Services

The Probation Department's Adult Services Division is organized to provide a continuum of services for adults at all stages of the criminal justice system, from pretrial and court services to formal and post-release community supervision, re-entry services, and specialized enforcement services. In the sections below, information and data are presented about Court Services, the Pretrial Services Program and Community Supervision Services offered by the Probation Department.

Court Services

Court Services are state mandated. Officers prepare written reports for the San Luis Obispo Superior Court by conducting investigations into an individual's background, education and employment history, prior probation/arrest history, impact on victims, and other relevant information. Officers assess risk of re-offense and needs related to criminal behavior using validated assessment tools (including the Level of Service/Case Management Inventor, the Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment, and the Static 99 to inform their recommendations.

Reports contain recommendations for or against release on probation and sentencing options which conform to statutory and case law requirements. These reports include the terms and conditions of probation (if eligible) to promote accountability, community safety, and rehabilitation for the defendant. Through the court process, Probation works to ensure victims' rights and establishes victim restitution.

During FY2022-2023, court services staff wrote 1478 reports related to 1204 individuals. This represents a 14.4% increase from the previous fiscal year. Table 7 shows the type of reports produced during both fiscal years.

Table 7. Investigation reports by type and fiscal year, FY2021-22 to FY2022-23

Report Type	FY2021-22	FY2022-23
Diversion	13	13
Post-Sentencing Report	57	79
Pre-Plea Report	66	95
Sentencing	653	775
Sentencing-Domestic Violence	240	243
Restitution Report	239	235
Supplemental Report	24	38
Grand Total	1292	1478

Pretrial Services Program

Pretrial Services Program in FY2022-23

- 474 individuals were referred for assessment
- 128 clients were placed on monitoring during the FY
- 84% had Felony charges
- 16% had Misdemeanor charges
- Average age was 38.1 years
- 23% were female and 77% were male
- 70% were White
- 23% were Hispanic
- 3% were African American
- 4% were other or unknown

The Pretrial Services Program supports judicial officers in making release and detention decisions, utilizing The Public Safety Assessment, a validated assessment tool. The Court refers recently arrested individuals to officers in the Pretrial Services Program, who complete the assessment, gather information on the individual, and prepare a report regarding suitability to release with probation monitoring. Individuals released are monitored to ensure public safety and increase appearances at future court hearings. Monitoring activities include referrals to supportive services, electronic or phone check-ins, office meetings, community-based contacts, electronic monitoring, and breath alcohol content monitoring.

In FY2022-23, 474 individuals were referred for assessment and possible release (Figure 24). This was up significantly from the first year of the program, during which only 70 individuals were referred.

During the first year of the program¹, a total of 61 individuals were ordered for pretrial monitoring. During the second year, 128 individuals were ordered for pretrial monitoring (Figure 25). From the second quarter of FY2021-22 (program inception) to fourth quarter of FY2022-23, the total number of active pretrial clients at a given time increased from three (3) clients to 65 (Figure 26).

¹ It should be noted that this program was in a planning and pilot phase during part of this fiscal year and was not fully operational until April of 2022.

Figure 24. Individuals referred by Quarter, FY2021-22- FY2022-23




Figure 25. Number of New Monitoring Clients by Quarter, FY2021-22- FY2022-23






Figure 26. Individuals on Pretrial Monitoring, Last Day of Each Quarter, FY2021-22- FY2022-23



MENTAL HEALTH DIVERSION COURT

The Probation Department participates in the Mental Health Diversion Court. This program diverts eligible individuals with mental disorders from the criminal justice system. The Mental Health Diversion Court is a problem-solving court, providing ongoing judicial supervision in conjunction with treatment, case management and community supervision. As of June 2023, there were 32 clients active in the program (Figure 27).

Figure 27. Number of Program Participants, Last Day of Each Quarter, FY2020-21 to FY2022-23



Community Supervision Services

Probation officers provide community supervision and case management services to individuals who were convicted of a crime (Formal Probation), returning from state prison (Post Release Community Supervision), or released from the County Jail following a local prison commitment (Mandatory supervision).

General Supervision

General supervision includes enforcing court orders, office contacts, community-based contacts, drug and alcohol testing, and GPS electronic monitoring. Officers use validated assessment tools, case plans, and treatment interventions to address offender needs, especially those likely to contribute to future criminal behavior. Officers collaborate with County agencies and community-based organizations to support rehabilitation needs by connecting individuals to mental health and substance abuse services, sober living residences and/or residential treatment programs, housing support, and employment and job placement services.

Specialized Caseloads

In addition to general supervision strategies described above, some officers receive additional training and resources to serve specialized caseloads. These include the following:

- Adult treatment courts²
- Domestic violence caseloads
- Unhoused caseload
- Drug sales caseload
- Gang caseload
- Sex-offense caseload


Post-Release Caseloads

The post-release offender populations originated per Public Safety Realignment (Assembly Bill 109) in October 2011. These populations include offenders with non-violent, non-serious, or non-registered sex offenses who have been released from state prison into Post-Release Community Supervision (PRCS) and those placed on Mandatory Supervision following a prison sentence served at the local jail. Both PRCS and Mandatory Supervision offenders are supervised by the PRCS Unit within the Adult Services Division and are collectively referred to as post-release offenders in this report.

Figure 28 shows the proportion of clients in each of the various supervision areas, including clients who are under Probation monitoring through the Pretrial Services Program.

² See page 35 for more detail

Figure 28. Clients by Program/Caseload, June 2023



Adults on Community Supervision

Who Probation Supervised in FY2022-23

- 1065 formal probationers and 235 post-release probationers were supervised on June 30, 2023
- 72% were on probation for a felony offense
- 28% were on for a misdemeanor
- Average age was 36.2 years
- 20% were female and 80% were male
- 56.2% were White
- 35.5% were Hispanic
- 4.1% were African American
- 1.5% were Asian/Pacific Islander
- 0.3% were Native American
- 2.5% were of other or unknown race/ethnicity

Over the past three years, from the first quarter of FY2020-21 through fourth quarter of FY2022-23, the total number of active formal adult probationers decreased by 19.6%, from 1325 to 1065 probationers (Figure 29). The number of individuals on post-release caseloads have fallen by only 4.5% during the same period.

During FY2022-23, the Adult Division received an average of 130 new grants of formal probation and 33 new grants of post-release supervision each quarter (figure 30). On an annual basis, new formal grants increased 14.6%, from 453 to 519 in FY2020-21 to FY2022-23; post-release clients decreased by 18.4%, from 163 to 133, during the same period.

Figure 29. Probation Population, Last Day of Each Quarter, FY2020-21- FY2022-23






Figure 30. Number of New Probation Grants by Quarter, FY2020-21- FY2022-23



As of June 2023, 71.6% of adult formal and post-release probationers were residing in stable housing, 16.5% were unhoused or unstably housed, and 11.9% were residing in residence types which don't provide a clear picture of housing stability—like sober living homes, residential treatment, supportive housing, recreational vehicles (figure 31).


Probationers were 79.3% males, 20.6% female and 0.1% other. The average age at supervision start was 36.4 for those on supervision as of June 30, 2022. Average age has increased slightly over the past several years.

Figure 31. Probationers by housing status, June 2023



Effective supervision practices include the use of a validated risk-need assessment tool. Adult probationers are assessed with the Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI), to determine the probationer's likelihood to commit any new offense and to identify issues that could be addressed through treatment and supervision. Probationers are grouped according to their risk level, typically based on their LS/CMI score (High, Medium, Low) but sometimes based on a supervisor-approved override of their score to ensure they are being supervised appropriately. (Figure 32). In tables 9 and 10 below, 90.2% of probationers were categorized according to their assessed risk level and 9.8% based on supervisor override.


Figure 32. Probationers by Risk Level, June 2023



Note: Invalid risk level is when assessment information is over a year old. Assessments are not updated while probationers are in custody or on a limited supervision caseload. No score is when the probationer's risk level has not been assessed. Excluding those who do not have a valid risk score, formal probationers were 22.1% high, 32.9% medium, and 45% low risk to reoffend.

Figure 33 reflects the breakdown of formal probationers under supervision on June 30, 2023, according to type of crime committed.

Figure 33. Probationers by Crime Type, June 2023



ADULT TREATMENT COURT PROGRAMS

Adults on Formal Probation may be eligible to participate in one of several collaborative treatment court programs. Probation partners with the Court, attorneys, and treatment providers to deliver these services to our clients. Treatment courts are an effective method of reducing recidivism; programs utilize judicial monitoring, community-based treatment, and supervision in lieu of incarceration. In addition to the Mental Health Diversion Court program, Probation works with clients in the following programs:


- Adult Drug Court
- Veterans Treatment Court
- Behavioral Health Treatment Court
- Adult Treatment Court Collaborative

As of June 30, 2023, there were a total of 85 probationers in these programs. Their demographic information and outcomes are included above and below.

Community Supervision Outcomes

The following outcomes are measured at the close of probation supervision. In FY2022-23, 526 formal and 152 post-release probationers closed their grant(s) of probation for any reason; combined, 678 (figure 34).

Figure 34. Number of Individuals Who Closed Probation, FY2018-19 - FY2022-23



Among the probation cases that closed during the year, 29.7% of formal probationers and 32.2% of post-release probationers were convicted of at least one new law violation, i.e. recidivated, while on probation. Combined, 30.2% of probationers who closed had recidivated (figure 35 and table 8).

Figure 35. Recidivism Rate among Probationers, FY2018-19 - FY2022-23





Table 8. Recidivism among Probationers by Risk Level, FY2022-23

Risk Level	# Closed	# Recidivated	% Recidivated
High	134	65	48.5%
Med	110	35	31.8%
Low	154	23	14.9%
Invalid Assessment	242	68	28.1%
No Score	38	14	37.8%
Total	678	205	30.2%

Among the formal probationers who closed probation in FY2022-23, 56.8% completed their grant of probation (figure 36). Revocations to local and state prison include both revocations for violations of probation and those due to new convictions.

Figure 36. Closing Status among Probationers, FY2022-23



Appendix A: Glossary of terms as used in this report

Juvenile Services

Probation Diversion: Per Welfare and Institutions Code 654, eligible youth can agree to be placed on informal probation in lieu of the filing of a 602 Petition (criminal charge) with the juvenile court.

Youth: A person referred to the Probation Department for an alleged criminal offense that occurred when the person was under the age of 18.

Youth under supervision: Includes youth on both court-ordered and non-court ordered types of probation.

Youth under court-ordered supervision: Includes youth for whom a petition has been filed with the juvenile court and results in a term of probation.

Juvenile referral: A matter brought to the attention of the Probation Department alleging a Youth engaged in unlawful behavior under Welfare and Institutions Code Section 601 and/or 602.

Petition: A formal declaration to the juvenile court of information surrounding the alleged offense by a youth and requesting the court adjudicate the matter.

Probation violation: When a Youth under court-ordered supervision violates a condition of his/her probation but does not commit a new offense.

Adult Services

Adult Probationer: An adult offender who has been convicted of a felony or a misdemeanor offense and been granted formal probation, suspending the imposition of a sentence.

Post-Release Offender: A non-violent, non-serious, or non-high risk sex crimes offender who has been released from state prison onto Post-Release Community Supervision (PRCS) or who has been placed on Mandatory Supervision following a prison sentence served at the local jail.

Revocation (of probation): When a probationer/post-release offender violates his/her conditions of probation/community supervision, the grant of probation may be revoked or terminated, and the sentence imposed.