

Probation Review Guidebook

March 2011

Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps

Prepared by:

Janet K. Wiig and John A. Tuell
Co-Directors, Models for Change Initiative
Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps

The authors would like to acknowledge members of the Jefferson Parish Probation Management Team whose work contributed so much to the Jefferson Parish Probation Review and the creation of this guidebook. Those members, from Jefferson Parish Juvenile Services, are:

Roy L. Juncker, Jr., Director
Christopher J. Trosclair, Assistant Director
John S. Ryals, Jr., Evaluation/Treatment Manager
Steve Cabal, Probation Manager
Matthew J. Villio, Models for Change Coordinator

The preparation of this document was supported by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation through its *Models for Change* initiative. Anyone may use the content of this publication, unchanged and in the whole, for redistribution, commercial and non-commercial. For such use, you must identify the material with credit to the Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps by reprinting the copyright notice below.

© Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps
March 2011



ModelsforChange
Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice

Models for Change

Models for Change is an effort to create successful and replicable models of juvenile justice reform through targeted investments in key states, with core support from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. Models for Change seeks to accelerate progress toward a more effective, fair, and developmentally sound juvenile justice system that holds young people accountable for their actions, provides for their rehabilitation, protects them from harm, increases their life chances, and manages the risk they pose to themselves and to the public. The initiative is underway in Illinois, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, and Washington and, through action networks focusing on key issues, in California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Texas, and Wisconsin.

Probation Review Guidebook¹

Background

The genesis for this guidebook was the probation review work undertaken in Jefferson Parish, LA as part of the work in the four core states associated with *Models for Change: Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice* and in Los Angeles County, CA under a Child Welfare League of America contract with the Los Angeles County Auditor-Controller's Office. In both of those jurisdictions, over a period of several months, there was a review of programs and operations to support the goals of the probation departments, culminating in reports of findings and recommendations for improvements to the respective departments. A carefully tailored work plan was used to direct the reviews in each instance but the core elements of the plan were essentially the same and included:

- A. Program Planning and Implementation
- B. Best Practices and Benchmarking
- C. Performance Measurement and Client Outcomes
- D. Intra- and Interagency Work Processes²

As the review work progressed in Jefferson Parish, the Models for Change lead entity for Louisiana, the Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, School of Public Health, and the MacArthur Foundation endorsed the development of a guidebook to assist other jurisdictions that were considering whether to undertake a probation review. They asked the principals who conducted the reviews in Jefferson Parish and Los Angeles County, Janet Wiig and John Tuell, to prepare this guidebook for that purpose.

Why Undertake a Probation Review?

Probation departments, like a number of other longstanding agencies, function within a framework of statutes, policies and practices that were built up over the course of many years. Typically, there has been little time or effort to reflect on that framework to determine how well it is working and whether it functions in a manner that is optimal. Further, a culture of doing things "the way we've always done them" often permeates daily operations despite changes that may be designed to improve practices.

A probation review is an exciting opportunity for the principals involved in the management and day-to-day operation of a probation department to assess how they are doing in relation to their goals and objectives. It is an opportunity to enhance practice by making sure that policies and procedures, corresponding training, departmental management, and supervision of probationers are all lined up to reflect best practices.

The auspices for undertaking a review can be internal or external. In the case of the Los Angeles work, the local governing body, the Board of Supervisors, ordered a program audit of the probation department. In Jefferson Parish, it was the department director himself who requested the review. This request set the stage for an internal self study as opposed to an external review or audit. The character of the review and the commitment to its concomitant recommendations is enhanced by its internal auspices or when it is the department itself that initiates the review. This is not to say that there is

-
1. The material in this guidebook is drawn heavily from the Jefferson Parish Probation Review Report (May 2010) including excerpts of language used to describe the process for the conduct of the review.
 2. It should be noted that a court review was undertaken in the **Newton County Juvenile Court, Georgia** using the approach described in this probation review guidebook and carried out through a contract funded by the **Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)**. The elements of the court review were slightly different as follows: Element A. Court Operations and Practice; Element B. Collect and Aggregate Performance Measures and Data; Element C. Practices and Intervention Strategies on School-Based Referrals; and Element D. Interagency Approaches for Multisystem Youth. Just as in Jefferson Parish probation, a report of the review's findings and recommendations was prepared and presented to the leadership in Newton County Juvenile Court. The report is being used to implement recommendations for the improved handling and improved outcomes for youth who appear before the Court.

no value in undertaking a review that is externally generated, but the character of the departmental participation in and the management of the review is potentially richer when the review is internally generated.

Participation—Getting the Right Players at the Table

The probation review must be organized and carried out by specifically designated individuals whether they are outside consultants as in the case of both the Jefferson Parish³ and the Los Angeles County reviews or individuals from within the jurisdiction of the review. For example, a probation department could designate one of its own employees with solid organizational, management, and analytical skills to develop and manage a work plan for the review or it could call on another organization within its jurisdiction that has personnel with a capacity to conduct organizational development activities. Whoever performs this function, it is critical that the person(s) be given both the time and the authority to keep the work plan and participants moving.

The probation review team in Jefferson Parish provides an excellent example of the leadership necessary to carry out a probation review. The team was made up of the department director, assistant director, probation manager, treatment coordinator, Models for Change coordinator, and the front-line supervisors. The enduring presence of the department's director was critical since he requested the review in the first instance and made clear to the whole department that the review was an important priority for their time and attention. The internal probation review team was involved in the

development of the work plan with the outside consultants and helped to carry out each of its activities and assure that both the internal and external personnel were available to participate in the various activities that constituted the review. The team also reviewed the preliminary findings, provided additional feedback to supplement the findings, and reviewed the draft of the final report of the findings and recommendations.

It is important to have a good balance of departmental personnel, outside agency personnel, and the consumers of the department's services involved in the review activities. In Jefferson Parish, all of the department's personnel participated in multiple activities involved in the review. Juvenile court judges, advocates, juveniles, parents, and several county and provider agencies also participated in the review, sharing their experiences regarding the probation department's performance. The specifics of each group's participation will be described further in this guidebook's section on methodologies.

Design and Work Plan

The design of the review may best be accomplished in discussions with the probation leadership regarding the most critical issues that confront a department. A review may also be prompted by concerns that have been raised in the broader community about a department's functioning or the handling of a particular high-profile case. Whatever the impetus, it is important that time be taken to "brainstorm the issues" and determine the priorities for review. Consideration should be given to the amount of time a jurisdiction has to undertake a review and what personnel resources will be available to organize and lead the review.

3. The Jefferson Parish Probation Review was carried out by two principal consultants from the MacArthur Foundation National Resource Bank, John Tuell and Janet Wiig (from Child Welfare League of America [CWLA] at the time of the review and now with Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps), aided by four other Resource Bank member consultants: Shauna Epps from the Center for Children's Law and Policy, Ned Loughran from the Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators, Gina Vincent from the National Youth Screening and Assessment Project, and Sorrel Concodora from CWLA at the time of the review and now with Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps.

Once the issues have been determined, a statement of work should be developed that:

- describes the jurisdiction in which the review is to occur,
- indicates the impetus for the review,
- describes the project scope (including the timeframe for completion and the resources to be used in the review),
- identifies the goals, and
- outlines the issues and sets them into a framework of elements.

As stated earlier, in both Jefferson Parish and Los Angeles County, the issues for review were organized into four elements:

- A. Program Planning and Implementation
- B. Best Practices and Benchmarking
- C. Performance Measurement and Client Outcomes
- D. Intra- and Interagency Work Processes

Within each of the elements, the statement of work should describe the importance of the particular element to the jurisdiction, the questions that are to be answered and the methods that are to be used. For example, in Jefferson Parish, under the element C., Performance Measurement and Client Outcomes, it was recognized that Jefferson Parish had previously addressed performance measurement through implementation of a revised performance-based contracting process. This reform provided for the individual monitoring of achievement of outcomes by the contractor in collaboration with the Jefferson Parish Department of Juvenile Services. The focus of this element for the probation review, however, was worker performance, the completion of particular case processes, and setting and measuring client outcomes.

The description of this element also stated the questions that were to be answered and the methods that would be used to complete the review of performance measurement and client outcomes:

- What performance measures exist presently for the completion of specific case processes (e.g. meetings with probationers, timely completion of reports)?
- What measures exist for the achievement of successful client outcomes?
- What measures exist for the case assignment and caseload standards?
- Has the Department clearly articulated a set of client outcomes?
- Do client outcomes drive probation practice?
- Do probation officers know what outcomes they are seeking in their work with probationers?
- How are client outcomes identified in the individual case? intermediate and long-term outcomes?

Upon articulation of the questions, the work plan identified the methods by which these questions would be explored and examined. The example that follows is also from the Jefferson Parish review:

Method C.1 Identify Performance Measures, Focused Worker Performance, and Case Processes

The project team will review documents (forms, reports, studies) and it will interview personnel regarding the existence of performance measures. Building on that data, it will draw from national resources and work with the department to further develop performance measures and a system for tracking them.

Method C.2 Develop Client Outcomes and Measurement

The project team will conduct a review of the literature on client outcomes for juvenile probationers including the research that is available on incremental improvements or intermediate outcomes. It will work with senior personnel and line probation

officers to develop a listing of desired client outcomes and measures, establish baseline data, and identify data sources for tracking them. It will also help develop a methodology for identification and achievement of individual case outcomes by matching outcome measures to specific units of service internal and external to the department.

Finally, the work plan should be developed with specificity to effectively guide the work over the course of the review. The work plan should define a timed schedule, indicate who is to be involved in each of the activities, and identify any anticipated products. The actual work plan document will include each of the elements and their corresponding methods; a calendar to indicate the start and completion of each element; persons involved; and a section for comments to give additional guidance, note existing documents, and specify particular actions. The Jefferson Parish work plan provides an illustration in Appendix A.

Methodology

A critical part of the methodology is the decision as to what activities will be used to answer the review's questions and ultimately develop recommendations for any needed improvements to the probation department's policies and practice. This should be accomplished by the individuals charged with organizing and carrying out the review along with the leadership or probation review team. Careful consideration of the activities by these persons not only assures access to the people or documents needed for the particular activities, but also encourages ideas about the best way to conduct the review. Following are methods that can be used to examine the four elements of the review that constituted the Jefferson Parish probation review.

Document Review

The probation review team can collect the various statistical reports, program descriptions and reports, and probation

practice forms for a review of the mission, vision, strategies, policies, and procedures of the probation department. It is important to direct significant attention to an analysis of the probation officer's manual since this should be one of the best source documents to guide the probation work on a day-to-day basis. A review of this document should focus on its strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement. The focus on all documents should be an exercise to determine how well the documents mirror the actual practice and the identified best practices for probation services.

Key Stakeholder Interviews

Interviews with key stakeholders should be held early in the review process to not only examine the issues identified in the elements of the review process, but also to identify additional issues and areas that are considered important by people outside of the probation department. These key stakeholders, personnel from outside of the department, should be identified in concert with the probation review team. This identification process provides a finding in and of itself in that it shows who the department's leadership believes is important to the examination and functioning of the department as that was the instruction provided to the leadership to identify the key stakeholders. It may also be important to get a perspective from individuals outside the department as to who should constitute the key stakeholder group to provide an additional element of objectivity to this particular activity.

Typical of individuals who would be considered key stakeholders are representatives of the related public entities such as judges, police, children's services, court administration, mental health, substance abuse, prosecutor, defense counsel, and schools. Another important group of key stakeholders are the private providers, the agency directors, therapists, and others who interface regularly with the probation department.

A questionnaire should be used to conduct the interviews. This permits the inquiry to be consistently directed to the critical issues identified in the review elements and to ensure

consistency in the information that it is gathered. Appendix B contains a list of questions to interview key stakeholders.

Employee Survey

The use of an employee survey presents a wonderful opportunity to get input from the probation staff that conducts the day-to-day activities of the probation department. While there are other structured activities to elicit this group's analysis and recommendations which are discussed in methods following, an employee survey allows for the examination of many different areas of current practice and the anonymous report of opinions, concerns, ideas, and recommendations.

Minimally, it is recommended that an electronic survey of employees include probation officers and their supervisors. The survey can be comprised of closed-ended questions, asking respondents to agree or disagree with statements, followed by open-ended questions. The scale for responding to the closed-ended questions can include a range of responses such as: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, and do not know. Appendix C is the employee survey that was used in Jefferson Parish. The 76 closed-ended questions were organized with the following categories:

- Pre-disposition investigations
- Case supervision
- Departmental Management and Supervision
- Resources and Service Delivery
- Best Practices
- Client Outcomes
- Inter-agency Relationships

The open-ended questions (Appendix D) called for the respondents to identify particular areas that could be improved. These areas included delivery of services to probationers, operations of the department, and the work experience of the probation officers. All of the survey questions were developed

in concert with the probation review team. The participants in the survey are not identified with their responses and the open-ended questions should be reported in summary manner with care to not include anything that would identify the survey respondent.

Process Mapping

A Process mapping exercise with a select group of probation officers is a good way to analyze interfaces, handoffs, bottlenecks, and other case flow issues in the handling of cases internally in a department. This should include a discussion of what information is available at various decision making points. Process mapping can also be conducted with a group of supervisors and line probation staff to identify critical issues with interagency work processes. These mapping processes can supplement meetings of outside agencies with the probation review team to gain the agencies' perspectives on interagency work processes.

Meetings with Department Director and Assistant Director

Whether the probation review is conducted using outside consultants or individuals within the department charged with organizing and carrying out all the review activities, it is important for those individuals to meet regularly with the probation department director and assistant director. These meetings should include discussion on the progress of the probation review, the directors' expectations of the review, and their suggestions for addressing many of the findings as the probation review progresses. This provides the opportunity for any needed remedial actions on the part of management without waiting for the probation review report to be completed. The draft report should be presented to the director for input prior to its final publication.

Probation Review Team Meetings

The probation review team should meet to discuss and plan for any on-site visits that are to be made to carry out review

activities. The team should also plan specific review activities, analyze data on probation services and programs, hear and discuss findings from the probation review, and discuss ideas for improvements based on those findings.

Group Interviews

Probation Officers

If the review is conducted by outside consultants, an important additional method to gain information from the probation officers, and to gain the trust that their participation in the review is a meaningful activity, is to extend an open invitation to all probation officers in the Department to meet with the consultants without any of the probation supervisors or managers present. The purpose of the meeting is to share results of the employee survey and to elicit more information, building on the survey responses. It should be an open meeting to encourage the probation officers to add whatever information they believe is pertinent to the probation review. They can offer their critique of the whole probation operation along with specific ideas for potential improvements.

Outside Agencies

Whether the probation review is conducted using outside consultants or individuals within the department charged with organizing and carrying out all the review activities, it is important to meet with outside agencies to determine what their experience has been working with the probation department on individual cases. Invitations should be sent to entities such as law enforcement, children's services, state office for juvenile justice, district attorney, juvenile court administration, mental health and substance abuse providers, and community-based service providers. The review team should work with a set of questions focused on interactions or transactions with the department and interagency work processes (see Appendix E for a list of sample questions).

Focus Groups

The conduct of focus groups is a useful method for obtaining the input of the consumers of probation services, parents and juveniles. In Jefferson Parish, focus groups were conducted on four separate occasions involving 1 group for parents and 1 group for juveniles each time. The Department was asked to conduct a random sample of 24 parent-juvenile pairs for each of the four dates and send invitations to each family. The invitation contained a description of the focus group activity and its purpose, and it offered an incentive (in this instance, a \$25 Target gift card), one each for the parent and the juvenile who elected to participate. The focus group discussions should be guided by a set of questions for the parents (see Appendix F for sample questions) and a set of questions for the juveniles (see Appendix G for sample questions).

Best Practice Analysis

The best practice analysis of a probation department's programs and practices involves an analysis of its decision making processes, a review of its data, and an examination of its case handling in some specific arenas, all in regard to its own internal programs. A review of the screening and assessment process should also be a part of best practice analysis. This should include recommendations for tools that would be most appropriate in the participating jurisdiction.

The review of a department's data can identify the need for more data development in order to be able to measure the effectiveness of its practices in identified program areas. A special focus on key target populations can underscore needs for more data development as the review team works to examine how a particular population could be better served.

An examination of the criteria and methodology for other programs that are review priorities can also be undertaken to determine how they measure against what is known about best practices in a particular program arena. Finally, another area for best practice analysis includes an examination of the

decision making processes between the probation department and other agencies to develop and incorporate best practices. In Jefferson Parish, this took the form of examining the decision-making processes between the Department and the Office of Juvenile Justice as the two entities worked together to make placement decisions.

Performance Measures and Outcomes Development

The examination of performance measures and outcomes is a critical piece of a probation review. To determine how performance of probation officers is measured, the review team should first meet to identify what indicators are used to measure probation officer performance of case processes. Next an exercise can be conducted with a group of probation officers and supervisors to determine:

- what are the desired outcomes for probationers,
- what factors affect the achievement of those outcomes, and
- what is used to measure the achievement of outcomes.

After these exercises are completed, a subsequent meeting can be held with the review team to conduct an exercise to identify how the performance indicators relate to the achievement of client outcomes.

The Probation Review Elements

Element A: Program Planning and Implementation

The review of program planning and implementation focuses on a probation department's policies, procedures, and operations, as well as how probation practice is carried out as reflected in the feedback from probation officers, stakeholders, and consumers. This review element begins with a careful analysis

of the policies and procedures. This is followed by descriptions of a department's operations and covers training, management practices, and actual probation practices. Probation practices include probation supervision, service delivery to probationers and the various views held about probation practices.

Issues

Some of the key issues in this review element may be:

- whether the probation manual is an effective guide to daily practice;
- how management practices contribute to the overall functioning of a department;
- how the design and delivery of training support effective probation practices;
- whether the probation supervision is effectively carried out and whether services to probationers are effectively delivered

Data Sources and Resources

To determine whether the probation manual is an effective guide to daily practice, the review team needs to analyze it step by step and elicit feedback from its users. The manual should serve as the foundation document to guide the probation officers' work. It should detail the basic functions of the probation officers and direct them to carry out their roles and responsibilities for probation supervision and treatment. In addition to the manual itself, sources of data to carry out the review include employee survey responses about the manual, key stakeholders' views of probation officers' daily functioning, and the views of supervisors and probation managers about the manual's utility. Authoritative resources should guide the manual review, including the statutory framework under which probation practices should function as these should be incorporated in the manual. Additionally, national guidelines from resources such as the American Probation and Parole Association and BARJ (Balance and Restorative Justice) principles can assist in this activity.

In the review of how management practices contribute to the overall functioning of a department, the examination of management practice should be based on the foundation (or best practice standard) that a department has in place 1) a carefully articulated mission and vision, 2) a clear set of strategies to achieve the mission and vision, and 3) corresponding policies and procedures that clearly direct and evaluate the staff in its performance. Both the managers and the probation officers are significant sources of information in the review of management practices. The management can be guided through self assessment and executive coaching to identify the strengths and weaknesses of its management practices. The employee survey responses are also a good source of data to evaluate the management practices as well as group interviews with probation officers and supervisors. Authoritative resources from literature reviews on management practice can also serve to illustrate effective management practices.

Sources for the review of the design and delivery of training to support probation practices should include a complete review of the training curriculum, both pre-service and in-service and all corresponding training materials. The training curriculum should encompass the material contained in the probation manual. It should help the probation officer to understand his/her role and the tools that need to be employed to effectively carry out that role. The probation officers themselves are the best source to identify what are the training strengths and weaknesses and this can be accomplished through a review of the employee survey responses and in conversation with the probation officers. Authoritative sources for training of probation officers include:

- American Probation and Parole Association's (APPA) whose mission is the development and delivery of training programs to enhance its constituents'

knowledge and skills for providing more effective community-based probation and parole services. While the majority of emphasis has historically leaned toward adult corrections, the APPA has a myriad of grant-funded projects that produce numerous training programs on a variety of topics of relevance to the community supervision field. These trainings are delivered in traditional classroom settings or via various distance learning technologies.⁴

- EPICS, out of the Center for Criminal Justice Research, School of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati is a training curriculum for Effective Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS). Based on research showing that supervision is based more on court mandates than assessments, this training is built on principles of effective supervision. The three main principles are risk, need, and responsivity. Differential supervision is applied using these principles, probation officers follow a structured approach in their interaction with offenders, and a cognitive-behavioral model is employed. (Latessa, 2010; Smith & Latessa, 2011).
- National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges whose publication, *Delinquency Prevention Guidelines: Improving Court Practice in Juvenile Delinquency Cases*, is a guide for juvenile delinquency court judges and juvenile delinquency system professionals. Specifically, in Chapter XI: Probation and Parole Violations (pp. 193–198), valuable guidance and instruction are provided for probation and court staff, designed to enhance practice and outcomes (NCJFCJ).

Whether the probation supervision is effectively carried out and whether services to probationers are effectively delivered can be based on feedback gained from a variety of sources. These sources include the employee survey, stakeholder

4. APPA sponsored training events can be accessed at: http://www.appa-net.org/eweb/DynamicPage.aspx?WebCode=1A_Introduction (click Training tab)

meetings and interviews, and focus groups with parents and probationers. This reflects a major effort contemplated by the review work plan, that is, to obtain staff and consumer feedback. Review in this arena can include an examination of the probation officer's role; assignment of cases and levels of supervision; and working conditions. The review of the actual delivery of services to probationers should include the capacity to deliver services; assessment and referral to services; resources and unmet needs of juveniles; and juveniles reporting of their probation experiences. Authoritative sources should include a department's own reports of its metrics for the delivery of services, covering not just the probation processes (completion of reports, number of contacts with probationers, etc.), but also its progress with the provision of treatment resources and achievement of intermediate outcomes.

Potential Findings and Recommendations

The findings and recommendations will be unique to each jurisdiction that undertakes a probation review but it is critical that the findings and recommendations support each other. In the program planning and implementation review element, a jurisdiction will likely find the greatest volume of findings and recommendations because the areas of examination are the foundation upon which probation practices stand. It is possible that a jurisdiction will find that, absent a recent update, it needs a significant overhaul of its manual, or that its probation officer roles and responsibilities are not as clear as they need to be, or that its training curriculum is in need of updates and revisions. The recommendations that flow from these findings should be specific and provide clear direction as to the next steps a department might take to improve its practices.

Element B: Best Practices and Benchmarking

The review of best practices and benchmarking involves an analysis of all programs and practices against a best practices standard. This should include the decision making processes and the handling of particular groups of probationers in specific programs. It also involves the development of a benchmark

system and the determination of a department's capacity for program and practice development.

Issues

Some of the key issues in this review element may be:

- whether decision making processes are clearly articulated, understood, and accompanied with corresponding tools
- how the methodology and performance for particular programs is supported by data and best practices
- how well a department understands and employs best practices and evidence-based practices
- whether benchmark goals and outcomes exist for a department's programs and practices

Data Sources and Resources

To determine whether decision making processes are clearly articulated, understood, and accompanied with corresponding tools, the review team should:

- undertake a file review of sample cases,
- analyze the department's use of assessment and other decision making tools, and
- consider the responses from the employee survey.

It should also consider how the organization is structured to make key decisions about probationers, that is, whether all of its probation officers should conduct assessments and make corresponding recommendations regarding individual probationers or whether this function should be performed in a separate assessment unit. Authoritative resources for this review area might be the ABA Joint Commission on Juvenile Justice Standards as well as a department's own reports of the effectiveness of its decision making and assessment practices.

How the methodology and performance for particular programs is supported by data and best practices can best be reviewed

by examining a department's own data sources and the literature on evidence-based practice. Data development and getting a data collection system in place is a challenge for most probation departments. This is a critical review component to enable and assure that data drives effective probation practice. The questions the review team must ask include 1) whether it has data about the characteristics of youths placed in particular programs and 2) whether it has data about the outcomes achieved by youths in each of the programs sufficient to be able to assess the effectiveness of its programs. If the answer to these questions is "no," then the review team needs to spend some time discussing what data development needs to take place and develop corresponding recommendations.

Determining how well a department understands and employs best practices and evidence-based practices can be accomplished by examining the responses to the employee survey and in group interviews with probation officers. It can also be determined with file reviews to assess how well assessments are tied to treatment and supervision recommendations. Another method of determination is through key stakeholder interviews to help identify what individuals outside of the department believe are the department's most promising programs and practices.

There are several indices to consider whether benchmark goals and outcomes exist for a department's programs and practices. The first consideration is whether a department has the data to inform itself about the programs and practices that are promising and effective. Next, the review team should consider whether the probation department has identified what performances of its probation staff and the department as a whole it wants to measure. The review team should consider whether, if the department has stated benchmarks, it has laid the foundation for effective measurement by establishing baselines and goals, and developed its internal and public reporting systems. Finally, another index of a department's commitment to benchmarking lies in its establishment of a performance-based contracting system for its contracted services. The department should have identified outputs

and outcomes for its program providers to help assure its commitment to best practices.

Potential Findings and Recommendations

Once again, the findings and recommendations will be unique to each jurisdiction, but in this arena of best practices and benchmarking there often will be improvements to be made because probation officers and managers are still challenging themselves to increase their use of evidence-based practice and establish solid benchmarks for the overall improvement of probation practices. Among the potential arenas for examination and improvement, it may be that a department needs to:

- examine its tools for decision making (e.g. assessment instruments, court reports, etc.),
- examine its criteria or methodology for the placement of youths in particular programs,
- undertake significant data development efforts so that it has the data to inform itself of its effectiveness, or
- construct a new or improved benchmarking system.

Element C: Performance Measurement and Client Outcomes

The achievement of successful outcomes for probationers should be the main business of any probation department and the gravitational point around which all of the probation officers' activities center." The achievement of successful outcomes depends on, first, a careful identification of what outcomes are sought, second, an examination and address of the factors that affect achievement, and third, the development of a measurement system to document achievement. The importance of the third item, or performance measurement, cannot be overstated because often what gets measured is what people value and where they focus their efforts." (CWLA, Los Angeles County Probation Program Audit report, p. 46)

Issues

Some of the key issues in this review element may be:

- whether a department is focused on the achievement of intermediate outcomes in addition to recidivism
- how a department measures worker performance
- whether a department has developed a clearly articulated set of client outcomes
- how worker performance and its measurement are related to desired outcomes

Data Sources and Resources

To determine whether a department is focused on the achievement of intermediate outcomes in addition to recidivism, the key sources of information will be its own internal performance reports, responses from the employee survey, and interviews with key stakeholders. While recidivism cannot be ignored since it relates to the public's expectation regarding the role of the system and public safety, there are a number of other factors that influence whether the juvenile commits additional offenses. In fact, intermediate outcomes (e.g. enrollment in school, paying restitution, entering into treatment) may be more directly related to the performance of the juvenile justice system (Thomas, NCJJ, 2006, p. 3 citing to Petersilia, 1993 and Dilulio, 1991).

Determining how a department measures worker performance can be accomplished by looking at the reporting measures it uses for overall departmental performance and by looking at the performance review instrument for probation officers. Often the performance indicators will focus primarily on the measurement of case processes (e.g. number of monthly contacts, timely completion of reports, other timely completion of forms, etc.). A related issue is consistency in the measurement of performance. This refers to whether the standards that constitute good performance are clear throughout a department and whether the performance measures are consistently applied by

each supervisor using tools that reflect those standards." Performance measures tell us where the organization is relative to its goals, how well the organization is doing, and point to things that can improve the organization's effectiveness. Ultimately, we measure to improve the performance." (Thomas, NCJJ, 2006, pp. 2–3)

Whether a department has a clearly articulated set of outcomes can be determined through the employee survey responses and in group interviews with supervisors and probation officers. A department may have in place several documents that identify desired outcomes for probationers in the individual service plans, probation conditions, and recommendations to the court. The key is to determine whether the probation officers themselves can articulate the outcomes they seek for probationers and then make sure that the documents or tools they use to direct their performance are integrated in terms of the articulated outcomes.

The probation review can utilize an exercise with the department managers and supervisors to determine how worker performance and its measurement are related to desired outcomes. The steps of that exercise are detailed as follows:

- 1) list the desired outcomes and all of the factors that affect achievement of those outcomes,
- 2) develop a list of probation officer actions that could relate to the achievement of those outcomes,
- 3) review the list of desired outcomes against the tools they use (e.g. individual service plans, probation conditions) to identify outcomes for individual probationers, and, finally,
- 4) review the department's performance reports and measures to determine how they relate to desired outcomes.

Potential Findings and Recommendations

In the performance measurement and client outcome review element, it is not uncommon to discover that there is ambiguity in the statements of desired outcomes and the measurement

of the probation officers in relation to the outcomes. Many probation departments are focused on process outcomes as opposed to client outcomes and their performance measurement systems are similarly focused. While it can be argued that it is desirable to have client outcomes drive performance, the probation review may reveal that is not the case. A department may find that it needs to revisit the construct of its whole performance measurement system. Further, the department may find that it needs to strengthen its articulation of desired client outcomes, focusing also on those intermediate outcomes whose achievement bears an important relationship to reduced recidivism.

Element D: Intra- and Interagency Work Processes

Work processes are major sets of interconnected activities through which decisions are made and services are delivered. In order to be effective, these processes must be well conceived, clearly articulated, and periodically monitored. Most often the work processes depend on the cooperation of many parts of the Department as well as outside organizations. Efforts to review these work processes will involve various professional roles inside a department, other public agencies, the Court, and private provider agencies.

Issues

Some of the key issues in this review element may be:

- How the case flow process functions within a department and whether key information is available at critical decision making points
- Whether the relationship with the Court is clear and functioning well in terms of roles and responsibilities
- How interagency processes function from the perspective of the department and the agencies and how linkages can be strengthened

- Whether ongoing forums exist to resolve issues between a department and other agencies

Data Sources and Resources

To determine how the case flow process functions within a department and whether key information is available at critical decision making points, it is useful to identify a select group of experienced probation officers to analyze the intra-agency case flow process. This can be accomplished using a mapping exercise modeled on the Cross Functional Process Map from Robert Damelio's book, *The Basics of Process Mapping*. Process mapping allows members of an organization to 1) analyze interfaces, handoffs, bottlenecks, and other case flow process issues; 2) identify information available at each point; 3) compliment on what works well; 4) identify any areas needing improvement; and 5) identify what performance measures should follow from the desired work processes (Damelio, 1996). The mapping useful to this review process consists of identifying probation officers' actions in performance of each of three functions (investigation, disposition, and supervision), the decisions to be made, and the resulting products. The probation officers can be divided into small groups of 3–5 for this exercise, with each group developing a map and a list of issues for consideration. This method maximizes opportunities to learn about the multiple perspectives of probation officers.

To determine whether the relationship with the Court is clear and functioning well in terms of roles and responsibilities, the best sources of data are the responses to the employee survey, group interviews with probation officers, and interviews with the judges who were a part of the key stakeholder group. Since this relationship is so important to the overall functioning of a department, a probation review is an excellent opportunity to reexamine the roles and responsibilities of the probation officers in relation to the court, the flow of paper and information between a department and the court, the comportment of both probation officers and judges in relation

to one another, and the level of satisfaction on the part of the department and the judges regarding the relationship.

How interagency processes function and how linkages with outside agencies, contractors, and community-based organizations can be strengthened should begin with a determination of the current effectiveness of interagency case flow processes. The data sources for this determination include key stakeholder interviews, meeting with outside agencies, employee survey responses, and meeting with supervisors and line staff. A mapping exercise for department staff is a useful tool to generate the data in each of three functional areas; investigation, disposition, and supervision (see Appendix H for sample mapping questions). Another tool that can be used to illustrate the functioning of interagency work processes is a sample list of questions for meeting with outside agencies (see Appendix E). The use of these two tools presents the opportunity for personnel inside and outside of a department to identify how the interagency linkages can be strengthened.

Whether ongoing forums exist to resolve issues between a department and other agencies is a critical question to determine. The character of the relationships between a department and other agencies is ever changing due to changes in law, policy, and practice affecting jointly and individually each of the entities. It is therefore critical that forums be in place to resolve problems and modify practices. A department should have in place open forums for broad communications (announcements, personnel and policy changes, etc.); representative committees that meet regularly to do problem solving, potential problem solving, and joint policy development; and interagency agreements to specify actions that are to take place on a regular basis between agencies (for information sharing, joint protocols, etc.). If these do not already exist, the probation review is a good opportunity to specify the need for their development.

Potential Findings and Recommendations

In the intra- and interagency work processes review element, a department may find that there are hidden problems in the relationships within and outside the agency. It may find that the review only serves to highlight those problems that were already known. Whichever is the case, the review presents a fresh opportunity to look at and improve these relationships. A department might find that there are unnecessary steps or paperwork in its interagency work processes that slow the process and frustrate its probation officers in the performance of their functions. Or, it might find things such as the referral process to outside agencies needs strengthening or the feedback from the providers regarding the treatment process is lacking. A department may recommend that its forums for resolution of ongoing issues, both internal and external, need to be strengthened in order to improve its intra- and interagency relationships.

Publication of Findings and Recommendations

Publication of the findings and recommendations of a department, and in what forums, should be in the sole discretion of the department's management.⁵ There is likely to be information in the report that the department will want to hold closely in order to accomplish its objectives because it is either embarrassing or identifies individual performances that should be protected. On the other hand, there is likely to be information that, if published, could assist the department to accomplish its recommendations for improvements. An Executive Summary can sometimes provide for a broader dissemination of the findings and recommendations because it can be written in a summary format that protects specific information. Further, it may be that excerpts of the report can

5. Noting the discretion of the department's management to share the results of the review with the public, in part or in the whole, relates to the situation in which the department itself has initiated the review. If the review was ordered by an outside agency, it will be incumbent upon that agency to decide how it is going to handle the publication of the review's findings and recommendations.

be shared in particular forums to which they relate without sharing the entire report. Whatever the decisions about the publication, the decisions should be considered carefully by a department's management to assure that the greatest benefit accrues from the ambitious undertaking of a probation review.

Implementation of Review Recommendations

Once the review has been completed and the report has been accepted by the probation department's management, it is time to turn a department's attention to the implementation of the report's recommendations. The first step is to gather the department personnel who are critical to the implementation of reform in the department. That group should consider the report in its entirety and identify what arenas and recommendations are priorities for implementation. It is likely that implementation will need to be a staged process, beginning with the areas that are ripe for action and sequencing action for other areas of reform over a prescribed time line.

The development of a work plan is critical. In many cases, if the probation review has taken place over a period of several months, the recommendations may be numerous and their

implementation time consuming. It is important to be realistic in deciding what can be undertaken, during what time period, and with what resources. Contextual factors will need to be taken into account such as budget periods and constraints, political pressures, employee participation and morale, and other department goals that must be managed during the period of implementation. The work plan should be very specific in terms of the recommendations that are to be undertaken, with specific individuals identified for involvement, and deadlines for completion.

As the implementation progresses, it may be important to provide progress reports. The updates should be provided to personnel within a department, to relevant constituents outside the department, and to key stakeholders and consumers who are invested in the department's success. Upon completion of the implementation plan and all of its recommendations, the department should publish a final implementation report. This should include improved outcomes already evident and a forecast of those improvements and outcomes likely to be realized in the future. Finally, a system of quality assurance should be developed so that the implementation of the recommendations can be tracked and it can be determined if the intended outcomes were achieved.

References

- American Probation and Parole Association, <http://www.appa-net.org/eweb/DynamicPage.aspx?WebCode=IA> Introduction (click Training tab)
- Child Welfare League of America, *Los Angeles County Probation Department Program Audit Report*, submitted to Los Angeles County Department of Auditor-Controller, September 2005.
- Damelio, Robert, *The Basics of Process Mapping*, CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group, Boca Raton, FLA, 1996.
- Dilulio, Jr. J. (1991). *No Escape: The Future of American Corrections*. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc.
- Latessa, Edward, Center for Juvenile Justice Research, School of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati, *Effective Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS)*, ppt presentation from Beyond the Bench Conference, California Administrative Office of the Courts, 2010 retrieved 3/19/11 at www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/pdffiles/BTB20Pre-conBPAIJun2.pdf.
- National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ), *Delinquency Prevention Guidelines: Improving Court Practice in Juvenile Delinquency Cases*, can be retrieved at: <http://www.ncjfcj.org/content/view/411/411/>
- Petersilia, J. (1993). Measuring the Performance of Community Corrections in *Performance Measure for the Criminal Justice System*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Smith, Paula, and Latessa, Edward, *Effective Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS) Model Overview*, a working paper, School of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati, 2011.
- Thomas, Doug, *How does the Juvenile Justice System Measure Up? Applying Performance Measures in Five Jurisdictions*, National Center for Juvenile Justice, May 2006.
- Wiig, Janet K. & Tuell, John A., *Jefferson Parish Probation Review Report*, Child Welfare League of America, May 2010.

Appendix A

Jefferson Parish Probation Review, Work Plan

Methods	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	Persons Involved	Comments
Element A: Program Planning and Implementation																
A.1 Review mission, vision, strategies, policies and procedures																
a. establish Jefferson Parish project management team	X														Roy Juncker and associates	
b. review probation manual with Jefferson team – identify strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for improvements		X													CWLA team with Jeff Team	
c. review CYPB planning document and identify interfaces with probation review		X													CWLA team	
A.2 Obtain staff and consumer feedback to determine how these items link to program operations																
a. identify questions regarding Dept's capacity to plan and carry out program operations (incorporate all review elements)		X													CWLA team, Gina Vincent, and Jefferson Team	
b. conduct focus groups of youth and parents <i>6 groups (3 parents, 3 youth); 4 West Bank, 2 East Bank, 2 groups 1 x month; one parent group and one youth group from same families</i>			X	X	X										CWLA team with assistance from focus group questions developed for DMC work	J. Ryals – random sample S. Cabal – write letters to parents and youth C. Troclair – identify incentives R. Juncker – obtain court order
c. survey/interview probation officers and supervisors			X												CWLA team	combination of survey and group interview/focus group; use individual responses to develop group interview/focus group Qs
d. assess the access to and quality of training provided to staff		X													CWLA team and Jefferson Team	S. Cabal – produce record of training for last year

Methods	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	Persons Involved	Comments
Element B: Best Practices and Benchmarking																
B.1 Conduct 'Best Practice' Analysis of Programs and Practices																
a. evaluate decision making processes	X	X	X												CWLA team, Gina Vincent, and Jefferson Team	focus on how the use of the SAVRY and new assessment process will improve practice; S. Cabal – produce data on assignment to 6 programs
• distinguish work accomplished by G. Vincent as completed																
• how decisions are made to use the 6 DJS programs																
b. focused review of criteria and methodology for restitution and community services and electronic monitoring			X	X											CWLA team and Shauna Epps	for R & CS – hours standard, amount of damages vs. ordered amount, cap put on amount collected?, community standards. For EMP which has no formal criteria, success criteria, characteristics of youth who are successful, look at national data, and establish criteria for referral
c. review the handling and consider separation of formal FINS from delinquency cases <i>multiple data requests of DJS</i>		X	X	X						X	X	X			CWLA team, Katayoon Majid, and Jefferson Team	youth with mental health issues that are in FINS to gain access to services
B.2 Develop Benchmarking System															CWLA Team	
a. examine success rate data of youth by DJS program assignment				X	X											
b. identify benchmark goals and outcomes for DJS programs						X			X							
c. tie to performance based contracting								X								
B.3 Work with OJJ and Department on Placement Decision Making															Ned Loughran, Gina Vincent, DJS, and OJJ	
B.4 Determine Department's Capacity for Program and Practice Development										X					CWLA Team	

Methods	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	Persons Involved	Comments
Element C: Performance Measurement and Client Outcomes																
C.1 Identify Performance Measures Focused Worker Performance and Case Processes																work processes such as timeliness (e.g. ISP within 30 days), follow through and achievement of outcomes sought in ISP
a. identify current performance indicators															CWLA Team	
• review documents (forms, reports, studies)										X						
• interview personnel																
b. further develop performance measures and a system for tracking										X		X			CWLA Team and Jefferson Team	
C.2 Develop Client Outcomes and Measurement																Seek involvement of Paul Frick in outcome development
a. review literature on client outcomes for juvenile probationers										X					CWLA Team	
b. review standard conditions of probation, specialized conditions, and other articulated outcomes (e.g. in ISP)															CWLA Team	
c. conduct session with DJS to identify desired client outcomes															CWLA Team	use a scheme of three broad categories 1. youth crime free for a period of time; 2. youth achieve some sort of educational goals; and 3. youth are prepared to enter the work force. Distinguish intermediate and incremental outcomes that lead to these three
d. develop a listing of desired outcomes, baseline data on each, and identify data sources for tracking															CWLA Team and Jefferson Team	

Methods	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	Persons Involved	Comments
Element D: Intra- and Interagency Work Processes																
D.1 Analyze Probation Case Flow Processes																
a. conduct a process mapping exercise with a selected group of probation officers to analyze interfaces, handoffs, bottlenecks and other case flow process issues						X									Stephen Phillippi and CWLA Team	Coordinate with Information Sharing project
b. include discussion of information available at various decision making points					X										CWLA Team and Supervisors	
D.2 Facilitate Improved Inter-agency coordination of Case Flow Processes																review what has already been accomplished in this arena by John Ryals, Gina Vincent, and Paul Frick
a. map interagency work processes with a group of supervisory and probation line staff						X									CWLA Team, supervisory, and line staff	
b. conduct meeting with DJS and external agencies to present mapping findings, solicit additional input, and discuss ways to strengthen linkages, better share resources, and improve case flow										X					CWLA team and external agencies	Coordinate with Dawn Palermo's Interagency Operations Committee

Appendix B

Interview Questions for Key Stakeholders

1. Review key elements of the Probation Review
2. How well do you think the Department of Juvenile Services provides needed services to juveniles through Department staff, contractors, and through linkages with other youth serving systems?
3. What are some of the unmet needs of juveniles that you think might be better served?
4. What do you think are the Department's programmatic strengths? Most promising practices?
5. Are there any program areas that you think require more attention and evaluation?
6. What do you think are the most important issues for the Department to address in terms of its mission and operation?
7. What do the juveniles find most troublesome about their probation experience?
8. What do the juveniles find most helpful about their probation experience?
9. Do you have any particular ideas for solutions to identified concerns or problems the Department faces?
10. How effective is the Department in its interaction with other agencies, including your agency or office?
11. Are there any other areas of concerns or issues that we have not touched on that you think should be addressed?

Appendix C/D

Employee Survey

CWLA Survey of Jefferson Parish Department of Juvenile Services

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this survey. We know to complete this survey will take approximately 30-45 minutes out of a busy schedule for each respondent and we most appreciate your assistance.

You are NOT able to save an incomplete survey to finish at a later time. Therefore, it is important that you begin the survey when you know you will not be interrupted. Please notify your supervisor if you are not ready to begin the survey or if you must exit the survey before completion.

Otherwise, please begin by clicking "Next".

CWLA Survey of Jefferson Parish Department of Juvenile Services

The Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) is conducting a review of the Jefferson Parish Department of Juvenile Services as part of its work on the MacArthur Foundation Models for Change juvenile justice reform effort. The review includes an assessment of the Department's program planning and implementation, management, delivery of services, and relationships with other agencies. As part of that assessment and through this survey, we are seeking the input of the Department's employees to gain their perspectives.

This survey is designed for use by probation officers and supervisors. You are invited to respond to each of the questions, but we recognize that, depending on your area of responsibility and function, you may not have knowledge related to every question. It is for that reason that we have a column to mark entitled, "do not know" and we encourage you to use it if you have no knowledge related to a particular question.

Again, we thank you for taking the time to fill out this survey.

Your position at Jefferson Parish Department of Juvenile Services:

- Probation Officer
- Supervisor

Number of years in your position

CWLA Survey of Jefferson Parish Department of Juvenile Services

Please give your response to the following statements by answering: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, or that you do not know.

PRE-DISPOSITION INVESTIGATIONS

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
1. Court reports are generally well written and of good quality
2. The court reports do not provide sufficient detail regarding the needs of probationers
3. Recommendations to the court for probationers are based on individualized needs for treatment
4. Recommendations to the court for probationers are based on available community resources

CASE SUPERVISION

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
1. Probationers in specialized caseloads receive an enhanced level of supervision
2. Probationers are receiving the required number of contacts as indicated by risk scores
3. Client outcomes are clearly identified for each probationer to guide the service delivery
4. Probation officers do not assure that probationers receive services to which they have been referred
6. Probation officers do not work close enough with community resources to which they refer probationers
7. Probation officers work closely with probationer's parents/caregivers to achieve desired outcomes.
8. The levels of supervision are characterized by distinctly different activities on the part of the probation officer
9. The caseloads do not allow for an adequate level of supervision
10. Probationers need more help than they presently receive during their period of probation
11. Additional resources are needed to adequately provide for the parent and family support network for probationers
12. The enforcement of conditions is sufficient activity for the supervision of probationers
13. The number of contacts required for each level of supervision is appropriate
14. A 10 hour day, 4 day week work schedule will increase probation officer contacts with probationers
15. The supervision of probationers does not result in greater public safety
16. The supervision of probationers is focused more on enforcement than rehabilitation
17. The assignment of all probation officers to specific geographic areas would result in more effective supervision of probationers
18. The needs of juveniles in FINS cases are the same as the needs of juveniles in delinquency cases
19. Specialized FINS-only caseloads would result in improved supervision of FINS cases

CWLA Survey of Jefferson Parish Department of Juvenile Services

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND SUPERVISION

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
1. Probation officers are supported in their work by the Department's administration
2. Probation officers are supported in their work by their supervisors
3. Probation officers efforts are not adequately recognized by the Department
4. Probation officers are provided the tools necessary to carry out their job functions
6. The probation manual is a useful tool to direct the work of probation officers
7. A 10 hour day, 4 day week work schedule would improve employee morale
8. The judges do not base their decisions on probation officers' recommendations
9. Probation officers are provided sufficient training to function effectively
10. Juvenile Court judges respect the work of probation officers
11. Probation officers are not adequately prepared to testify in court
12. Judges read the probation officers' reports

RESOURCES AND SERVICE DELIVERY

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
1. Probationers have access to treatment resources that address their particular needs
2. Probationers do not have access to needed mental health services while on probation
3. The current staffing/placement process is satisfactory
4. Services to probationers are not provided in a timely manner
5. Probationers have access to needed substance abuse resources while on probation
6. Juveniles receive adequate support when they transition in and out of placement
7. Juveniles do not have access to aftercare services upon return home to parents/caregivers
8. Probation officers have a method for identifying probationers with mental health needs
9. Juveniles are not matched to placements equipped to address their individual needs
10. There is sufficient oversight of juvenile probationers while in placement
11. Adequate community resources exist to address the needs of juvenile probationers
12. Most probationers are referred to the same services
13. There is not adequate communication between treatment providers and probation officers
14. Probation officers are provided with current information regarding the adequacy of community resources
15. Additional funding is the most important solution to improve service delivery

CWLA Survey of Jefferson Parish Department of Juvenile Services

BEST PRACTICES

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
1. Probation services are not based on best practices
2. Evidence-based practices would be applied to all probationers if there was adequate funding
3. Evidence-based practices are available in the community but are not used
4. Probation officers are not knowledgeable about best practices for providing services to probationers
5. Probation officers are knowledgeable about evidence-based practices and their impact on recidivism
6. Current case management strategies are based on best practices
7. The Department should coordinate with community-based organizations in defined geographic areas to target the needs of juveniles in that area
8. The availability of evidence-based practices in the community would allow some juveniles to stay out of placement

CLIENT OUTCOMES

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
1. Probation officers are not knowledgeable about identifying client outcomes for probationers
2. Probationer officers set clear, achievable goals for each probationer
3. A 10 hour day, 4 day week work schedule will not improve client outcomes
4. The Department uses the achievement of client outcomes to select and monitor providers who contract with the department
5. The work of the Department is not related to the achievement of outcomes by probationers beyond the period of probation supervision
6. There should be incentives and rewards for probation officers whose probationers achieve successful outcomes

CWLA Survey of Jefferson Parish Department of Juvenile Services

INTER-AGENCY RELATIONSHIPS

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do Not Know
1. The Department's relationships with DA Prosecution are not good
2. The Department's relationships with community-based agencies have improved in the past three years
3. The Probation Department's relationships with OJJ are not good
4. The Probation Department's relationship with the Jefferson Parish Public Schools could be improved
5. The Probation Department's relationship with JPHSA is good
6. The Probation Department's relationship with the DSS Office of Community Services could be improved
7. The Department's relationships with DA Diversion are good
8. The Department's relationships with Informal FINS are good
9. The Department would function more effectively if its relationships with community-based agencies were better
10. The Probation Department should look at data across service delivery systems to assist with the identification of prevention and earlier intervention opportunities
11. The interface between OCS and Probation around moving kids from OCS to Probation needs improvement
12. Probationers' prior OCS involvement is known/documented

CWLA Survey of Jefferson Parish Department of Juvenile Services

Open-Ended Questions

1. How could the probation manual be improved? What could be added?

2. What enables you the most to do your job?

3. What training would help you do your job?

4. What services are needed for probationers that do not exist at this time?

5. What client outcomes should the Probation Department seek for probationers?

6. What specific ideas do you have for the improved delivery of probation services that you believe will result in better client outcomes?

CWLA Survey of Jefferson Parish Department of Juvenile Services

Open-Ended Questions

7. What makes you uncomfortable or upset in court?

8. What ideas do you have about reducing the amount of paperwork?

9. What challenges do you face in your relationships with other agencies?

10. What are some of the special skills and talents that you offer to probation operations that aren't currently tapped in your role as probation officer?

11. In what ways would you like your work to be recognized?

12. Where do you see yourself in 3-5 years? What are your career aspirations?

Any additional comments:

Appendix E

Jefferson Parish

Interagency Work Processes

Meeting with Outside Agencies

1. What works particularly well in your interactions/transactions with the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS)?
2. How well does DJS assess the needs of juveniles and match them to services?
3. How well does DJS attend to details in making referrals to other agencies?
4. How well does DJS perform to help assure that juveniles actually access services?
5. How well do you and DJS share/exchange case information?
6. What interagency work processes do you think need improvement beyond the discussion we have had to this point?
7. Are there any other issues that need to be discussed as we consider interagency work processes and DJS?

Appendix F

Parent Focus Group Questions

1. How well do you think the probation department provides needed services to juveniles?
2. Are there programs or services that you think would better serve your child?
3. What kind of changes in your child do you wish the probation department could help your child make?
4. Are there policies or procedures of the Department that need improvement?
5. How well does the probation officer work with you and your child? What recommendations do you have for improvement?
6. What are you finding the most helpful about your child's probation experience?
7. What are you finding the least helpful about your child's probation experience?

Appendix G

Juvenile Focus Group Questions

1. What has been most helpful to you about your probation experience? Why?
2. What has been least helpful to you about your probation experience? Why?
3. What kind of changes in your life do you wish the probation department could help you make?
4. How well do you think the probation officer works with you? Describe things the probation officer does. . .
5. What recommendations do you have for improving the way the probation officer works with you?
6. Are there any rules or ways that things work in probation that you think should be changed?
7. Is there something that would help you get off probation and stay out of trouble that isn't available to you?

Appendix H

Jefferson Parish

Process Mapping for Interagency Work Processes

Investigation

1. What are the steps/actions involve other agencies?
2. Who are the agencies?
3. What information gets shared?
4. What decisions are made between the DJS and other agencies? How does this get done?
5. What products result from these interactions?
6. Are there roadblocks, inefficiencies, conflicts with these agencies?
7. What ideas do you have for improvement?
8. Are there any other issues?

Disposition

1. What are the steps/actions involve other agencies?
2. Who are the agencies?
3. What information gets shared?
4. What decisions are made between the DJS and other agencies? How does this get done?
5. What products result from these interactions?
6. Are there roadblocks, inefficiencies, conflicts with these agencies?
7. What ideas do you have for improvement?
8. Are there any other issues?

Supervision

1. What are the steps/actions involve other agencies?
2. Who are the agencies?
3. What information gets shared?
4. What decisions are made between the DJS and other agencies? How does this get done?
5. What products result from these interactions?
6. Are there roadblocks, inefficiencies, conflicts with these agencies?
7. What ideas do you have for improvement?
8. Are there any other issues?

For more information, contact:

Janet K. Wiig, JD, MSW

Co-Director

MacArthur Foundation Models for Change: Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice Initiative

Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps

11 Beacon Street, Suite 820

Boston, MA 02108

480-837-1685

jwiig@rfkchildren.org

John A. Tuell, MA

Co-Director

MacArthur Foundation Models for Change: Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice Initiative

Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps

11 Beacon Street, Suite 820

Boston, MA 02108

703-753-0059

jtuell@rfkchildren.org

ModelsforChange

Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice

www.modelsforchange.net

An initiative supported by the John D.
and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
www.macfound.org