



April 2008

Juvenile Delinquency Court Assessment: Judicial Officer Report

This report covers information about the Juvenile Delinquency Court Assessment (JDCA) project and the 2006 CFCC Survey of Juvenile Judicial Officers. Findings from the survey are related to professional background and judicial assignments, court management, quality of probation reports and attorney advocacy, service and sanction needs, system collaboration, and the needs of the juvenile court:

- Juvenile delinquency judicial officers¹ have significant expertise, education, and experience in juvenile law.
- Judicial officers have an average of over 10 years of judicial experience and have been in their current assignments for more than 5 years.
- They receive an average of 22 hours of specialized education in juvenile law and related matters each year.
- Information available to the court at the initial, jurisdiction, and dispositional hearings is largely adequate. Judicial officers are relatively less satisfied with the quality and availability of information about youth's special needs, individualized education programs, and physical and mental health.
- The quality and availability of information about the youth during the postdispositional period varies by the terms of probation.
- Judicial officers are largely satisfied with attorney representation. Two areas in which they are dissatisfied with attorney performance are the frequency with which defense attorneys confer with their clients and the frequency with which they physically visit their clients.
- Juvenile delinquency is a highly collaborative field, with ongoing multidisciplinary efforts to respond to policy and program challenges as they arise.
- Judicial officers believe that their counties need more probation officers, more services for youth, and more disposition options in court.

Results from all assessment tools used in the JDCA are discussed in the *Juvenile Delinquency Court Assessment 2008*. A copy of the survey can be found in Volume 2, chapter 7, Research Instruments.

About the JDCA

The Judicial Council of California's Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee, in conjunction with the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC), conducted the JDCA. The Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee convened a working group composed of members of the advisory committee and experts drawn from state entities

¹ "Judicial officers" refers to judges, commissioners, and referees.

and the major participants in the juvenile delinquency court: judicial officers, court staff, probation, prosecutors, and defense attorneys. Working group members were selected both for their subject matter expertise and to ensure representation from a cross section of the state in terms of geographic location and county size. The working group helped develop the study plan, guide the research, and interpret the findings. A list of working group members can be found at the beginning of volume 1 of the *Juvenile Delinquency Court Assessment 2008*.

The JDCA marks the first major assessment of California's delinquency courts. This assessment was designed to gather and provide information to help improve the juvenile delinquency system by making recommendations for changes in laws and rules of court; improvements in hearing management, judicial oversight, court facilities, and other aspects of court operations; caseload changes; and improvements in court services for all court users. The assessment covered the following general topics:

- Hearings and other court processes;
- Court facilities;
- Court collaboration with justice system partners;
- Sanction and service options for youth;
- Perspectives of court users, including youth, parents, victims, and community members;
- Education and training;
- Accountability; and
- Professional background and experience.

The primary mode of investigation was to communicate directly with justice partners and court users. The JDCA project conducted surveys with all juvenile judicial officers, all court administrators, a random sample of juvenile probation officers, all juvenile division prosecutors, and all court-appointed defense attorneys, including public defenders, alternate public defenders, and contract or panel attorneys who were identified as handling cases in delinquency court. The JDCA project chose six counties to study in depth to learn about issues facing delinquency courts: Los Angeles, Placer, Riverside, San Francisco, San Joaquin, and Siskiyou. These six counties were selected for their size and geography in order to study a range of California's local delinquency courts. Interviews were conducted in each of these study counties with the presiding judge of the juvenile court, the chief probation officer or the juvenile probation division designee, the managing or supervising juvenile deputy district attorney and public defender, and court administration staff such as the supervising juvenile court clerk, court executive officer, or manager. Focus groups were also conducted with justice partners such as probation officers, prosecutors, and defense attorneys, and with court users such as youth, parents, victims, and community members. An assessment of delinquency court facilities across the state was also conducted as part of the JDCA project. The ultimate goal of this project was to improve both the administration of justice and the lives of youth, victims, and other community members affected by the delinquency system.

About the Judicial Officer Survey

The 2006 CFCC Survey of Juvenile Court Judges, Commissioners, and Referees was mailed in June 2006 to every judicial officer with regular assignments to hear juvenile dependency or delinquency proceedings. Out of a population of 214 eligible judicial officers, 191 returned a completed survey—an 89 percent response rate. Out of these 214 judicial officers, 73 hear delinquency cases but not

dependency cases, 67 hear dependency cases but not delinquency cases, and 68 hear both types., and we were not able to learn about the caseload of 6 out of the 23 nonrespondents. The figures reported here are based on the 131 respondents out of the 141 judicial officers in the population with regular assignments to delinquency cases who responded to the survey. Respondents who hear juvenile delinquency but not juvenile dependency cases were excluded.

The survey contained questions related to respondents' professional backgrounds and department information and asked about satisfaction with and effectiveness of sanctions and services, quality of information and advocacy, courtroom management and caseflow processes, and relationships and collaboration. Respondents also answered open-ended questions about their perceptions of the strengths and challenges of the juvenile delinquency system.

Background and Job Descriptions

In order for the delinquency system to best meet the needs of youth, families of youth, victims, and other court participants, it is critical that the juvenile delinquency courts be properly staffed and resourced with experienced judicial officers who are committed to working within that framework of the juvenile court to meet court users' needs and are given reasonable caseloads and working conditions, enabling them to meet those needs effectively. The findings in this section show that the juvenile court bench has significant expertise, education, and experience in juvenile law. Judicial officers have an average of over 10 years of judicial experience and have been in their current assignments for more than 5 years. The majority had some experience as an attorney in the juvenile law field before their first judicial assignments, and they receive an average of 22 hours of specialized education in juvenile law and related matters each year.

As table 1 shows,² 29 percent of judicial officers with regular assignments to hear delinquency proceedings are subordinate judicial officers, 40 percent are judges, 22 percent are presiding judges of the juvenile court, 10 percent are presiding judges of the superior court, and 28 percent are subordinate judicial officers. About one-quarter of all judicial officers work in jurisdictions with county populations of under 2 million, another one-quarter work in jurisdictions with populations of 2 to 10 million, and half work in jurisdictions with populations of 10 million or more. The proportion of judges to subordinate judicial officers varies depending on the size of the jurisdiction, with judges in smaller jurisdictions making up a larger proportion of judicial officers with regular delinquency calendars than judges in medium and large jurisdictions. This remains true when presiding judges with regular delinquency assignments are excluded (such judges are rare in medium and large jurisdictions).

We asked judicial officers what their regular time commitment to juvenile delinquency is (table 2). Slightly more than one-half (53 percent) indicated that they have full-time juvenile delinquency assignments, 13 percent are between half time and full time, and 34 percent spend less than half time working on delinquency cases. The 21 percent that reported working on delinquency assignments less than one-quarter time is somewhat higher than previous estimates have suggested. A possible explanation is that since the survey was sent to all judicial officers working in juvenile court, dependency judicial officers who occasionally hear delinquency cases on a backup basis may have entered "less than one-quarter time" as their average time commitment, while previous estimates may have tallied only judicial officers with regular delinquency assignments.

² This table includes nonrespondents for whom some information was available.

Based on the reported time commitment to juvenile delinquency cases among survey respondents, and on the estimated time commitment of nonrespondents, given their county size and job title, we estimate that there are approximately 95 full-time equivalent judicial positions serving juvenile delinquency. Each full-time equivalent position is responsible for approximately 1,100 filings per year.³

Table 3 presents data on the number of years respondents had been in their current delinquency judicial assignment and in all delinquency judicial assignments in their careers. Respondents reported that, as of the survey date, they had been in their current, ongoing assignment for an average of five years. One-half had completed three years or less of their assignment so far, 15 percent were in their third or fourth year, and about one-third (35 percent) had been in their current assignments five years or more. Across all juvenile delinquency assignments in their careers, presiding judges of the superior court had the most experience on average (9 years); however, very few presiding judges of the superior court have juvenile assignments. Subordinate judicial officers had an average of 7 years of experience in juvenile assignments, presiding judges of the juvenile court had 6 years, and judges had 3 years. Standard 5.40 of the California Standards of Judicial Administration encourages juvenile bench assignments of at least 3 years.⁴ Because we do not have data on the length of completed assignments, we can say with certainty only that one-half of the current assignments have already met the 3-year mark and that a significant minority have been in their assignments for 5 years or longer. One respondent commented upon the strengths of his or her court by noting that “judicial officers assigned to juvenile court want to be here and are not being ‘forced’ to sit in juvenile.” Another added that a strength was the stability that longer tenures brought their court.

Table 4 shows that the overall tenure of judicial officers working in juvenile delinquency is extensive. Overall, the median length of judicial experience is 11.5 years for all judicial officers combined, 11.5 years for judges, and 8.0 years for subordinate judicial officers (only 15 judges were once subordinate judicial officers).

Survey respondents were also asked about their professional involvement in juvenile court before becoming a judge or subordinate judicial officer (table 5). Sixty-two percent had been attorneys who had practiced juvenile law.⁵ Subordinate judicial officers were much more likely to have had prior juvenile experience than were judges (86 versus 52 percent), because they are often hired to work in the area of their legal expertise. Although some respondents with prior experience as juvenile court attorneys also had prior professional roles as nonattorneys (such as social worker or probation officer), only 6 percent of delinquency court judicial officers had exclusively nonlegal professional roles.

Judicial officers also reported on the training in delinquency law they received at the start of their first assignment, as well as on their current education and training (table 6). Seventeen percent reported not having received specialized education in the juvenile delinquency field, either before they started or within the first year of their delinquency assignments. Forty-seven percent received it before they started the assignment, and 48 percent received it within the first year of their assignment. (This totals to more than 100 percent because some respondents received training during both periods.) The proportion who received no training does not change appreciably when the analysis is limited to

³ 105,714 602 case filings divided by 95 full-time equivalent judicial positions is 1,113. Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, *Court Statistics Report: 2006*.

⁴ Cal. Stds. Jud. Admin., std. 5.40(a): The presiding judge of the superior court should assign judges to the juvenile court to serve for a minimum of three years. Priority should be given to judges who have expressed an interest in the assignment.

⁵ The survey did not ask about the extent of prior legal experience in the field.

respondents with delinquency appointments of half time or more, or when it is limited to respondents who had been judicial officers for less than 10 years.

As shown in table 7, judicial officers reported that they spent an average of 22 hours in the previous year in specialized training related to juvenile delinquency, dependency, and related subjects. Nine percent participated in no training, 18 percent in 1 to 9 hours of training, 18 percent in 10 to 19 hours, 21 percent in 20 to 29 hours, and 35 percent spent more than 30 hours in training. About one-half (46 percent) reported that there are no work-related barriers to attending more trainings (table 8). Among those who cited barriers, the most frequently cited barriers were that the court has difficulty covering their time away from the bench and budget constraints.

Quality of Information Available to the Court

Judicial officers make court findings and orders after considering an array of information on a case, primarily from probation officers and attorneys, but also from youth, victims and witnesses, service providers, and others. This information generally comes in the form of written reports and oral in-court presentations. Orders and findings needed to move a case from one stage to the next are largely dependent on these reports and the judicial inquiries that follow them. The data in this section are focused on the quality of information provided by probation reports and reviews. They show that judicial officers are generally satisfied with the quality of information they receive from probation but that there are some areas in need of attention. This includes information about mental and physical health, individualized education programs (IEPs), special needs, and success with meeting the terms of probation.

Judicial officers were asked to rate their satisfaction with the quality of information that should be found in detention/initial hearing probation reports (table 9). Their level of satisfaction with information about the youth's prior delinquency record is relatively high (75 percent). Satisfaction levels are somewhat lower regarding information about drug and alcohol use, and about the parents' views on detaining the youth (59 and 57 percent, respectively). There is appreciable dissatisfaction with the quality of information regarding school attendance and adjustment, as well as regarding home life (17 and 20 percent, respectively). More than one-quarter of respondents do not receive information about the youth's Indian ancestry.⁶

Judicial officers were satisfied with the quality of information available at jurisdictional hearings (table 10) about prior delinquency record, school attendance and adjustment, home life, and drug and alcohol use (72 to 93 percent). However, only one-half of judicial officers were satisfied with the risk and needs assessments presented at this stage. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction among judicial officers with information provided about mental and physical health, IEPs, and special needs.⁷

After youth have received their disposition, the court must monitor the progress of those who have been made wards by assessing information about their general welfare, services received, and progress toward meeting the terms of their probation. Although it is the probation officers' responsibility to provide this information, they, in turn, must rely on reporting from detention facilities when youth

⁶ Probation officers are not legally required to report on possible Indian ancestry until the court finds that there is a risk of the youth being removed from the family's home.

⁷ The choice "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" may have been interpreted in more than one way by survey respondents. It may have been used as a midpoint on the rating scale or it may have been selected by respondents who have no opinion on the question item.

have been sent to local or state institutions. Generally, tables 11 through 14 show that judicial officers' appraisal of the quality of postdispositional information varies more by the source of the information than by the type of information. Satisfaction is highest for information about youth in foster or group homes, followed by youth who are home on probation and those in state DJJ facilities.⁸ About 15 percent receive no reports back from camps and ranches, and about 25 percent receive no information from DJJ facilities.

For youth who are home on probation, about two-thirds of judicial officers are satisfied with information regarding the youth's progress in meeting community service, restitution, fines, and other terms of probation (table 11). Levels of satisfaction drop for information about their general welfare and the provision and effectiveness of services. Here again, dissatisfaction with information about mental health, IEPs, and special needs is quite high. The pattern is similar for youth in foster or group homes, with the addition of a low level of satisfaction (50 percent) with information regarding independent living services. Satisfaction with information that the court might receive from a DJJ facility did not rise above 30 percent for any of the 12 categories of information listed in the survey question (table 14). Respondents are particularly dissatisfied with reports on the provision and effectiveness of court-ordered services. The survey data could not help determine whether information from DJJ is not being sent to the court, or whether the court is not effectively forwarding that information to judicial officers.

Table 15 shows the levels of satisfaction that judicial officers have with various postdispositional activities. More than two-thirds are satisfied with postdispositional review hearings,⁹ and more than one-half are satisfied with probation review reports. There is less satisfaction regarding probation officer visits with youth (54 percent satisfied). This table also shows satisfaction rates with two attorney activities. Only 17 percent are satisfied with attorney visits with the youth, and only 20 percent are satisfied with attorney requests to amend probation terms. Effective July 1, 2004, rule 5.663 clarified existing law governing the responsibilities of delinquency defense attorneys in representing youth, including during a case's postdispositional period.¹⁰ These include defending against allegations in all petitions filed in delinquency proceedings; representing youth at every stage of the proceedings; and advocating during hearings that youth receive care, treatment, and guidance consistent with his or her best interest. Although dissatisfaction is high with these activities, the Attorney Report¹¹ shows that a sizable 25 percent of defense attorneys reported that their postdispositional advocacy has increased since the passage of rule 5.663.

Under title IV-E of the Social Security Act and the California statutes implementing the federal law, the state is required to provide the same types of services to youth who are at risk of entering foster care and those who are in foster care, as well as to their parents, in the delinquency system as it does for the children and their families in the dependency system. The evidence required to support the findings must be provided to the court by the probation department. The judge needs time to read and evaluate the probation officer's report prepared for each hearing and time during each hearing to

⁸ California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Juvenile Justice will be referred to as DJJ.

⁹ It is difficult to know the meaning of the 12 percent who do not "receive information" about postdispositional review hearings, because judicial officers are present at those hearing. It is possible that those respondents do not engage in such hearings because they specialize in predispositional hearings.

¹⁰ Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.663 (effective July 1, 2004), Responsibilities of Children's Counsel in Delinquency Proceedings.

¹¹ See volume 2, chapter 4.

discuss the contents of the report with the parties. Table 16 summarizes judicial officers' responses indicating how often they believe the probation department is undertaking a number of activities related to federal and state legal requirements for these youth and their families. These activities should be described in probation reports and considered in hearings. Many judicial officers (averaging 30 percent across the questions) reported that they do not know whether probation officers are involving youth in case planning, trying to locate relatives, helping youth make adult connections, securing Independent Living Program (ILP) services, or notifying tribes when a youth's Indian status is in question. One possible explanation for this finding is that they cannot tell from the probation reports they review whether these activities are occurring. Among those respondents who are aware of probation departments' efforts concerning these activities, a minority think that many of these activities are nearly always happening for foster youth and those at risk of entering foster care.¹² Judicial officers are largely making the findings and orders required in these cases, but they may need more time to consider probation reports and make inquiries about their content.

Judicial officers were asked about their satisfaction with various processes involved in responding to youth who have come to the attention of both the delinquency and dependency sides of the juvenile court (table 17). Sixty-two percent are satisfied with the frequency with which the probation department and child welfare agency agree on a recommendation for how the court should treat the youth. About two-thirds are satisfied with the appropriateness of the recommendations, given the offense and the offender's strengths and challenges. However, only about one-half (52 percent) are satisfied with the information sharing during the process. Forty-four percent are satisfied with the information presented to them when the two agencies' viewpoints diverge.

We asked respondents what, apart from public safety and best interest, were considerations in deciding whether to move a youth from one part of the juvenile court to the other (table 18). The two concerns cited most frequently by delinquency judicial officers are that services in juvenile delinquency are not as extensive as they are in juvenile dependency (55 percent reported this as a consideration) and that youth can lose their ability to return to placement after a delinquency adjudication (42 percent). Many of the respondents who checked "other" wrote that in their jurisdictions the services available to dependent youth are not as extensive as those available to delinquent youth.

Quality of Legal Advocacy

Because attorney advocacy is such an important component of fairness and justice, judicial officers were asked to assess it in their surveys. They were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with the performance of prosecutors and defense attorneys by rating them on a large number of attorney activities (tables 19 and 20). Overall, judicial officers are satisfied with the performance of juvenile attorneys, and they do not consistently rate one attorney type more highly than the other. The variations in satisfaction levels for these activities suggest gaps either in attorney performance or in attorneys' access to information that judicial officers believe they need in order to arrive at the best decisions possible.

As shown in table 19, judicial officers are relatively satisfied with prosecutors in terms of their knowledge of the law, quality of legal arguments, and knowledge of the case (satisfaction levels are 69

¹² The percentages in these tables did not change appreciably when the analysis omitted respondents who perhaps seldom hear title IV-E cases (such as respondents working in delinquency less than half time and respondents from small jurisdictions).

to 89 percent). Although 70 percent are satisfied with prosecutors' predispositional advocacy, 10 percent are not. Satisfaction is lower with postdispositional advocacy (58 percent satisfied and 12 percent dissatisfied).¹³ Respondents were moderately satisfied with prosecutors' performance in a number of other areas, including timely discovery, calling witnesses, and direct and cross-examination. Judicial officers are not satisfied with the level of knowledge about community resources that prosecutors have: only 30 percent are satisfied, with 31 percent reporting being dissatisfied with their knowledge of these resources. Satisfaction with motion practices and trial briefs is quite low, in part because these practices do not occur frequently in juvenile cases.

Judicial officers' attitudes toward juvenile defense attorneys are similar in some ways to those toward juvenile prosecutors. For instance, as shown in table 20, respondents are again more satisfied with predispositional advocacy than with postdispositional advocacy. They are also rather dissatisfied with defense attorneys' knowledge of community resources (only 46 percent are satisfied and 21 percent are dissatisfied). Judicial officers are relatively satisfied with defense attorneys' knowledge of the facts of the case and with their appearance for scheduled hearings. They are moderately satisfied with other court practices, such as calling witnesses and direct and cross-examinations. One area in which judicial officers are distinctly dissatisfied involves how defense attorneys work with their clients. Less than two-thirds are satisfied with the frequency with which attorneys confer with clients, and only 39 percent are satisfied with the frequency of attorneys' physical visits with clients.

Hearing Management

Hearing continuances and delays can pose problems for the court and court users. They contribute to exceeding statutory timelines; delaying accountability, rehabilitation, and victim restoration; wasting resources such as the time of paid professionals; and causing youth, parents, and victims to forgo competing obligations, such as school and work, while they wait in court, often for half-days or full days. They also benefit cases because they allow late-arriving information to be considered and enable required parties to appear in court. No empirical guidance exists regarding what is an excessive number of hearing delays, and assessing whether delays are warranted is a difficult exercise. There is a sense that too many delays may signify justice denied and too few may signify due process denied, but there is no precision to those values that can easily guide an assessment.

Only about one-half of the respondents said that they always or almost always get through their juvenile delinquency calendar and hear each case to their satisfaction. However, only one-quarter of the respondents said that hearing delays are a moderate or major problem (table 21).

As shown in table 22, a lack of information (such as reports and evaluations) is a major reason for hearings being held over, according to the observations of judicial officers. In addition to explicitly noting this problem, many respondents chose the separate reason "attorney not ready," which is often related to the lateness or unavailability of information. It is possible that a failure to receive reports on time may affect judicial officers' and prosecutors' perceptions of defense attorney readiness. The only other major cause of hearing delays in uncontested matters was the youth not being present. In contested matters (table 23), in addition to the lack of information and youth's absence noted in uncontested matters, a significant source of delay involves hearings going over their allocated time.

¹³ The role of the prosecutor after disposition is generally limited to advocacy surrounding new violations and responses to requests for dismissal and other postdispositional amendments.

Performance-related reasons for hearing delays (such as probation or attorney not being present or lack of or improper notice) seem to be relatively uncommon.

These survey data and the difficulty of appraising delays and continuance at the statewide level suggest that local courts should monitor trends in the frequency of, and stated reasons for, hearing delays and should examine both how expeditiously hearings are completed and whether justice is compromised by resource limitations. As is explained in volume 1 and elsewhere in volume 2 of this report, courts also need to consider how they communicate with court users about hearing continuances and delays, since court users often view continuances and poorly explained reasons for delays as a significant affront.

Sanctions and Services

Effective juvenile justice systems have developed an array of services and sanctions available to youth who have come to the attention of law enforcement.¹⁴ Youthful offender populations present a broad array of risks and needs that must be accompanied by an appropriate range of service and sanction options. Evaluations must be made regarding how best to match youth with services, depending on the youth's individual mental, educational, and familial strengths and challenges. Sanctions range from less to more severe and can move up or down the continuum depending on the performance of the offender. The primary advantage of a range of sanctions and services is that they give probation departments the tools and ability to respond appropriately to different offenses and offenders. There is a good deal of data in the JDCA report regarding shortcomings in the availability of appropriate sanctions and services for youth in the juvenile justice system. These shortcomings vary by level of sanction and by type of treatment. This section describes judicial officer satisfaction with sanctions and services, and with the performance of youth in different probation settings.

Judicial officers are more likely to be satisfied with the options available to the juvenile court for sanctioning youth than they are with the options available for mandated services (table 24). They are also more likely to be satisfied with the sanctions and services available for lower-risk youth than with those available for higher-risk youth. At 48 percent, the rate of dissatisfaction with services for high-risk youth is strikingly high.¹⁵

Most judicial officers do receive information about youth on court-ordered informal probation and deferred entry of judgment (DEJ), as shown in table 25. They are most satisfied with the performance of these youth in their community service (60 percent), avoidance of recidivism (50 percent), and restitution payment (46 percent). They are less satisfied with the progress these youth may be making with their education, mental health, and substance abuse problems.

Judicial officers are somewhat less satisfied with the performance of (traditional) probation wards compared to informal probation and DEJ youth (table 26). Although they are relatively satisfied with the rate at which these youth complete their community service (65 percent), they are somewhat dissatisfied with their rate of recidivism, restitution, and improvements to education, mental health, and substance abuse.

¹⁴ U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *Comprehensive Responses to Youth at Risk: Interim Findings from the SafeFutures Initiative* (2000); available at http://www.ncjrs.gov/html/ojjdp/summary_comp_resp/index.html <last accessed March 17, 2008>.

¹⁵ This pattern is similar to what was found in the probation and attorneys surveys (volume 2, chapters 3 and 4).

Youth who are intensively supervised are assessed as performing relatively better than probation wards along almost every dimension (recidivism, educational progress, and substance abuse improvement). Respondents are more satisfied with the completion of community service for probation wards than for youth on intensive supervision (65 and 51 percent)(table 27).

The percentage of respondents who are dissatisfied with the various youth performance dimensions is higher for youth in camps, ranches, and private placement than for youth who are completing their probation at home (table 28). A sizable percentage of respondents reported not receiving information about restitution and community service for youth placed in these settings.

Respondents reported the lowest levels of satisfaction with the performance of youth at DJJ facilities (table 29). Strikingly, one-third or more of the respondents reported that they do not receive any information about youth's performance in these facilities.

As shown in table 30, respondents are relatively satisfied with most supervision programs: short stays in juvenile hall (64 percent), intensive supervision (54 percent), residential treatment facilities (47 percent), and, when they are available, restorative justice programs (50 percent satisfaction among those that have these programs).

Respondents were asked to indicate the types of youth who are particularly difficult to match with supervision, treatment, and placements. Table 31 shows that the most difficult youth to match are those with mental health issues, those who are beyond control, and those who are developmentally delayed. In open-ended survey questions, respondents thought that more options for girls and for youth who run away from placement are also needed.

Collaboration

Judicial officers and justice partners routinely collaborate at a number of different levels in order to improve the juvenile justice system. At the system level, they collaborate to improve court services, increase service and sanction options, and resolve policy and other managerial issues as they arise. In an open-ended survey question asking respondents to name the top strengths of their court, many judicial officers credited the court's collaborative relationships with justice partners, or the justice partners' collaborative relationships with one another.

About 85 percent of judicial officers hearing delinquency proceedings meet with other justice partners (table 32). About one-half participate in regularly occurring meetings (42 percent), and one-half meet as needed (44 percent). Of the 43 presiding judges of the juvenile court, about one-half meet with them regularly, one-quarter meet with them on an as-needed basis, and one-quarter do neither. At the court level, about three-quarters of courts have at least one delinquency judicial officer who attends regular justice partner meetings.¹⁶ About one-third of respondents believe that courts should meet with them more often, and about one-third believe they should meet more often without judicial participation (table 34).

¹⁶ This calculation excludes courts in which no respondent reported attending regular meetings if that court also had nonresponding judicial staff. (The reasoning is that the nonrespondent may be the sole judicial representative attending regular stakeholder meetings.) Of the remaining 49 courts, 36 (or 73 percent) have at least one judicial officer who regularly attends stakeholder meetings.

Table 34 also shows that respondents feel strongly that collaboration with the community and cross-training should be increased. More than half think that the courts should increase their collaboration with the community, and about as many think that other agencies should also increase community collaboration.

Roughly 8 in 10 respondents assessed the court's relationship with the probation services division of the probation department, public defender's offices, and district attorney's offices as very good or good (table 35). Fewer respondents rated the working relationship between the court and juvenile hall that highly. Respondents were more likely to cite poor or very poor relationships with groups that courts do not routinely work with, such as county mental health (21 percent), child welfare (14 percent), and school districts (18 percent), as shown in tables 35 and 36.

System Needs

Respondents were given a list of 52 items and asked to check how strongly they agree that there needs to be improvement in the quality or quantity of these items in order to improve the functioning of the juvenile justice system. Although the list is long, it is not exhaustive, so the results from this question should not be interpreted to mean that the neglected dimensions are not thought to be important. The top 8 selected improvements are discussed here. The full list is shown in Table 37.

The top three areas where judicial officers think that the system needs improvement are all related to probation services for youth. They include more probation officers, improvements in probation-supervised services, and improvements in juvenile custody options. The next 5 are related to judicial resources and court services needs. Respondents reported that more judicial positions and more time and opportunities to visit placement would improve the system. They also agreed that access to mental health courts, availability of victims' and restitution services, and access to family group conferencing could be improved. These are important findings because they suggest areas where some concentrated improvements to resources may be needed. The other items listed in the table are also important and may reflect significant needs within local jurisdictions, but at the statewide level, there is relatively less agreement that significant improvements are needed in these areas.

Conclusion

This report summarizes the findings from the 2006 CFCC Survey of Juvenile Judges, Commissioners, and Referees, the first statewide survey of all juvenile court bench officers conducted in California.

Because of the limits of centralized, administrative data, little was known about the background of juvenile court judicial officers. The survey data show that the majority of judicial officers were involved professionally with the juvenile court prior to their first juvenile assignment, and that they continue to develop their expertise, with an average of more than 22 hours per year of formal education in juvenile law and related fields. About one-half have full-time delinquency assignments; the rest have other assignments as well. About one-half are in the first three years of their delinquency assignment. Court hearings should continue to be led by experienced judicial officers who are committed to the goals of the juvenile court and to working within the unique setting of the juvenile court to meet the needs of youth, victims, and the community.

Respondents are generally satisfied with most aspects of probation officer and attorney work. Several areas in need of further exploration include judicial officers' access to knowledge about community

resources and their access to important information about the well-being of youth, such as their mental health, school life, and educational needs. Judicial officers would like to become more knowledgeable about the availability and effectiveness of treatments and services for youth. Probation officers need reasonable caseloads in order to generate information that is vital to the court's role in making findings and orders and monitoring the postdispositional period. Three-quarters of the respondents agree that more juvenile probation officers are needed.

Although the ability to continue a hearing is an essential component of guaranteeing that rights are protected and court outcomes are fair, the ability to process cases without significant delays and continuances is also a sign of a well-run and adequately resourced court. Judicial officers and court managers should consider monitoring the reasons for delays and continuances in order to be assured that the delays are for good cause and in the interest of justice, and so that they can recognize where they may need either more resources or a different organization of their calendar. Because court users can find continuances to be a significant affront, particularly if they occur after long waits in the courthouse, it is important for courts to consider how they communicate their good-cause continuances to court users, who are largely unfamiliar with legal language.

Most judicial officers reported that they are significantly involved in multidisciplinary justice partner meetings, either to discuss procedures and policy or to discuss supervision, treatment, and placement issues. Most believe that they meet sufficiently often. One-half think that there should be more collaboration with the community. They reported good working relationships with the groups with whom they collaborate most often (probation and attorneys). When asked to report on what they consider the strengths of their court, they acknowledged that the expertise of and also the working relationships between the justice partners contribute significantly to the overall strength of the court. They recognize that the juvenile justice system needs more resources, particularly probation officers, services, and custody options.

Tables

Table 1 Type of Judicial Officer by County Size (N=141)				
	Under 2 million	2 to under 10 million	10 million or more	Total
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court	36.1	0.0	1.5	10.1
Presiding Judge of the Juvenile Court	30.6	37.1	10.3	22.3
Judge	27.8	31.4	50.0	39.6
Subordinate Judicial Officer	5.6	31.4	38.2	28.1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 2 Regular Time Commitment to Juvenile Delinquency as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=128)		
	Count	Percent
Less than 1/4 time	27	21.1
1/4 time	8	6.3
Less than 1/2 time	8	6.3
1/2 time	11	8.6
3/4 time	6	4.7
Full time	68	53.1
Total	128	100%

Table 3
Years in Juvenile Delinquency Assignments
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=130)

	Presiding Judge of the Superior Court	Presiding Judge of the Juvenile Court	Judge	Subordinate Judicial Officer	Total
Current Assignment					
0 to 2.9 years	0.0	55.6	64.6	47.1	50.8
3 to 4.9 years	15.4	11.1	20.8	8.8	14.8
5 to 9.9 years	53.8	22.2	12.5	14.7	19.7
10 years and over	30.8	11.1	2.1	29.4	14.8
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Current Assignment					
N	13	27	48	34	122
Mean	9.0	5.0	3.1	6.8	5.2
Median	8.6	2.7	2.1	4.3	2.8
Standard deviation	3.4	4.6	3.6	5.5	5.5
Total assignments					
N	13	31	42	44	130
Mean	9.2	5.9	3.2	6.9	5.5
Median	8.5	5.0	2.4	4.9	3.9
Standard deviation	3.2	4.4	3.5	5.2	5.2

Table 4
Years Spent in Judicial Officer Positions
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=128)

	As a Judge	As a Subordinate Judicial Officer	As a Judicial Officer
N	93	48	128
Mean	11.3	10.1	12.0
Median	11.5	8.0	11.5
Standard deviation	6.9	6.9	7.1

Table 5
Prior Professional Roles Related to the Juvenile Court
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=128)

	Presiding Judge of the Superior Court	Presiding Judge of the Juvenile Court	Judge	Subordinate Judicial Officer	Total
None	7.7	34.5	48.0	13.9	31.3
Dependency Attorney	7.7	3.4	2.0	22.2	8.6
Delinquency Attorney	7.7	17.2	24.0	19.4	19.5
Dependency and Delinquency Attorney	76.9	34.5	18.0	41.7	34.4
Non-Attorney juvenile roles only	0.0	10.3	8.0	2.8	6.3
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 6
Specialized Judicial Training in Juvenile Delinquency
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=127)

	Count	Percent
Before starting assignment	60	47.2
Within a year of starting assignment	61	48.0
No delinquency training	21	16.5
Do not recall	3	2.4

Note: Percentages may not total 100 because respondents were asked to check all that applied.

Table 7
Hours of Specialized Training in the Last Year
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=113)

	Count	Percent
0 hours	10	8.8
1 to 9 hours	20	17.7
10 to 19 hours	20	17.7
20 to 29 hours	24	21.2
30 to 39 hours	15	13.3
40 to 49 hours	17	15.0
50 hours and over	7	6.2
Total	113	100%

Median = 20.0 hours; mean = 22.2 hours; standard deviation = 16.6 hours

Table 8
Work-Related Barriers to Attending More Training
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=125)

	Count	Percent
No work related barriers to training	57	45.6
Few juvenile trainings available	21	16.8
Travel difficult from location	17	13.6
Trouble covering time away	57	45.6
Available training does not meet needs	10	8.0
Budgets constraints	31	24.8
Other reasons	25	20.0

Note: Percentages may not total 100 because respondents were asked to check all that applied.

Table 9
Satisfaction with Quality of Information in Detention/Initial Hearing Probation Reports
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=123-128)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Do not Receive Report	Total
Prior delinquency record	24.2	50.8	10.9	8.6	1.6	3.9	100%
School attendance and Adjustment	7.0	39.8	29.7	14.8	2.3	6.3	100%
Home life	7.0	44.5	24.2	18.0	2.3	3.9	100%
Alcohol and drug use	10.9	48.4	25.8	9.4	0.8	4.7	100%
Parent's feeling about detaining the youth	10.2	46.5	31.5	6.3	0.0	5.5	100%
Risk assessments	11.9	38.9	24.6	11.1	7.1	6.3	100%
Indian ancestry	6.5	26.0	21.1	13.8	4.9	27.6	100%

Table 10
Satisfaction with Quality of Information in Jurisdiction and Disposition Hearing Probation Reports
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=129-130)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Do not Receive Report	Total
Prior delinquency record	45.4	47.7	6.2	0.8	0.0	0.0	100%
School attendance and Adjustment	30.0	46.2	19.2	4.6	0.0	0.0	100%
Home life	23.8	48.5	22.3	4.6	0.8	0.0	100%
Mental health	15.4	38.5	31.5	11.5	3.1	0.0	100%
Physical health	20.0	36.9	33.1	9.2	0.8	0.0	100%
Alcohol and drug use	24.6	51.5	16.2	7.7	0.0	0.0	100%
Mental health assessments	10.8	33.1	33.1	16.9	4.6	1.5	100%
Risk and needs Assessments	12.3	37.7	33.1	1.0	6.2	0.8	100%
IEP	12.4	26.4	34.1	18.6	7.0	1.6	100%
Special needs	10.8	28.5	36.9	15.4	7.7	0.8	100%

Table 11
Satisfaction With Quality of Information in Probation Reports for Postdisposition Youth Who Are at Home as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=125–126)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Do not Receive Report	Total
Progress in community service, restitution, and fines	11.9	51.6	16.7	10.3	0.0	9.5	100%
Progress in meeting other terms of probation	12.7	52.4	20.6	4.8	0.0	9.5	100%
Provision of court-ordered Services	8.0	36.8	34.4	10.4	0.8	9.6	100%
Effectiveness of court-ordered services	6.3	31.0	33.3	12.7	4.0	12.7	100%
School attendance and Adjustment	11.9	44.4	20.6	12.7	0.8	9.5	100%
Home life	7.1	44.4	27.8	8.7	1.6	10.3	100%
Mental health	5.6	28.6	34.9	18.3	2.4	10.3	100%
Physical health	7.2	30.4	38.4	9.6	2.4	12.0	100%
Alcohol and drug use	11.1	50.0	23.0	6.3	0.0	9.5	100%
IEP	6.4	28.0	34.4	20.0	1.6	9.6	100%
Special needs	6.4	27.2	34.4	19.2	3.2	9.6	100%

Table 12
Satisfaction With Quality of Information in Probation Reports for Youth Placed in Foster or Group Homes as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=124–125)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Do not Receive Report	Total
Progress in community service, restitution, and fines	15.2	46.4	25.6	7.2	1.6	4.0	100%
Progress in meeting other terms of probation	19.2	47.2	26.4	3.2	0.8	3.2	100%
Suitability to be returned home	14.4	52.0	24.0	6.4	0.8	2.4	100%
Safety of youth at placement	11.2	34.4	35.2	12.0	2.4	4.8	100%
Provision of court-ordered services	10.4	40.0	36.0	10.4	0.8	2.4	100%
Effectiveness of court-ordered services	8.0	39.2	32.8	12.8	2.4	4.8	100%
School attendance and adjustment	15.2	45.6	29.6	6.4	0.8	2.4	100%
Connections with family	11.2	44.0	31.2	10.4	0.8	2.4	100%
Mental health	7.2	42.4	33.6	12.0	1.6	3.2	100%
Physical health	11.2	40.8	35.2	8.0	2.4	2.4	100%
Alcohol and drug use	13.6	48.0	29.6	4.8	1.6	2.4	100%
Independent living services	11.2	38.4	32.0	12.8	3.2	2.4	100%
IEP	8.8	37.6	35.2	10.4	4.8	3.2	100%
Special needs	8.9	33.1	38.7	12.9	4.0	2.4	100%

Table 13
Satisfaction with Quality of Information in Probation Reports for Youth Placed in Camps and Ranches as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=108–110)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Do not Receive Report	Total
Suitability to be returned home	10.9	39.1	20.9	11.8	1.8	15.5	100%
Safety of youth at the facility	10.0	29.1	30.0	12.7	2.7	15.5	100%
Provision of court-ordered services	9.2	28.4	27.5	16.5	3.7	14.7	100%
Effectiveness of court-ordered services	8.3	30.3	30.3	13.8	2.8	14.7	100%
School attendance and adjustment	10.0	39.1	24.5	10.9	1.8	13.6	100%
Connections with family	9.1	32.7	30.0	11.8	2.7	13.6	100%
Mental health	7.3	25.5	34.5	13.6	4.5	14.5	100%
Physical health	8.2	30.0	34.5	9.1	3.6	14.5	100%
Alcohol and drug use	10.0	35.5	27.3	10.0	3.6	13.6	100%
Independent living services	7.3	22.7	31.8	18.2	3.6	16.4	100%
IEP	7.3	22.0	33.9	17.4	3.7	15.6	100%
Special needs	6.5	21.3	32.4	21.3	2.8	15.7	100%

Table 14
Satisfaction with Quality of Information in Probation Reports for Youth in State Juvenile Facilities as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=95–96)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Do not Receive Report	Total
Suitability to be returned home	6.3	24.0	30.2	11.5	5.2	22.9	100%
Safety of youth at the facility	5.2	12.5	33.3	15.6	8.3	25.0	100%
Provision of court-ordered services	5.2	15.6	34.4	15.6	5.2	24.0	100%
Effectiveness of court-ordered services	6.3	14.6	34.4	16.7	5.2	22.9	100%
School attendance and adjustment	5.2	19.8	37.5	11.5	4.2	21.9	100%
Connections with family	5.2	14.6	40.6	12.5	4.2	22.9	100%
Mental health	5.2	16.7	37.5	13.5	4.2	22.9	100%
Physical health	5.2	18.8	36.5	11.5	4.2	24.0	100%
Alcohol and drug use	5.2	19.8	38.5	9.4	4.2	22.9	100%
Independent living services	4.2	15.6	36.5	12.5	5.2	26.0	100%
IEP	4.2	17.7	35.4	11.5	5.2	26.0	100%
Special needs	4.2	14.7	36.8	13.7	4.2	26.3	100%

Table 15
Satisfaction with Activities Occurring Postdispositionally
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=118–123)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Do not Receive Information	Total
Postdisposition review hearings for nonplacement youth	15.3	41.5	22.9	7.6	0.8	11.9	100%
Probation review reports	9.9	44.6	27.3	8.3	0.0	9.9	100%
Probation visits with youth	8.1	32.5	31.7	17.1	2.4	8.1	100%
Child's attorney visits with youth	3.3	13.8	32.5	19.5	9.8	21.1	100%
Child's attorney requests to amend probation terms	5.7	13.8	47.2	8.9	8.9	15.4	100%

Table 16
Frequency of Probation Officers' Activities When Working with Youth for whom Title IV-E Money is Drawn
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=125–126)

	Always or Nearly Always	Often	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never or Rarely	Do not Know	Total
Involve youth in case plans	19.0	15.9	22.2	5.6	4.0	33.3	100%
Try to locate relatives	20.0	24.8	19.2	5.6	7.2	23.2	100%
Help youth make adult connections	8.7	20.6	27.0	6.3	7.1	30.2	100%
Secure ILP services	11.1	26.2	22.2	7.9	4.8	27.8	100%
Notice tribes when Indian status is in question	16.8	16.8	12.0	4.0	10.4	40.0	100%

Table 17
Satisfaction with Handling of Cases Involving Youth Moving from One Part of the Juvenile Court to Another
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=124)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Total
Satisfaction with frequency of Probation and Child Welfare agreements	13.7	48.4	25.8	10.5	1.6	100%
Satisfaction with information sharing	8.1	43.5	26.6	18.5	3.2	100%
Satisfaction with information presented	9.0	35.2	42.6	11.5	1.6	100%
Satisfaction with appropriateness of recommendations	11.3	54.0	21.8	9.7	3.2	100%

Table 18
Considerations in Moving Youth from One Part of Juvenile Court to Another
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=123)

	Count	Percent
Crossover interruption in services	43	35.0
Crossover delinquency services not extensive	67	54.5
Delinquency youth kept on probation	40	32.5
Dependency youth can lose ability to return to placement	52	42.3
None of the above	24	19.5
Other	13	10.6

Note: Percentages may not total 100 because respondents were asked to check all that applied.

Table 19
Satisfaction With Performance of Prosecutors
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=125-128)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Not Applicable	Total
Predisposition advocacy	21.6	48.8	19.2	10.4	0.0	0.0	100%
Postdisposition advocacy	16.0	42.4	28.8	12.0	0.0	0.8	100%
Appearing for scheduled hearings	40.6	46.1	10.9	2.3	0.0	0.0	100%
Making sound legal arguments	21.9	51.6	21.1	3.9	1.6	0.0	100%
Being knowledgeable about the facts of the case	27.3	44.5	21.9	5.5	0.8	0.0	100%
Being knowledgeable about the law	22.8	45.7	22.0	7.9	1.6	0.0	100%
Being knowledgeable about community resources	7.0	23.4	36.7	25.0	5.5	2.3	100%
Providing timely discovery	20.5	44.1	24.4	5.5	2.4	3.1	100%
Calling witnesses	19.7	45.7	26.8	6.3	0.8	0.8	100%
Direct examination	18.4	47.2	29.6	4.0	0.0	0.8	100%
Cross examination	16.7	42.9	31.0		0.8	0.8	100%
Motion practices	12.7	38.1	31.7	7.9	3.2	6.3	100%
Trial briefs	6.3	27.0	27.0	10.3	5.6	23.8	100%

Table 20
Satisfaction With Performance of Defense Attorneys
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=125-128)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Not Applicable	Total
Predisposition advocacy	22.8	52.8	19.7	4.7	0.0	0.0	100%
Postdisposition advocacy	20.5	50.4	22.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	100%
Conferring with child clients	18.9	44.1	26.8	7.9	0.0	2.4	100%
Visiting child clients	12.6	26.0	34.6	13.4	4.7	8.7	100%
Appearing for scheduled hearings	22.7	48.4	23.4	5.5	0.0	0.0	100%
Making sound legal arguments	14.8	48.4	31.3	5.5	0.0	0.0	100%
Being knowledgeable about the facts of the case	21.9	57.8	17.2	3.1	0.0	0.0	100%
Being knowledgeable about the law	16.4	53.1	25.8	4.7	0.0	0.0	100%
Being knowledgeable about community resources	9.4	36.2	33.1	19.7	1.6	0.0	100%
Providing timely discovery	10.2	35.4	40.9	3.1	2.4	7.9	100%
Calling witnesses	13.5	48.4	32.5	3.2	1.6	0.8	100%
Direct examination	15.1	51.6	29.4	2.4	0.8	0.8	100%
Cross examination	12.7	53.2	27.0	5.6	0.8	0.8	100%
Motion practices	10.4	40.0	34.4	7.2		4.8	100%
Trial briefs	4.0	27.0	32.5	8.7	6.3	21.4	100%

Table 21
Severity of Problem With Continuances and Delays by Frequency of Getting Through the Day's Calendar to the Judicial Officers' Satisfaction
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=130)

	Always or Nearly Always	Often	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never or Rarely	Total
Not a problem	47.8	29.4	8.3	0.0	14.3	33.8
Minor problem	40.3	50.0	41.7	20.0	42.9	41.5
Moderate problem	11.9	17.6	41.7	80.0	28.6	22.3
Major problem	0.0	2.9	8.3	0.0	14.3	2.3
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 22
Causes of Hearing Delays in Uncontested Matters
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=130)

	Count	Percent
Attorney not ready	58	17.0
Other reports, persons, or information not available	55	16.1
Youth not present	42	12.3
Probation report not available or filed on time	41	12.0
Evaluation reports not available or filed on time	38	11.1
Lack of or improper notice	29	8.5
Parent not present	27	7.9
Hearings need more than allocated time	24	7.0
Attorney not present	24	7.0
Probation not present	3	0.9
Did not check any	3	2.3

Note: Percentages may not total 100 because respondents were asked to check all that applied.

Table 23
Causes of Hearing Delays in Contested Matters, or Trials
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=130)

	Count	Percent
Evidentiary information or witness not available	87	26.0
Attorney not ready	68	20.4
Other reports, persons, or information not available	51	15.3
Hearing needs more than allocated time	34	10.2
Youth not present	26	7.8
Evaluation reports not available or filed on time	25	7.5
Probation report not available or filed on time	17	5.1
Parent not present	9	2.7
Attorney not present	8	2.4
Lack of or improper notice	7	2.1
Did not check any	6	4.6
Probation not present	2	0.6

Note: Percentages may not total 100 because respondents were asked to check all that applied.

Table 24
Satisfaction With Sanctions and Services Options
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=122–123)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Option not available	Total
Sanctions for low risk youth	10.6	43.9	23.6	17.1	4.9	0.0	100%
Sanctions for intermediate risk youth	8.1	35.0	28.5	24.4	4.1	0.0	100%
Sanctions for high risk youth	8.9	30.9	23.6	26.8	9.8	0.0	100%
Services for low risk youth	6.6	35.2	27.9	23.0	6.6	0.8	100%
Services for intermediate risk youth	4.1	30.1	26.0	34.1	5.7	0.0	100%
Services for high risk youth	6.5	25.2	20.3	29.3	18.7	0.0	100%

Table 25
Satisfaction With Performance of Youth Under Court-Ordered Informal Probation or DEJ
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=127)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Do not Receive Information	Total
Recidivism	6.3	44.1	33.1	7.9	0.8	2.4	100%
Educational progress or improvement	3.1	40.9	35.4	12.6	0.0	2.4	100%
Mental health improvement	3.1	29.9	41.7	15.7	0.0	3.9	100%
Substance abuse improvement	3.9	34.6	33.9	16.5	2.4	3.1	100%
Payment of restitution	5.5	40.2	33.9	8.7	3.9	2.4	100%
Completion of community service	11.0	48.8	29.9	1.6	0.0	3.1	100%

Table 26
Satisfaction With Performance of Youth Under Probation With Wardship
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=121–122)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Do not Receive Information	Total
Recidivism	3.3	31.1	36.1	26.2	0.8	2.5	100%
Educational progress or improvement	3.3	27.9	45.9	19.7	1.6	1.6	100%
Mental health improvement	2.5	24.8	46.3	24.0	0.8	1.7	100%
Substance abuse improvement	2.5	25.5	33.1	25.6	1.7	1.7	100%
Payment of restitution	5.8	25.5	38.0	14.0	5.0	1.7	100%
Completion of community service	9.9	55.4	25.6	6.6	0.0	2.5	100%

Table 27
Satisfaction With Performance of Youth Under Intensive Supervision or Electronic Monitoring as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=101–102)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Do not Receive Information	Total
Recidivism	6.9	40.6	33.7	15.8	0.0	3.0	100%
Educational progress or improvement	5.9	36.3	35.3	19.6	0.0	2.9	100%
Mental health improvement	2.9	24.5	46.1	21.6	1.0	3.9	100%
Substance abuse improvement	3.9	35.3	33.3	22.5	1.0	3.9	100%
Payment of restitution	6.9	31.7	39.6	13.9	2.0	5.9	100%
Completion of community service	9.8	41.2	33.3	7.8	1.0	6.9	100%

Table 28
Satisfaction With Performance of Youth in a Camp, Ranch, or Private Placement (in California) as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=110–111)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Do not Receive Information	Total
Recidivism	3.6	30.9	37.3	21.8	1.8	4.5	100%
Educational progress or improvement	6.3	39.6	27.9	18.0	3.6	4.5	100%
Mental health improvement	2.7	30.6	39.6	18.0	4.5	4.5	100%
Substance abuse improvement	4.5	37.8	29.7	20.7	2.7	4.5	100%
Payment of restitution	1.8	31.5	41.4	15.3	2.7	7.2	100%
Completion of community service	3.6	35.1	37.8	10.8	0.9	11.7	100%

Table 29
Satisfaction With Performance of Youth at CDCR, DJJ Facilities
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=94–96)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Do not Receive Information	Total
Recidivism	0.0	12.5	28.1	12.5	5.2	41.7	100%
Educational progress or improvement	0.0	13.7	37.9	10.5	7.4	30.5	100%
Mental health improvement	0.0	9.5	32.6	13.7	10.5	33.7	100%
Substance abuse improvement	0.0	11.6	34.7	13.7	8.4	31.6	100%
Payment of restitution	1.1	12.8	34.0	7.4	7.4	37.2	100%
Completion of community service	0.0	7.4	31.6	7.4	6.3	47.4	100%

Table 30
Satisfaction With Supervision Programs
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=117–125)

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Do not Receive Information	Total
Restorative justice-focused programs	5.0	24.4	18.5	1.7	0.8	49.6	100%
Intensive supervision	10.7	43.4	20.5	5.7	0.8	18.9	100%
Day reporting centers	4.9	22.1	20.5	3.3	0.8	48.4	100%
Day treatment centers	1.7	20.0	25.8	3.3	0.8	48.3	100%
House arrest	8.0	39.2	30.4	7.2	3.2	12.0	100%
Short stay in juvenile hall	12.0	52.0	26.4	6.4	1.6	1.6	100%
Foster homes	4.9	30.9	43.1	8.9	2.4	9.8	100%
Group homes	4.0	39.5	40.3	11.3	3.2	1.6	100%
Residential treatment facilities	6.6	40.2	31.1	9.0	3.3	9.8	100%
Camps	10.4	37.6	20.0	9.6	1.6	20.8	100%
Ranches	6.6	31.1	16.4	6.6	1.6	37.7	100%
CDCR, DJJ facilities	0.9	18.8	36.8	15.4	12.0	16.2	100%

Table 31
Youth Who are Difficult to Match With Appropriate Supervision, Treatment, and Placements as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=130)

	Count	Percent
Youth with mental health issues	95	12.6
Beyond control youth	76	10.1
Developmentally delayed youth	72	9.5
Other	68	9.0
Runaways	62	8.2
High risk/low need youth	61	8.1
Youth with troubled home lives	53	7.0
Very young children	50	6.6
Youth with sex crime backgrounds	47	6.2
Youth with arson backgrounds	43	5.7
Pregnant girls	28	3.7
Girls	25	3.3
Youth with violent backgrounds	22	2.9
Gang youth	18	2.4
Low risk youthful offenders	17	2.2
Native American youth	12	1.6
Did not check any	7	0.9

Note: Percentages may not total 100 because respondents were asked to check all that applied.

Table 32
Current Level of Court-Stakeholder Meetings in Which Judicial Officers Are Involved as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=130)

	Count	Percent
Meet on an as-needed basis	58	43.9
Meet regularly	55	41.7
Never or rarely meet	19	14.4
Did not check any	3	2.3

Note: Percentages may not total 100 because respondents were asked to check all that applied.

Table 33
Topics Discussed at Court-Stakeholder Meetings as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=130)

	Count	Percent
Procedure and policy	102	47.0
Supervision, treatment, and placement issues	96	44.2
Other	19	8.8
Did not check any	18	13.8

Note: Percentages may not total 100 because respondents were asked to check all that applied.

Table 34
Beliefs About Collaboration Activities
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=108–121)

	Should Happen More Often	Should Stay As Is	Should Happen Less Often	Total
Meetings of stakeholders with courts' participation	33.9	64.5	1.7	100%
Meetings of stakeholders without the courts	34.3	61.1	4.6	100%
Court collaborating with community	52.9	42.9	4.2	100%
Other agencies collaborating with the community	51.8	46.4	1.8	100%
Court-probation cross training/briefings on procedures and policies	50.0	46.6	3.4	100%
Training/briefing the court on treatment options	67.8	30.6	1.7	100%
Training/briefing the court on placement options	68.3	30.0	1.7	100%

Table 35
Quality of Working Relationship With Juvenile Justice Stakeholders
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=122–126)

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	No Working Relationship	Total
Probation	46.0	37.3	11.9	4.0	0.8	0.0	100%
Public Defender's Office	31.2	48.0	12.8	5.6	0.8	1.6	100%
Alternate Public Defender's Office	20.5	36.1	12.3	1.6	0.0	29.5	100%
District Attorney's Office	33.3	47.6	15.1	4.0	0.0	0.0	100%
County Mental Health	12.7	23.8	38.1	14.3	7.1	4.0	100%
Child Welfare	17.6	36.0	28.0	11.2	2.4	4.8	100%
Juvenile Hall management	31.2	34.4	18.4	7.2	0.8	8.0	100%
Camps and Ranches management	16.9	29.0	22.6	8.1	0.8	22.6	100%

Table 36
Quality of Working Relationship With Other Stakeholders
as Reported by Judicial Officers (N=122–124)

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	Varies Too Much to Say	No Working Relationship	Total
Law enforcement	21.3	47.5	17.2	4.1	0.0	4.9	4.9	100%
School districts	13.7	33.1	27.4	14.5	3.2	4.0	4.0	100%
Substance abuse service providers	10.6	44.7	28.5	7.3	2.4	2.4	4.1	100%
Domestic violence service providers	4.9	29.5	30.3	12.3	2.5	4.9	15.6	100%

Table 37
Agreement with System Improvement Needs
As Reported by Judicial Officers (N=124–125)

	Agree Strongly	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Mean	Standard Deviation
More time for hearings	27.2	23.2	30.4	12.0	4.8	100%	3.5	1.3
More time for prehearing preparation	23.2	26.4	28.8	13.6	4.0	100%	3.4	1.3
More judicial positions	40.8	20.8	22.4	9.6	4.8	100%	3.8	1.3
More research attorneys	18.4	21.6	37.6	15.2	5.6	100%	3.3	1.2
More case managers	20.2	21.0	33.9	14.5	4.8	100%	3.2	1.4
More probation officers	49.6	28.0	16.0	4.0	0.8	100%	4.2	1.1
Improving quality of probation reports	27.0	19.0	32.0	18.0	2.0	100%	3.5	1.2
Improving timeliness of probation reports	21.0	24.0	30.0	18.0	3.0	100%	3.3	1.3
Improving attorney attendance or performance	10.0	28.0	41.0	16.0	2.0	100%	3.2	1.1
Access to victim-offender mediation	14.0	31.0	40.0	10.0	3.0	100%	3.4	1.1
Access to family group conferencing	19.0	33.0	37.0	10.0	1.0	100%	3.6	1.0
Access to court volunteers	19.0	30.0	37.0	9.0	2.0	100%	3.4	1.2
Access to juvenile drug court	20.0	22.0	35.0	15.0	6.0	100%	3.3	1.2
Access to juvenile mental health court	32.0	19.0	35.0	7.0	2.0	100%	3.6	1.3
Access to juvenile traffic court	8.0	6.0	54.0	22.0	10.0	100%	2.8	1.0
Access to truancy court	12.9	12.1	49.2	15.3	8.1	100%	3.0	1.2
Access to youth/peer court	12.8	12.8	48.0	16.0	8.8	100%	3.0	1.1
Access to same or next day Spanish interpreters	10.4	13.6	40.8	20.0	13.6	100%	2.8	1.2
Access to same or next day interpreters for other languages	14.5	21.0	32.3	22.6	8.9	100%	3.1	1.2
Improvements in juvenile custody options	40.8	28.8	24.0	4.0	0.8	100%	4.0	1.1
Improvements in probation-supervised services	44.8	36.0	22.4	3.2	0.0	100%	4.1	1.0
Availability of victim and restitution services	20.0	30.4	34.4	5.6	1.6	100%	3.6	1.1
More time/opportunity to collaborate with probation and other stakeholders	17.6	28.0	32.8	12.8	4.0	100%	3.4	1.2
More time/opportunity to meet with community members	17.6	31.5	32.8	16.0	3.2	100%	3.3	1.2
More time/opportunity to visit placements	26.6	29.0	24.2	11.3	4.0	100%	3.6	1.2
Improvements in postdisposition reports	15.2	29.6	36.8	14.4	2.4	100%	3.4	1.1
Improvements in postdisposition review hearings	13.6	24.8	43.2	13.6	3.2	100%	3.3	1.1

Note: For means, Strongly Agree=5, Agree=4, Neither=3, Disagree=2, Strongly Disagree=1

Administrative Office of the Courts

Hon. Ronald M. George
Chief Justice of California and Chair of the Judicial Council

William C. Vickrey
Administrative Director of the Courts

Ronald G. Overholt
Chief Deputy Director

Diane Nunn
Director, Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Charlene Depner
Assistant Division Director, Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Lee Morhar
Assistant Division Director, Center for Families, Children & the Courts

Authorship

Iona Mara-Drita (lead author)
Senior Research Analyst

Amy Bacharach
Research Analyst

Audrey Fancy
Supervising Attorney

LaRon Hogg-Haught
Associate Attorney

Kimberly Tyda
Research Analyst

Assistance

Jens Zeschky
Administrative Coordinator



CFCC generates and distributes research-based information that has promise for informing the work of the courts in California and nationwide. To learn more about its work and to see more *Research Updates*, visit www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/.

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Sixth Floor
San Francisco, California 94102-3688
E-mail: cfcc@jud.ca.gov
Phone: 415-865-7739