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I. From the Desk of Chief Katherine Miller

During my second year leading the Juvenile Probation Department (JPD), San Francisco's juvenile justice system has undergone historic transformations, driven by both local efforts to close and replace the current Juvenile Hall, as well as California's landmark decision to transfer responsibilities associated with the state's youth prison system to counties (Division of Juvenile Justice Realignment). These transformative initiatives coincided with the global COVID-19 pandemic and the national reckoning about race and the justice system, which have added both challenges and moral urgency to our work.

While we have not yet emerged from the pandemic, we have many more tools at our disposal to keep young people, their families, and JPD's staff safe. We have heeded important lessons from the pandemic: JPD has continued efforts to prevent and mitigate the potential for COVID-19 transmission in our facilities and maintained our focus on safely reducing youth detention in Juvenile Hall, wherever possible, resulting in historically low average daily populations. In 2021, we partnered with community-based organizations to hold numerous virtual events for youth and families, including family paint nights, cooking classes, life skills classes, higher education workshops, and even virtual spring break college tours. We have reinvested millions of juvenile justice dollars into the community and expanded efforts to provide direct financial support to young people and their families.

Over the past decade, juvenile arrests, petitions, and detentions have declined roughly 90% in San Francisco. In just the past two years, since the Board of Supervisors voted to replace Juvenile Hall, the footprint of San Francisco's juvenile justice system has grown significantly smaller: JPD's caseload is 38% lower, we have 42% fewer case-carrying staff, and our average daily population is 62% lower than in 2019. Despite this important progress, there remains much more to do to build a racially equitable system that promotes community safety by helping young people and their families to thrive. As demonstrated by the figures in this report, unjust racial and community disparities persist, and must be the focus of our transformative initiatives.

JPD's staff and management team, as well as the Juvenile Probation Commission embrace this focus as we chart a new path forward for the juvenile justice system in San Francisco that is healing-centered, community-centered, and culturally responsive.

It is with great respect and appreciation to the staff of the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department—and to the young people and families we serve, our network of community-based providers, and our government partners—that I present the Department's 2021 Annual Report.

In Community,

Katherine W. Miller
Chief Probation Officer
San Francisco Juvenile Probation Officer
II. Mission

It is the mission of the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department to serve the needs of youth and families who are brought to our attention with care and compassion; to identify and respond to the individual risks and needs presented by each youth; to engage fiscally sound and culturally competent strategies that promote the best interests of the youth; to provide victims with opportunities for restoration; to identify and utilize the least restrictive interventions and placements that do not compromise public safety; to hold youth accountable for their actions while providing them with opportunities and assisting them to develop new skills and competencies; and contribute to the overall quality of life for the citizens of San Francisco within the sound framework of public safety as outlined in the Welfare & Institutions Code (WIC).

III. Vision & Priorities

• Equitably right-size and operate the Juvenile Probation Department.
• Center the voices, experiences, and well-being of young people and their families.
• Effectively serve the needs of justice-involved youth through strengths-based youth-and family-centered strategies that are grounded in the community.
• Improve coordination across government agencies, community-based organizations, and youth and families to provide holistic support that helps justice-involved youth thrive and prevents future justice involvement.
• Keep youth in their communities whenever possible; provide safe alternatives to detention for youth who cannot return home; reserve secure detention as a last resort when it is necessary to protect the safety of youth and those around them; develop secure long-term setting(s) that are healing-centered, family-centered, community-centered, and culturally responsive.
• Collaborate with the community and partner agencies to expand diversion opportunities that prevent justice system involvement.
• Reinvest and redirect juvenile justice funding to the community, including directly to youth and families.
• Advance transparency and accountability through data-driven operations, and evidence-based and promising practices.

IV. About the Juvenile Probation Department

The San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department (JPD) consists of three divisions: Probation Services; Juvenile Hall; and Administration & Finance.

Probation Services Division

The Probation Services Division provides pre- and post-adjudication services to youth who are alleged or have been found to have committed law violations (delinquent acts), and performs duties and responsibilities mandated by the California Welfare & Institutions Code, and related
federal and state statutes and regulations. Unlike the adult criminal justice system, where the Probation Department becomes involved only at the sentencing phase, the Juvenile Probation Department is involved at every stage of the juvenile justice process, from beginning to end. Please see the Juvenile Justice System Case Flow & Glossary for detailed information regarding juvenile case processing.

Probation Services receives law enforcement referrals (arrests), screens referrals for community-based diversion, conducts risk and needs assessments, conducts investigations, prepares court reports, and makes dispositional recommendations to the court, while building supportive relationships with the young people we serve. Deputy Probation Officers and Social Workers develop youth- and family-centered case plans that support youth to be successful in their homes and communities, deter deeper justice system involvement, provide opportunities, and help youth to complete court-ordered requirements. For youth who are placed on probation by the court, Deputy Probation Officers conduct visits, make service referrals pursuant to the case plan, and administer court-imposed conditions. Due to the closure of the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ-California’s youth prison system), and realignment of duties to the counties, Probation Services also provides support to youth ordered to a Secure Youth Treatment Facility through the development of Individualized Rehabilitation Plans, provision of progress reports to the court, and facilitation of youth reentry to the community once young people are ordered released by the court (see Section VII for more information about DJJ Realignment).

Community Based Programming for Justice-involved Youth: San Francisco invests over $9 million each year from the local Children’s Fund (a 1991 voter-approved property tax allocation), city, and state funding in services and programs specifically for justice-involved young people in both the juvenile and adult system. The bulk of this funding is administered by the Department of Children, Youth, and their Families (DCYF) through the Justice Services portfolio, which includes a continuum of services for justice system-involved youth (under age 18) and disconnected transitional aged young adults (age 18-25). The aim of the service area is to prevent further youth engagement in the justice system and reduce rates of youth recidivism through connection to adult allies, culturally relevant programming, ongoing case management, access to positive skill building activities, and whole family engagement. JPD leverages this tremendous array of services to support youth to succeed and thrive, both in Juvenile Hall and in the community.

In 2021, Probation Services was comprised of six units. This structure incorporated a reorganization to distinguish the unique services associated with youth in extended foster care programming (AB12), and streamline services associated with out of home placement and reentry.

Vertical Units 1 & 2: Vertical Unit Deputy Probation Officers work with youth from the point at which the arrest is referred by law enforcement throughout the court process, providing continuity of care and stable relationships for justice-involved young people in San Francisco pre- and post-adjudication. For youth living at home who are placed on wardship, non-wardship, or informal probation by the court, Vertical Unit Deputy Probation Officers support them in
meeting their court-ordered conditions, and by connecting them to community-based services and programs to help them and their families to succeed.

**Placement/ Juvenile Collaborative Reentry Unit (Placement-JCRU):** In 2021, the Department merged the Private Placement and the Juvenile Collaborative Reentry Units to improve continuity of care for youth ordered to out of home placement. The Deputy Probation Officers in the Placement/Juvenile Collaborative Reentry Unit provide support to youth whom the court has ordered to be removed from their home as a result of juvenile delinquency proceedings, from the point of removal through reentry back to their home and community. Placement-JCRU Deputy Probation Officers work with youth who have been placed with a Resource Family—which includes all types of caregivers formerly known as foster parents—as well as youth placed in a Short-Term Residential Treatment Program (previously called a group home). Youth committed to Juvenile Hall and the Secure Youth Treatment Facility are also supported by this unit, from the point of disposition throughout their term of confinement and the reentry process.

---

**A New Strategy for Out of Home Placement Youth:** A 2021 UC Berkeley study found that youth ordered to out of home placement (foster care) by the San Francisco Juvenile Court were spending an additional 25 days in custody after disposition awaiting an appropriate placement. Launched in September 2021, the **Resource Family Pilot for Juvenile Justice System Impacted Youth** is a collaboration of JPD, the Department of Children, Youth, and their Families (DCYF), Alternative Family Services (AFS) – a non-profit foster family agency, and San Francisco Court Appointed Special Advocates (SFCASA) to minimize the use of secure detention and achieve better outcomes for youth ordered to out of home placement, particularly Black, Indigenous, and youth of color. Through the pilot program, AFS recruited seven culturally responsive Resource Families in the Bay Area dedicated to serving justice-involved youth. AFS places youth within 24 hours of referral and provides extensive 24/7 support to youth and Resource Families.

---

Placement-JCRU Deputy Probation Officers match youth to appropriate placements, make placement and program referrals, support youth transitioning into and from placements, monitor the suitability of placements, create and implement case plans and Individual Rehabilitation Plans, and facilitate and participate in Child & Family Team (CFT) meetings. Probation Officers are required by law to visit youth in placement monthly. The Placement-JCRU Social Worker supports kinship (relative) Resource Families, by facilitating the approval process, and helping to address ongoing needs to promote stability and success.

The Unit also participates in the **Juvenile Reentry Court**, a collaborative court and public-private partnership that provides comprehensive reentry planning and aftercare services for youth returning home from all types of placements, to ensure coordinated services are in place for a successful transition back home.

**AB12 Unit:** The AB12 Unit consists of licensed Social Workers who provide services to former foster youth between the ages of 18 to 21, who were previously involved in the juvenile justice system. Established by California Assembly Bill 12 in 2010, this voluntary program provides
former foster youth with transitional housing or a stipend for living expenses until their 21st birthday, with the goal of improving outcomes. Participants must be working, attending school, or participating in a program to remove barriers to employment (unless they are unable to work/attend school due to a medical condition). AB12 Social Workers assist participants with housing, mental health and substance abuse services, credit reporting, budgeting, health education, and other independent living skills. Social Workers meet in-person with participants—who reside all over the state and country—once a month, attend court hearings, work with participants on their goals, and collaborate with outside agencies, attorneys, and other team members.

**Emergency Support for AB12 Youth during the Pandemic:** On December 31, 2021, pandemic related provisions that allowed AB12 youth to remain on extended foster care past their 21st birthday expired. A total of 127 young adults served by the San Francisco Human Services Agency (HSA) and JPD—who had been severely impacted by pandemic job losses, social isolation, and housing instability—emancipated on that date. Through the collaborative efforts of community advocates, attorneys, the court, HSA, and JPD, a plan was developed to support the transition of each and every one, including ongoing stipends, housing, and moving and storage resources for those in need. HSA and JPD will continue to provide transitional support to young people exiting AB12 in 2022 and are working to establish a guaranteed income pilot for this population going forward.

**Court Officers/Special Services Unit:** Court Officers are responsible for communication between case carrying Deputy Probation Officers and the court. Court Officers also support youth, families, and the court during court proceedings and disseminate information to relevant parties. Special Services Officers conduct investigations and manage the record sealing process, ensuring that youth are able to exit the juvenile system without a record, as ordered by the court. This unit also conducts investigations for stepparent adoptions.

**Records, Officers of the Day, & Quality Assurance (ROQ Unit):** The Officers and Support Staff in this unit perform a variety of functions that ensure that all referrals are appropriately triaged; youth are detained only when mandated by law, or under limited circumstances as warranted by considerations for community safety; and manage records and quality assurance for the Department. Quality assurance is a collaborative, cross-division effort that also involves Juvenile Hall staff, and the IT and Research & Planning Units of the Administration & Finance Division. Officers of the Day collaborate closely with the police and the Community Assessment and Resource Center (CARC), San Francisco’s detention diversion program for youth arrested for misdemeanors and non-707(b) felony offenses. Roughly 30% of citations in San Francisco are referred to CARC, and nearly 90% of referred youth successfully complete the program, avoiding deeper juvenile justice system involvement.

---

1 Welfare & Institutions Code 707(b) offenses include murder, attempted murder, arson, robbery, rape, kidnapping, assault by any means of force likely to produce great bodily injury, and several other serious and/or violent acts.
Juvenile Hall

Juvenile Hall is the official reception and detention center for youth detained as a result of an arrest for alleged delinquent misconduct or a court order in San Francisco, including San Francisco residents transferred in custody from other jurisdictions. With the closure of the California Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) in 2021, Juvenile Hall now also serves as San Francisco’s interim Secure Youth Treatment Facility for youth ordered by the court to long term confinement for serious sustained offenses that would have otherwise been eligible for state youth prison (see Section VII for more information about DJJ Realignment). Juvenile Hall is a secure 150-bed facility operated 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and 365 days a year.

Juvenile Hall counselors provide supervision; manage the daily needs of youth; coordinate the delivery of educational, vocational, and positive youth development programs, as well as medical and behavioral health services; and facilitate access to families, lawyers and other advocate services. Programs are delivered in partnership with community-based organizations that engage young people with a range of services designed to provide rehabilitative linkages to on-going support systems upon return to the community.

The San Francisco Unified School District operates the Woodside Learning Center within Juvenile Hall for detained youth up to age 19, providing a wide range of programming, including special education programs, school day academic enrichment, arts enrichment, college counseling, tutoring, and a culinary garden with an outdoor classroom. For youth who are over 18, or who have already completed high school, online college courses are available.

The San Francisco Department of Public Health operates Special Programs for Youth (SPY) within Juvenile Hall. SPY is staffed by a multi-disciplinary team dedicated to providing trauma informed, culturally relevant and accessible health services to all youth at Juvenile Hall. SPY offers primary medical care, behavioral health services (substance abuse and mental health), and health education, as well as coordination of dental care, subspecialty services, and screening for sexually transmitted infections.

All aspects of Juvenile Hall operations and services comply with federal and state mandates, including Titles 15 and 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Juvenile Hall undergoes annual compliance inspections by the Board of State and Community Corrections. During the COVID-19 pandemic, in collaboration with the Department of Public Health, all aspects of Juvenile Hall operations have been modified to ensure the well-being of youth who are detained in San Francisco, including mandatory health screenings, on-site testing, mask wearing and social distancing, extensive sanitation efforts, the implementation of medical triage for admissions, and the establishment of isolation and quarantine housing units.

For more information about JPD’s COVID response, including all pandemic related policies and procedures within Juvenile Hall, please visit our web site, here.

Finance & Administration Division

The Finance & Administration Division manages fiscal and budget operations, human resources, facilities (including Juvenile Hall and the nonoperational Log Cabin Ranch), information technology, research, grants, and strategic planning. The Division also administers JPD’s federal Title IV-E foster care program, monitoring implementation and compliance with state and federal regulations associated with out of home placements.
Juvenile Probation Commission

The Juvenile Probation Commission provides oversight to the Juvenile Probation Department and appoints the Chief Juvenile Probation Officer. The Commission consists of seven members appointed by the Mayor of San Francisco and holds public meetings every month.

Meeting information can be found on JPD’s website, here.

Juvenile Advisory Council

The Juvenile Advisory Council (JAC) is a paid leadership opportunity for young adults who have been impacted by the juvenile justice system to inform youth-centered policy development at JPD. JAC members provide support to youth placed on probation and their families, including regular orientations to the juvenile justice system. One JAC member serves on San Francisco’s Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC), as well as on the JJCC’s DJJ Realignment Subcommittee.

In 2021, JAC members also participated in the Youth Justice and Employment Community of Practice, a collaboration of the National Youth Employment Coalition, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and the Pretrial Justice Institute to improve outcomes for youth with justice-involvement by strengthening the bridge between courts, juvenile justice, and youth employment programs.

Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council

California law requires each county to establish a Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (JJCC), a statutorily mandated body responsible for developing and implementing a “continuum of county-based responses to juvenile crime.”\(^2\) The JJCC is responsible for developing the county’s Multi-Agency Local Action Plan to Serve Juvenile Justice-Involved Youth. San Francisco’s plan can be found on JPD’s website, here.

The coordinating council shall, at a minimum, include the Chief Probation Officer, as chair, and one representative each from:

- The District Attorney’s Office
- The Public Defender’s Office
- The Sheriff’s Department
- The Board of Supervisors
- The Department of Social Services
- The Department of Mental Health
- A Community-Based Agency Drug and Alcohol Program
- The Police Department
- The County Office of Education or School District
- An At-large Community Representative

San Francisco’s two required community seats are filled by the Community Assessment and Resource Center (CARC) and the Juvenile Justice Providers Association (JJPA). The San

\(^2\) Welfare and Institution Code 749.22
Francisco JJCC also includes representatives from the Recreation & Parks Department; Department of Children, Youth, and their Families; Adult Probation; Mayor’s Office of Housing; San Francisco Youth Commission; and the Juvenile Advisory Council. As mandated by state law, the JJCC established a DJJ Realignment Subcommittee to develop San Francisco’s DJJ Realignment Plan (see Section VII for more information about DJJ Realignment).

2021 Staff Demographics

As part of JPD’s commitment to advancing racial equity, and an organizational culture of inclusion and belonging, the Department is committed to publishing annual data regarding the demographic breakdown of our staff, Senior Management, and Commission.

**Staff (Excluding Senior Management)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Race/Ethnicity (N=182)</th>
<th>Staff Gender (N=182)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White 15%</td>
<td>Female 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian 24%</td>
<td>Male 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx/Hispanic 17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino 6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black 38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Senior Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Management Race/Ethnicity (N=10)</th>
<th>Senior Management Gender (N=10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White 40%</td>
<td>Female 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian 30%</td>
<td>Male 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx/Hispanic 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black 10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Advancing Racial Equity

JPD is committed to conducting the intensive processes necessary to advance racial equity both internally across the Department’s diverse staff through meaningful culture and operational change, as well through expansive, collaborative planning efforts to improve support for justice-involved youth and sustainably reduce the racial inequities of the juvenile justice system. Guided by the following goals, we are dedicated to a vision of probation in which youth and their families see the Department as reflective of them and working for them and with them:

- Reimagine how the City addresses juvenile delinquency, from referral through reentry, in collaboration with the community and our system partners, emphasizing research and evidence-based practices, and sustainably addressing pervasive racial disparities throughout the system.
- Advance a Whole Family Engagement strategy that places racial equity at its center to ensure that all youth have equal access to successful outcomes, and that advances youth-and family-centered case plans and goal development, with the supports and resources necessary to help justice-involved youth thrive.
- Bolster equitable leadership development opportunities for Black, Latino and Asian/Pacific Islander staff throughout the Department, implement change that meaningfully improves the workplace experience of BIPOC staff; enact our organizational belief of redemption and helping people to succeed.

In 2021, JPD made progress in a number of areas of the Phase 1 Racial Equity Action Plan, which focuses on strategies regarding the Department’s workforce. As described in our first annual Departmental Racial Equity Progress Report, some highlights include:

- Hiring panels now consist of subject-matter experts diverse in gender and race/ethnicity, and in some cases include subject matter experts from community-based organizations that are representative of the youth and families we serve.
• The JPD Celebrations Committee acknowledged, celebrated, and circulated learning materials on Black History Month, Lunar New Year, Women’s History Month, AAPI Heritage Month, Pride Month, Juneteenth, Latinx Heritage Month, Filipino American History Month, and many more. Some staff commented that 2021 was the first time they experienced the Department acknowledging their cultures and cultural celebrations.

While JPD awaits instruction from the Office of Racial Equity on Phase 2 of the Racial Equity Action Planning process, which will center on external equity indicators and support for historically marginalized communities, we have pursued efforts to advance racial equity in our work with young people and their families. To that end, JPD:

• Invested over $40,000 in gift cards to administer to young people and families that we serve in 2021.
• Continued to expand our justice reinvestment efforts, increasing our investment of state juvenile justice apportionment dollars in community-based organizations by over $1.6 million in the last fiscal year alone.
• Convened workgroups of equal numbers of staff from the Department and community-based organizations to develop implementation plans for system transformation, with racial equity at the forefront.

VI. Close Juvenile Hall Working Group

On June 18, 2019, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed legislation to close Juvenile Hall by December 31, 2021. The Board established a 15 member Working Group to create a plan to “provide a rehabilitative, non-institutional place or places of detention, in a location approved by the court, which is available for all wards of the court and persons alleged to come within the jurisdiction of the court” and, “which shall conform to all applicable State and federal regulations.”3 The Close Juvenile Hall Working Group submitted its final report, including 39 proposals regarding the creation of a non-institutional place of detention and expanding community alternatives to the Board in November 2021. While San Francisco did not meet its goal to close and replace Juvenile Hall in 2021, the Board is continuing its efforts to identify a location for a new secure place of detention. Until that time at which an alternative is available, JPD will continue to operate our current Juvenile Hall, as mandated by state law.

Information about the Close Juvenile Hall Working Group, including meetings, materials and the final report, is available here. Board of Supervisor hearings on the Working Group’s recommendations are available, here.

VII. Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) Realignment

Through the passage of Senate Bills 823 and 92, California enacted historic reforms to the administration of justice for young people with sustained charges for the most serious offenses,

3 SEC. 5.40-1(a)(3) and SEC 121.3 of the San Francisco Administrative Code
shifting numerous responsibilities from the state to the counties. This realignment of responsibilities and funding, “DJJ Realignment,” involves the following measures:

- As of July 2021, juvenile courts can no longer commit youth to the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ)—the state’s youth prison system.
- Responsibility and funding have been shifted to the counties for the custody, care, and supervision of youth who would have otherwise been eligible for DJJ.
  - The DJJ Realignment target population includes young people, age 14 to 25, adjudicated to be a ward of the juvenile court based on an offense described in subdivision (b) of Section 707 of the Welfare & Institutions Code, or an offense described in Section 290.008 of the Penal Code.
  - Notably, the DJJ Realignment population is not limited to youth ordered to secure confinement. In San Francisco, the vast majority of young people with sustained 707(b) petitions are placed on probation or ordered to out of home placement, rather than committed to secure confinement.
- Commencing July 1, 2021, the court may order eligible youth to be committed to a “Secure Youth Treatment Facility” (SYTF), defined as a secure facility that is operated, utilized, or accessed by the county of commitment to provide appropriate programming, treatment, and education.
- The age of juvenile court jurisdiction was extended to 21, 23, or 25, depending on the offense. Furthermore, any person whose case originated in juvenile court is now required to remain in a county juvenile facility during their term of commitment until they turn 25 years of age, with limited exceptions (previously, young people detained under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court would be transferred to adult facilities at age 19).
- To be eligible for the Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant (JJRBG), an annual state apportionment to support local realignment functions, each county is required to convene a subcommittee of their local Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council “to develop a plan describing the facilities, programs, placements, services, supervision and reentry strategies” for the realignment population, and submit the plan for approval to the new state Office of Youth and Community Restoration (OYCR).

As mandated by state law, the DJJ Realignment Subcommittee of the San Francisco Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council, chaired by Juvenile Probation Chief Katherine Miller developed, unanimously approved, and submitted San Francisco’s DJJ Realignment Plan to the Office of Youth and Community Restoration in December 2021. In addition to the ten statutorily required seats, San Francisco’s DJJ Realignment Subcommittee included five additional members—resulting in a total of nine community members and youth justice advocates on the subcommittee, including two with lived experience in secure juvenile facilities.

**DJJ Realignment Subcommittee Statutorily Mandated Seats:**

1. Katherine Miller, *Probation Chief (Chair)*
2. Kasie Lee, *District Attorney’s Office*
3. Patricia Lee, *Public Defender’s Office*
4. Joan Miller (Jessica Mateu-Newsome, alternate), *Department of Social Services (HSA)*

---

4 WIC 707(b) offenses include murder, attempted murder, arson, robbery, rape, kidnapping, assault by any means of force likely to produce great bodily injury, and several other serious and/or violent acts.

5 PC 290.008 covers a range of sex offenses that require registration as a sex offender.
5. Mona Tahsini, Department of Mental Health (DPH)
6. Alysse Castro, County Office of Education/School District (SFUSD)
7. Judge Monica Wiley, Superior Court
8. Angel Ceja Jr., Juvenile Advisory Council
9. Denise Coleman, Huckleberry Youth Programs/ CARC
10. Ron Stueckle, Juvenile Justice Providers Association/ Sunset Youth Services

Additional Community Member/Youth Advocate Seats:

11. Liz Jackson-Simpson, Community-based provider with TAY Workforce & Housing Expertise
13. Tiffany Sutton, Family Member of Youth Impacted by Secure Facility
14. Chaniel Williams, Victim/Survivor of Community Violence
15. Lana Kreidie, SF Bar Association Indigent Defense Administrator – Juvenile Delinquency

From May through December 2021, the subcommittee met as often as three times per month to gather and share information from a wide range of stakeholders and subject matter experts to develop San Francisco’s unanimously approved DJJ Realignment Plan, which can be accessed here. The plan identifies San Francisco Juvenile Hall as the City & County’s interim Secure Youth Treatment Facility; advocates to leverage San Francisco’s wealth of services already available to young people in the community; and elects to use JJRBG funds to address specific gaps identified by the subcommittee, as described on the next page.

JPD is deeply grateful to the members of the subcommittee for their hard work and collaboration throughout this unprecedented process. Additional information about San Francisco’s JJCC, the DJJ Realignment Subcommittee (including recordings of all meetings), and the closure of DJJ, is available here.
San Francisco’s DJJ Realignment Plan

The DJJ Realignment Subcommittee voted to adopt the following key elements of San Francisco’s DJJ Realignment Plan:

For youth committed to the Secure Youth Treatment Facility

*Use Juvenile Hall as San Francisco’s interim Secure Youth Treatment Facility (SYTF) and revise the SYTF plan once City leadership makes decisions regarding San Francisco’s place of detention and the replacement of Juvenile Hall;

*Recommend to City leadership to consider co-locating San Francisco’s SYTF and its future place of detention;

*San Francisco’s SYTF should be healing-centered, family-centered, community-connected, and culturally responsive;

*Enable youth to be placed in out-of-county SYTFs as appropriate.

Proposed Use of Juvenile Justice Realignment Block Grant Funds

*Across all settings (Community, Out of Home Placement, & SYTF): invest in credible messenger life coaches; whole family support programs, including flexible, direct funding to young people and their families; and collective training for all system stakeholders and partners.

*Inside the SYTF: invest in flexible funding for personalized programming & support; education—including two- and four-year college, intensive tutoring, and support; workforce—including certification opportunities and vocational support; behavioral health and wellness—including indigenous, nontraditional approaches; parenting—for young parents in SYTF; substance abuse—including harm reduction and holistic approaches; and reentry/transition—including life skills and financial literacy support.
VIII. Department Statistics

Department Statistics

For over two decades, the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department has published an annual report that includes a wide range of juvenile justice system statistics (all of which, dating back to 1999, can be found on our website). JPD has been a leader in data transparency among our law enforcement partners and continues to innovate in this space. JPD data belongs to the community it represents, and we remain committed to data transparency.

With this annual report, we have expanded the scope of the statistics and analyses and provided additional context and insights throughout. We are mindful that these statistics do not by any means adequately represent the young people behind the numbers or their experiences, rather they depict the juvenile justice system in San Francisco at a high level.

Privacy and Confidentiality

JPD is statutorily obligated to protect the privacy and confidentiality of the young people who are referred to our Department, which creates challenges in sharing the individual stories of youth involved in the juvenile justice system. It also compels us to be cautious when presenting statistics involving very small numbers of youth, particularly in combination with residential and/or demographic information—like zip code, race/ethnicity, or gender—that might facilitate re-identification. This report follows the guidance of the San Francisco Chief Data Officer to the greatest extent possible, masking statistics in which demographic/residential attributes in combination with case statistics yield a sub-population that is less than 11 persons.

Access to Sealed Records

San Francisco has a robust record sealing program which aids in facilitating successful outcomes for youth by removing some of the collateral consequences of justice system involvement. Historically, sealed records have been excluded from all SFJPD data reporting efforts.

After further research of the Welfare & Institutions Code and its directives pertaining to accessing sealed records for the purpose of research and reporting, JPD is now including sealed records in annual statistics reporting pursuant to Welfare & Institutions Code 787. Sealed record data accessed for the purpose of reporting is only examined at an aggregate level.

While 2021 data includes sealed records, prior years of data presented in this report do not include sealed records.
Executive Summary

Patterns Across the Juvenile Justice System:
- Black youth were disproportionately represented across system touch points. These disparities were even worse for girls than for boys.
- Young adults ages 18 and older accounted for a larger percentage of youth represented across system touch points than in 2020.
- Out-of-county youth accounted for at least one-third of cases across system touch points.
- In comparison to 2020, assault accounts for a larger percentage of cases while robbery accounts for a smaller percentage.

Admissions to Juvenile Hall:
- The number of admissions declined by 38% from 299 in 2020 to 185 in 2021.
- The percentage of admissions for offenses or circumstances for which detention is statutorily mandated increased from 72% in 2020 to 79% in 2021.
- The percentage of referrals that resulted in an admission decreased from 52% in 2020 to 43% in 2021.

Population in Juvenile Hall:
- The average daily population in 2021 was 14 youth, a decrease from 17 youth in 2020.
- The daily population in 2021 peaked at 21 youth.

Length of Stay for Youth Released from Juvenile Hall:
- The mean length of stay for youth released in 2021 was 19 days, the same as in 2020.
- The median length of stay decreased from 9 days in 2020 to 5 days in 2021, meaning that half of all youth released were released within 5 days.

Referrals to JPD:
- The number of referrals decreased by 25%, from 572 in 2020 to 429 in 2021.
- The percentage of referrals that were diverted to CARC and Make it Right increased from 17% in 2020 to 24% in 2021.
- 55% of youth referred in 2021 had never been arrested in San Francisco prior to 2021.

Petitions Filed:
- The filing rate decreased from 48% in 2020 to 41% in 2021.

Active Caseload:
- The active caseload decreased by 25% from December 31, 2020 to December 31, 2021.
- The largest declines were among girls (-34%), white youth (-38%), younger youth, and youth from San Francisco (-40%).

Programs:
- The percentage of youth on JPD’s caseload who were active in San Francisco programs increased from 39% at the start of 2021 to 64% by the end of the year.

Petition Outcomes:
- The number of petitions sustained decreased by 27% from 106 in 2020 to 77 in 2021.
- While still rare, commitments to Juvenile Hall and Secure Track increased in 2021.

Probation Termination:
- 96% of youth who terminated probation in 2021 did so successfully.
Section 1: Juvenile Hall
Section 1.1: Juvenile Hall, Admissions

This section presents data regarding the number of admissions to Juvenile Hall for youth detained as a result of a referral (arrest) to the Juvenile Probation Department for new law violations, warrants/court orders, and technical violations. In 2021, 43% of juvenile referrals resulted in an admission to Juvenile Hall in comparison to 52% in 2020. Individual youth may be associated with multiple admission episodes if they are released and subsequently re-arrested and detained.

Admissions to Juvenile Hall by Year

Figure 1 displays admissions to Juvenile Hall by year. Prior to 2020, JPD Annual Reports presented the number of incidents (“bookings”) for which youth were detained, rather than admissions to Juvenile Hall. While incidents and admissions often have a 1 to 1 relationship, a number of youth are booked on several incidents (“re-bookings”), including after they have already been admitted.

Beginning in 2020, we have calculated admissions rather than bookings to better represent how often youth are detained in Juvenile Hall and why. Each admission reflects the beginning of a unique detention event that can include multiple incidents/re-bookings. Due to this change in methodology, a 5-year trend is not depicted. However, the number of admissions declined by 38% from 299 in 2020 to 185 in 2021.

Youth Admitted to Juvenile Hall by Number of Admissions

Figure 2 outlines that in 2021, there were 142 unique youth admitted to Juvenile Hall.

The number of admissions per youth within the calendar year ranged from 1 to 5 admissions. Over 75% of youth were admitted only once, 17% of youth were admitted twice, and about 6% of youth were admitted three to five times.
Admissions & Releases by Month

**Figure 3** shows admissions to, and releases from, Juvenile Hall by month.

**There were 185 admissions to Juvenile Hall and 180 releases from Juvenile Hall in 2021.**

Admissions peaked at 24 admissions in June and releases peaked at 23 releases in March. In general, the number of admissions and releases by month followed similar patterns throughout the year.

**Admissions by Gender**

**Figure 4** illustrates admissions to Juvenile Hall by gender.

**Overall, boys accounted for 78% of admissions, while girls accounted for 22% of admissions.**

**Admissions by Race/Ethnicity**

**Figure 5** shows the breakdown of admissions to Juvenile Hall by race/ethnicity.

**Overall, 58% of admissions were Black youth, 28% were Latinx youth, 9% were AAPI youth, and 5% were youth of another race/ethnicity** (including white youth due to sample size < 11).

As compared to the overall racial/ethnic composition of children in San Francisco, Black youth (6%) were significantly overrepresented in admissions to Juvenile Hall. Latinx youth (23%) were also slightly overrepresented among admissions, while AAPI youth (29%) and white youth (35%) were underrepresented.6

---

6 San Francisco demographic estimates taken from: [S0901 Children Characteristics American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates Table](#).
**Figure 6** shows admissions by gender and race. Due to a small number of girls of other racial/ethnic groups represented in 2021 admissions, all other racial/ethnic groups (AAPI, Latinx, White, and Other) were collapsed into one category.

**Racial disparities in admissions are even more pronounced for girls than boys.** Black girls accounted for almost two-thirds of all admissions for girls. Black boys accounted for 56% of admissions for boys. Despite girls accounting for only 22% of admissions, Black girls were the third largest group of admissions, following Black and Latinx boys.

**Admissions by Age**

**Figure 7** depicts admissions to Juvenile Hall by age. Overall, 11% of admissions were under the age of 15, 12% were 15 year-olds, 21% were 16 year-olds, 35% were 17 year-olds, 16% were 18 year-olds, and 5% were young adults older than 18.

The average age at admission was 16.5 years old, older than in 2020 when it was 15.9 years old. The average age at admission in 2021 was virtually the same for both boys and girls.

**Admissions by Location of Residence**

**Figure 8** outlines admissions by gender and location of residence. In 2021, 51% of admissions for girls were for out of county residents in comparison to only 33% of admissions for boys.

**Table 1** outlines admissions by location of residence, with county of residence specified for admissions for youth who resided outside of San Francisco and zip code of residence specified for San Francisco residents.
For admissions that included residential information, 37% were admissions for youth who lived outside of San Francisco. Two-thirds of admissions for out-of-county youth were from nearby counties of Alameda (11%), Contra Costa (7%), and Solano (7%).

Admissions for youth who lived within San Francisco accounted for 63% of admissions. Four zip codes accounted for 57% of San Francisco admissions: 94124 (Bayview/Hunter’s Point), 94112 (Visitacion Valley/Sunnydale), 94110 (Mission/Bernal Heights), and 941110 (Mission/Bernal Heights). All other San Francisco zip codes accounted for less than 5% of San Francisco admissions.

Admissions by Primary Detention Reason

Table 2 outlines admissions to Juvenile Hall by primary detention reason. There can be multiple reasons why a young person is detained for a given admission. Therefore, they have been ranked in order of importance to determine the primary detention reason.

As seen in Table 2, 79% of admissions to Juvenile Hall were mandatory7, an increase from 72% in 2020.

---

7 In certain scenarios, it is mandated by state law that a youth is held in a secure detention facility until they can appear before a judge. For example, when a youth age 14 or older is arrested for the personal use of a firearm in the attempt or commission of a felony, or for any offense outlined in WIC 707(b), including but not limited to murder, attempted murder, robbery, rape, and assault with great bodily injury. Another scenario where secure detention is state-mandated is when youth are brought into custody on a court order, bench warrant, or arrest warrant. Secure detention is also mandatory when youth are transferred in-custody from county jail, the California Division of Juvenile Justice, or another county/jurisdiction until they appear before a judge.
The most common reasons for admission were for new law violations (personal use of a firearm in the commission of a felony, and/or 707(b) offense; 38%) and warrants/court orders (34%), for both of which detention is mandated by state law.\(^8\)

As seen in Figure 9, admissions for new law violations accounted for a larger percentage of admissions for boys than for girls. Conversely, warrants/court orders accounted for the most serious reason for detention for half of all admissions for girls, in comparison to 29% for boys.

For non-mandatory detentions, the largest category of admissions was for youth scoring 11 or higher on the Detention Risk Instrument\(^9\) (DRI; 17%). The majority of DRI-related admissions were due to possession of a firearm (71%).

Less commonly, youth were also admitted due to an automatic detention\(^10\) (2%) or a detention override (2%). Detention overrides accounted for a smaller percentage of admissions in 2021 than in 2020 (2% in 2021; 8% in 2020).

### Admissions for New Law Violations

**Table 3** outlines admissions for new law violations by most serious offense. While youth may be admitted on multiple charges, for this report, we categorize admissions by the most serious offense alleged by the arresting agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Willful Homicide</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willful Homicide</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Felonies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For youth who were admitted due to a new law violation for which detention is mandated by state law, 52% of these admissions were for robbery and 27% were for assault. Compared to 2020, robbery now accounts for a smaller percentage of new law violations (down from 75% in 2020) and assault accounts for a larger percentage (up from 16% in 2020).

The remaining offense categories (i.e., attempted murder, murder, weapons, and other felonies) accounted for about 20% of new law violation admissions. Robbery was the most common

---

\(^8\) Detention reasons are not mutually exclusive. For example, over 20% of admissions for new law violations also had a warrant at their time of admission, but are categorized as new law violations.

\(^9\) The Detention Risk Instrument (DRI) is a decision-making tool that assists Probation Officers in determining whether a minor will remain in secure detention pending a court hearing or be cited and released to a parent or guardian, taking into consideration whether detention is mandated by state law, or if not, whether there are other circumstances regarding the safety of the minor and/or the community that warrant detention. The DRI is completed for all youth referred to JPD. The DRI was developed by JPD many years ago, based on a model created by the Annie E. Casey Foundation Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI). Similar instruments are used by jurisdictions across the country. The DRI utilized in San Francisco is not a predictive risk assessment tool.

\(^10\) Automatic Detention is defined as when a young person returns from a placement and a non-secure detention option is not available.
offense for both boys and girls, though it accounted for a larger percentage of new law violation admissions for girls (75%) than boys (47%).

Admissions for Warrants/Court Orders

Table 4 outlines admissions for warrants/court orders by warrant type. Youth may be admitted on warrants and new charges, but would be categorized as a warrant/court order admission if the new charges did not meet the criteria of a new law violation (i.e., youth age 14 or older where the new offense included a 707(b) offense or personal use of a firearm in the commission of a felony).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warrant Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrest Warrants</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench Warrants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of County Warrants</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Orders</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramey Warrants</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Door Warrants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Warrants are not mutually exclusive, meaning a youth can be admitted to Juvenile Hall on more than one warrant. The most common warrant included in warrant/court order admissions was an arrest warrant (seen in 65% of warrant admissions).** This was followed by bench warrants (31%), and out of county warrants (11%).

Alternative Placement Youth in Custody by Month, End of Month Snapshot

Figure 10 displays youth in custody by alternative placement status on the last day of each month in 2021.

At any given time, a percentage of the Juvenile Hall population usually consists of youth for whom the court has sustained charges and issued a disposition that involves removal from their home. This includes youth who are awaiting placement, meaning they are awaiting placement with a resource family (foster care family, which may also include a relative) or Short-Term Residential Therapeutic Program (STRTP, previously called a group home). It also includes youth who have been committed to Juvenile Hall or a Secure Youth Treatment Facility (SYTF) by the Juvenile Court. Since California has terminated use of out-of-state STRTPs and announced the closure of the California Department of Juvenile Justice, youth who are in Juvenile Hall due to commitments to Juvenile Hall or Secure Track have become more common.

The percentage of youth in Juvenile Hall awaiting placement on the last day of the month declined throughout 2021, while the percentage of youth in Juvenile Hall due to a commitment increased.
Section 1.2: Juvenile Hall, Average Daily Population

Average daily population (ADP) is a measure of how many youth are in Juvenile Hall, on average, over a specified period of time. ADP is calculated by using individual youth’s admission date/time and release date/time to count how many youth were in Juvenile Hall on each day for a given time period of interest (i.e., month, year), and calculating the average.11

Average Daily Population by Year

Figure 11 illustrates how average daily population has changed over the past five years. **There has been a 69% decrease in the average daily population in Juvenile Hall from 2017 to 2021.**

The yearly ADP in Juvenile Hall remained stable in 2017 and 2018 and has decreased since. There was a 54% decrease from 2019 to 2020 that can be tied to a decrease in referrals due to the global COVID-19 pandemic, which led to historic local, state, and national declines in crime and arrests. The ADP continued to decline by 18% from 2020 to 2021, with an average of **14 youth in Juvenile Hall on any given day in 2021.**

Average Daily Population by Month

Figure 12 shows the trend in average daily population and the peak population in Juvenile Hall each month.

The monthly ADP in Juvenile Hall remained relatively stable throughout the year, ranging from a low of 10 youth on average in April to a high of 17 youth on average in November. The largest single-month change in average daily population occurred from April (10 youth on average) to May (15 youth on average).

**The peak population reached in Juvenile Hall in 2021 was 21 youth.**

---

11 As calculating an average requires division, ADP is rarely a whole number, and therefore is rounded to the nearest whole number. Because of this, the cumulative total of ADP by demographic subgroups (e.g., boys, girls) in each month may differ from the overall ADP for the same month due to rounding error.
Average Daily Population by Gender

Figure 13 shows the average daily population in Juvenile Hall by gender.

On average in 2021, boys accounted for 86% of the average daily population in Juvenile Hall, and girls accounted for 14%. This is similar to the gender breakdown of the average daily population in Juvenile Hall in 2020.

Figure 14 below shows the average daily population by gender by month.

By month, the ADP for boys in 2021 was at its lowest in March at 7 and peaked at 15 in June. For girls, their ADP in Juvenile Hall for 2020 peaked in February and March at 4, and declined to its lowest point of 1 multiple times during the year.

Average Daily Population by Race/Ethnicity

Figure 15 shows the average daily population in Juvenile Hall by race/ethnicity.

On average in 2021, the average daily population in Juvenile Hall was 64% Black youth, 21% Latinx youth, 14% AAPI youth, and 7% youth of other race/ethnicity (including white youth). As with admissions, the average daily population in Juvenile Hall on any given day was racially disproportionate and not reflective of the youth population in San Francisco.

Figure 16 shows the average daily population by race/ethnicity by month.

Black youth accounted for anywhere between 53% and 73% of the average daily population each month. Latinx accounted for between 7% and 35% of the average daily population each month. AAPI accounted for between 6% and 21% of the average daily population. Youth of another race accounted for a small percentage of the average daily population monthly, between 0 and 10%.
Average Daily Population by Age

**Figure 17** displays the average daily population in Juvenile Hall by age for 2021.

On average in 2021, youth under the age of 15 accounted for 7% of the average daily population in Juvenile Hall, 15 year-olds accounted for 7%, 16 year-olds accounted for 21%, 17 year-olds accounted for 43%, and 18 year-olds accounted for 29%. The percentage of 18 year-olds in Juvenile Hall on any given day increased from 13% in 2020 to 29% in 2021.

**Figure 18** displays the average daily population by age by month.

Over the course of 2021, the ADP in Juvenile Hall began skewing older. Youth 18 and older accounted for only 14% of the average daily population in January and increased to accounting for 36% of the average daily population in December 2021.

---

12 While youth over the age of 18 were admitted into Juvenile Hall in 2021, they are not shown in this graph because there were less cumulative days spent by youth over the age of 18 in Juvenile Hall in 2021 than there were days in the year.
Section 1.3: Juvenile Hall, Length of Stay

Average length of stay (ALOS) measures the number of days between the admission date and release date from Juvenile Hall for each detained youth over a specified time period, divided by the number of youth. The parameters for most of these calculations were all youth released in 2021 (N=180), including youth who were admitted prior to 2021. The ALOS for youth in custody is calculated by counting the number of days between the admission date and the last day of the month, for each youth in custody as of the last day of the month.

Average Length of Stay by Year

Figure 19 shows the five-year trend in mean length of stay for youth released from Juvenile Hall. Median length of stay has also been incorporated into the graph for 2020 and 2021 and will be included in future years of reporting.

The mean length of stay has remained stable over time, peaking at 23 days in 2018 and decreasing to 19 days in 2020 and 2021. While the mean length of stay was unchanged from 2020, the median length of stay decreased from 9 days to 5 days. This means that in 2021, half of youth released were released within 5 days of admission.

Average Length of Stay by Month for Youth Released

Figure 20 shows the ALOS for youth released each month. It is helpful to include both the mean and median length of stay, as the mean can be skewed by outliers (e.g., when youth with very lengthy stays are released). These outliers have a larger impact on the average when the sample is small, as it is in this case.

As described earlier, the mean length of stay for youth released in 2021 was 19 days, though this ranged from a low of 6 days to a high of 32 days. While the median length of stay in 2021 was 5 days, the low was 2 days and the peak was 18 days.

---

13 JPD’s methodology for calculating ALOS changed in 2020. In prior years, ALOS was not limited to youth who were released in a given year. For youth who had not been released by the end of the year, length of stay was calculated as the number of days between the admission date and the last day of the year. The effect of including youth detained on the last day of the year on calculation of the full year’s ALOS is likely minimal.
Average Length of Stay by Month for Youth in Custody

Figure 21 shows the ALOS for youth in custody on the last day of the month each month of 2021.

As the average daily population in 2021 was so low, longer stays had a significant impact on length of stay for youth in custody on the last day of the month. These longer stays were typically either youth detained on serious charges waiting for their court case to resolve or youth committed to Juvenile Hall.

The mean length of stay for youth in custody on the last day of the month increased from 49 days in January (median: 16 days) to 147 days in December (median: 74 days).

Length of Stay for Releases by Demographics & Primary Detention Reason

Table 5 outlines how average length of stay for youth released in 2021 differed by demographics and primary detention reason.

The minimum length of stay for releases in 2021 was 0 days, meaning some youth were released in less than 24 hours. The maximum for releases was 208 days, about 7 months. The median length of stay was 5 days, meaning that half youth were released within 5 days. The mean, which is more susceptible to outliers, was 19 days. Over half of youth released in 2021 were released in a week or less, a greater proportion than in 2020: 54% (2021) versus 45% (2020).

On average, girls had shorter lengths of stay than boys. AAPI youth had longer lengths of stay than other racial/ethnic groups. Younger youth had shorter lengths of stay than older youth. Youth whose primary detention reason was for a new law violation or transfers (either from county jail, DJJ, or another county jurisdiction) had shorter lengths of stay in Juvenile Hall.
Section 2: Probation Services

Section 2.1: Probation Services, Referrals

This section outlines referrals presented to JPD in 2021. Referrals in the youth justice system are the equivalent of arrests in the adult system. Unlike in the adult system, where Adult Probation only becomes involved after a conviction and a sentence to probation, all juvenile arrests are presented to the Juvenile Probation Department shortly after arrest, and the Department remains involved in the court process throughout. As noted in the previous section, when a youth is referred to JPD, they can either be cited and released or detained in Juvenile Hall.

Referrals by Year

FIGURE 22 shows how the number of referrals to JPD by year has changed over time.

From 2017 to 2021, the number of referrals to JPD has decreased by 66%.

TABLE 6 illustrates the five-year trend in the percentage of referrals resulting in detention in Juvenile Hall. The percentage of referrals that resulted in a youth being detained has also declined.

As noted earlier, the way that JPD calculates admissions changed in 2020 to remove re-bookings, and only measure unique admissions to Juvenile Hall. Due to this change, the percentage of referrals that result in youth being detained is now an exact calculation. However, prior years should be viewed as an estimate.

Youth Referred to JPD by Number of Referrals

As one youth can be referred to JPD multiple times in one year, FIGURE 23 shows the number of unique youth referred to JPD.

The number of youth referred to JPD decreased by 25% from 2020 to 2021 (387 youth and 291 youth, respectively).

About three-quarters of youth accounted for 1 referral (76%), 13% accounted for two referrals, and 11% accounted for between 3 and 10 referrals.
For over half of youth referred to JPD in 2021, it was their first San Francisco arrest (55%), while 45% of youth referred has been arrested in San Francisco in years prior.

Probation Referrals, CARC Referrals, and Make it Right Referrals

Figure 24 shows probation referrals, referrals to CARC, and referrals to Make it Right by month. Probation referrals include CARC referrals and Make it Right referrals, which are both forms of diversion.

While the number of referrals to probation decreased by 25% from 2020 to 2021, referrals to diversion programs either remained the same or increased. The number of referrals to CARC increased by 14% from 73 in 2020 to 83 in 2021. The number of referrals to Make it Right remained about the same (22 in 2020 and 21 in 2021). In 2021, 24% of referrals were diverted to CARC or Make it Right, in comparison to 17% in 2020.

Referrals by Referral Type

Figure 25 displays referrals by referral type.

43% of referrals were Booking referrals, or referrals associated with admission into Juvenile Hall. Another 36% were for Citations, meaning that the young person was cited and released with a notice to appear at Probation or at CARC at a later date.

Transfer Ins (cases transferred from another county due to the youth’s residence in San Francisco), both in and out of custody accounted for 9% of referrals, warrants accounted for 6%, violations accounted for 2%, and “Other” accounted for 4%. Referrals labeled as “Other” were a small subset of cases that were a combination of rare scenarios such as Inter-State Compact Jurisdiction cases (cases transferred from another state), jurisdictional transfer back cases, and cases transferred down from adult court.
Referrals by Most Serious Reason

Referrals can include multiple charges of varying degrees of seriousness, warrants, and violations. Figure 26 displays referrals categorized by the most serious reason for the referral.

Felonies accounted for 64% of all referrals, with 707(b) felony offenses\(^\text{14}\) accounting for 25% of all referrals and non-707(b) felonies accounting for 39%. Misdemeanors accounted for 22% of all referrals and warrants accounted for 10%. Violations accounted for 4% of all referrals, down from 8% of all referrals in 2020.

Referrals by Offense/Legal Status

Figure 27 displays referrals by offense/legal status category.

Person offenses\(^\text{15}\) accounted for the largest percentage of referrals in 2021 (39%), followed by property offenses\(^\text{16}\) (25%). Public order offenses, mostly comprised of probation violations, weapons possession offenses, and miscellaneous traffic offenses, accounted for 15% of referrals. Other status, which accounted for 11% of referrals, is comprised of uncategorized legal status details: warrants, courtesy holds, home detention violations, and changes of placement due to unsuccessful placements. Drug offenses accounted for the remaining 10% of referrals.

Table 7 shows the most common offense/legal status reasons why youth were referred to JPD in 2021. These top 10 reasons encompass about 82% of all referrals.

In 2021, the most common referral reason was for robbery, which accounted for over 15% of all referrals. This was followed by referrals for other status (11%) and assault (10%).

\(^{14}\) Section 707(b) of the Welfare & Institutions Code enumerates a range of serious and violent crimes, including but not limited to murder, attempted murder, arson, robbery, rape, and assault with great bodily injury, for which an arrest involving a youth age 14 or older mandates detention until a court hearing.

\(^{15}\) Person offenses are offenses against a person, including assault, robbery, rape, and homicide.

\(^{16}\) Property offenses are offenses against property, including burglary, theft, motor vehicle theft, arson, vandalism, and trespassing.
Referrals by Gender

Figure 28 displays referrals to JPD by gender.

Girls accounted for 22% of referrals, while boys accounted for 78% of referrals to JPD. Girls accounted for a smaller percentage of referrals in 2021 in comparison to 2020 (22% in 2021 versus 27% in 2020).

Referrals by Race/Ethnicity

Figure 29 shows referrals to JPD by race/ethnicity.

Black youth accounted for half of all referrals to JPD, followed by Latinx youth (31%). AAPI youth, white youth, and youth of another race/ethnicity all accounted for less than 10% of referrals each.

In comparison to 2020, Black youth accounted for a smaller percentage of referrals (50% versus 57%) and all other racial/ethnic groups accounted for a slightly larger percentage of referrals. However, the racial makeup of referrals to JPD remains vastly disproportionate to the population of children in San Francisco.

Figure 30 displays referrals to JPD by gender and race/ethnicity.

As noted prior, referrals to JPD are disproportionately Black youth. This disproportionality is even more pronounced for girls than boys. Similar to admissions, two-thirds of referrals for girls were Black girls. Black girls comprised the third largest demographic group of referrals, following Black boys and Latinx boys, despite girls only accounting for 22% of all referrals.
Referrals by Age

Figure 31 shows referrals to JPD by age.

Youth under the age of 15 accounted for 15% of referrals, 15-year-olds accounted for 12%, 16-year-olds accounted for 23%, 17-year-olds accounted for 37%, 18-year-olds accounted for 11%, and young adults over 18 accounted for 3% of referrals.

The mean age at referral in 2021 was 16.2 years old, slightly older than 2020 when the mean age was 15.8. The mean age at time of referral was similar for boys and girls.

Referrals by Location of Residence

Table 8 shows referrals by location of residence.

About one-third of referrals with address information available were for out of county youth. The majority of referrals to JPD from other counties came from Alameda (10% of referrals), Contra Costa (8%), and Solano (6%). These three counties accounted for 70% of referrals to JPD of youth who resided outside of San Francisco.

About two-thirds of referrals with address information available were for youth who lived within San Francisco. Three zip codes accounted for over 25% of referrals to JPD with address information available in 2021: 94124 (Bayview/ Hunter’s Point), 94134 (Visitacion Valley/ Sunnydale), and 94103 (South of Market). These three zip codes accounted for just under half of referrals issued to San Francisco residents (44%).

Figure 32 is another way of visualizing the neighborhood-level findings. For referrals issued to residents of San Francisco, the largest percentages of referrals were issued in the Southeast area of San Francisco. The six zip codes in the Southeast region shaded the darkest shades of blue accounted for about two-thirds of referrals issued to San Francisco residents.
Section 2.2: Probation Services, Petitions Filed

This section outlines referrals with petitions filed. A petition is a formal statement to the court by the District Attorney’s Office alleging that the youth is delinquent for committing a specified offense. It is comparable to the DA’s Office filing a complaint alleging criminal charges in the adult system. In San Francisco, petitions are generally filed for more serious offenses.

PetitionsFiledbyYear

**Figure 33** displays the number of referrals and referrals with petitions filed for the past 5 years.

**From 2017 to 2021, there was a 73% decrease in the number of petitions filed.** This decrease in petitions filed outpaces the 66% decrease in referrals that occurred over the same five-year period.

**Table 9** illustrates that as the decrease in petitions filed outpaced the decrease in referrals, there has been a decrease in the filing rate from 50% in 2017 to 41% in 2021.

While this analysis explored all referrals with petitions filed, subsequent analyses related to the most serious offense and charge category explore unique petitions, to avoid double counting petitions with identical offenses.

Unique Petitions by Most Serious Offense

**Figure 34** displays unique petitions filed by most serious reason.

**In 2021, 85% of petitions were for felony offenses: 35% of unique petitions were for 707(b) felony offenses and 50% were for non-707(b) felony offenses.**

While the percentage of petitions for felony offenses was the same as in 2020, non-707(b) offenses comprised a larger percentage of petitions in 2021 than in 2020 (50% versus 41%). The remaining 15% of petitions were for misdemeanors and probation violations.
Unique Petitions by Offense Category

Figure 35 breaks down unique petitions filed by offense type.

Person offenses comprised almost half of petitions (48%), followed by property offenses (28%), public order offenses (18%), and drug offenses (7%). All petitions for drug offenses were for drug sale or possession for the purpose of sale. The percentage breakdown of petitions by offense type in 2021 was similar to in 2020.

Table 10 shows petitions by most serious offense.

The 10 offense categories in the table capture 86% of unique petitions filed in 2021. Assault was the most common most serious petition offense (18%), followed by robbery (15%), and burglary (12%).

In comparison to 2020, robbery now accounts for a smaller percentage of petitions filed (down from 29% in 2020) while assault accounts for a larger percentage of petitions filed (up from 12% in 2020).

Petitions by Gender

Figure 36 displays petitions filed by gender.

Boys accounted for 82% of petitions filed while girls accounted for 18%.

Explored a different way, the filing rate for girls in 2021 was 34% in comparison to 42% for boys. Both boys and girls experienced slight decreases in filing rate from 2020, where 37% of referrals for girls and 52% of referrals for boys resulted in a petition filed.
Petitions by Race/Ethnicity, 2021

**Figure 37** displays petitions filed by race/ethnicity.

**Black youth accounted for 61% of petitions filed in 2021, Latinx youth accounted for 24%, and youth of another race or ethnicity accounted for 15%.**

The filing rate was also higher for Black youth (49%) than Latinx youth (32%), and other race youth (33%).

**Figure 38** shows the racial breakdown of petitions filed by gender. Due to a small number of girls of other racial/ethnic groups represented in 2021 petitions filed, all other racial/ethnic groups (AAPI, Latinx, White, and Other) were collapsed into one category.

As with prior analyses exploring system touch points by gender and race, this one also showed racial disparities to be even worse for girls than boys.

**Black girls accounted for 72% of all petitions filed for girls,** while girls of all other racial/ethnic backgrounds accounted for about 28%. Black boys accounted for 58% of petitions filed for boys, while boys of other racial/ethnic backgrounds accounted for 42% of petitions filed for boys.

Petitions by Age, 2021

**Figure 39** displays petitions filed by age.

Youth under the age of 15 accounted for 10% of petitions filed, 15-year-olds accounted for 14%, 16-year-olds accounted for 24%, 17-year-olds accounted for 37%, and youth aged 18 and older accounted for 14% of petitions filed.

**Generally, the filing rate was higher for older youth.** The mean age at the time when the petition was filed was the same for boys and girls at 16.3 years old.
Petitions by Location of Residence

Table 11 displays petitions filed by location of residence with county of residence specified for petitions filed for youth who resided outside of San Francisco and zip code of residence specified for San Francisco residents.

In 2021, 35% of petitions filed were for youth who lived outside of San Francisco. Over half of petitions filed on youth who lived outside of San Francisco were for residents of Alameda and Contra Costa.

Of the remaining 65% of petitions filed on youth who lived within San Francisco, almost half were from three zip codes: Bayview/ Hunter’s Point (94124), Visitacion Valley/ Sunnydale (94134), and Ingleside/ Excelsior (94112).

Figure 40 is another way of visualizing the neighborhood-level findings. For petitions filed on residents of San Francisco, the neighborhoods with the highest percentages were in the Eastern and Southern areas of San Francisco. The six zip codes in the region shaded the darkest shades of blue accounted for about 70% of petitions filed on San Francisco residents.

---

**Table 11: Petitions by County & Zip Code of Residence, 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Residence</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside of San Francisco</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara, San Mateo, Sonoma, Out of State</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within San Francisco</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayview/Hunter’s Point (94124)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitacion Valley/Sunnydale (94134)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingleside/Excelsior (94112)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potrero Hill (94107)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Market (94103)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Merced (94132)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission/Bernal Heights (94110)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Richmond (94121)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincon Hill (94105); Russian Hill/Polk Gulch (94109); Western Addition (94115); North Beach (94133); Inner Richmond (94118); Miraloma/Sunnyside (94127); Mission Bay (94158); Tenderloin/ Western Addition (94102); Twin Peaks/Glen Park (94131)</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 8 petitions were missing residential information

---

**Figure 40: Percentage of SF Petitions Issued by Zip Code of Residence, 2021**

Note: Includes only petitions with a valid San Francisco zip code entered (N = 163)
This section outlines active cases on the JPD caseload for all case-carrying units (i.e. CARC, Vertical 1, Vertical 2, Placement-JCRU, & AB12), both pre- and post-adjudication. Caseloads are dynamic and can change daily, which is why only single day snapshots are provided.

Active Caseload by Case Status

Figure 41 displays the active caseload by case status, by month. This includes youth who are pre-adjudicated, post-adjudicated, or on extended foster care (i.e., AB12)

Overall, the active caseload declined by 22% in 2021. The most significant decline was seen in the number of post-adjudicated youth, which decreased by 44% over the course of the year.

Active Caseload by Demographics

Table 12 shows the demographics of the active caseload on December 31 for 2020 and 2021.

Overall, the active caseload decreased by 25% in one year’s time. The largest declines were among girls (-34%), white youth (-38%) younger youth, and youth from San Francisco (-40%). The percentage decline for youth from San Francisco significantly outpaced that for out of county youth (-40% versus -16%)

While the zip codes within San Francisco that accounted for the largest percentage of youth in 2020 still accounted for the largest percentage in 2021, all saw significant drops in one year’s time (ranging from 38 to 54% decreases).
Section 2.4: Probation Services, Programs

This section outlines JPD referrals to San Francisco programs and services in 2021. JPD accesses a wide variety of programs for justice-involved youth in neighborhoods across the City, including substance abuse treatment, mental health treatment, community service, anger management, and detention alternatives. Detention alternatives include electronic monitoring and evening reporting, among other programs.

There are several ways a young person can be connected to programs in San Francisco, either a self-referral, a referral by another agency, or a referral by their probation officer. The referrals data presented in this section includes only referrals to San Francisco programs by probation officers, and therefore does not reflect the full array of programs that youth may be connected to. It is also important to note that a significant percentage of young people on JPD’s caseload are from out of county and would not be referred to programs within San Francisco because of the additional burden of needing to travel to a different county to attend a program.

Program Referrals by Month

Figure 42 displays the number of referrals to programs in San Francisco by month.

There were a total of 318 referrals made by JPD to San Francisco programs, with an average of 27 referrals per month.

Youth on Active Caseload Active in Programs

Figure 43 shows the number of youth on JPD’s active caseload, the number of youth active in San Francisco programs, and the percentage of youth on the active caseload who are active in San Francisco programs.17

The percentage of youth on active caseload who were active in San Francisco programs increased from 39% at the start of 2021 to 64% by the end of the year.

17 This analysis does not include AB12 youth.
Program Referrals by Program Type

Table 12 provides a breakdown of referrals to San Francisco programs by type of program. Most programs provide an array of services, but are only categorized as one “type” of service in JPD’s case management system.

About half of probation program referrals were for detention alternatives, with the largest number of program referrals being for Electronic Monitoring GPS (19%) and CARC (16%).

Detention alternative program referrals were followed by mental health therapy (9%), case management (8%), and JPD diversion (6%). All other program types accounted for less than 5% of probation program referrals made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detention Alternative</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRAM - Electronic Monitoring GPS</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huckleberry Youth - CARC</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFDA - Make it Right</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Neighborhood Centers - Home Detention</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Community Developers - Evening Reporting Center</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFDA - Unaccompanied Children Assistance Program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huckleberry Youth - Huckleberry Advocacy &amp; Response Team; SCRAM - Alcohol Monitoring</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Therapy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion - JPD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Management</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/Alcohol Outpatient</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Training</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion - SFDA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational; Restorative Justice</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>318</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programs Terminated by ALOS and Outcome

Table 13 shows program types by success rates and average length of stay in programming for programs terminated in 2021. Only program types with over 10 terminations are included for the purpose of this analysis. It is important to note that success in a program is determined by the program provider, not by JPD.

The program types with the highest success rates and longest lengths of stay were mental health therapy and drug/alcohol outpatient programs. Detention alternative programs, which accounted for the majority of programs terminated, had a success rate of 80%. Anger management had a much lower success rate than other program types (36%).
Section 2.4: Probation Services, Petitions Sustained

This section outlines petitions sustained in 2021. A sustained petition in juvenile court is essentially the same as a guilty verdict in adult court. As in adult court, one petition can include multiple counts—either stemming from one incident (for example, a robbery where a gun also was used), or from multiple incidents grouped together into a single prosecution (for example, a string of robberies on different days involving different victims). Therefore, there can be multiple sustained petition events stemming from multiple referrals within one petition.

Sustained Petitions by Year

**Figure 44** displays sustained petitions by year.

In prior years, the number of sustained petitions was calculated as the total number of events where a petition was sustained in a given year. Beginning in 2020, our calculation changed to use just one petition sustained event per petition case number in order to avoid double counting the same petition and provide an exact number of sustained petitions.

Due to the change in calculation, percent change over time is not calculated. **However, from 2020 to 2021, the number of sustained petitions decreased by 27% from 106 to 77.**

Sustained Petitions by Most Serious Sustained Offense

**Figure 45** displays unique petitions sustained by the most serious reason.

Non-707(b) felony offenses accounted for the largest percentage of petitions sustained (49%), followed by misdemeanors (27%), 707(b) felony offenses (18%), and violations (5%). It is important to note that charges are frequently reduced through the adjudication process, for example, many felony petitions are reduced to misdemeanors by the time a case resolves.
Section 2.4: Probation Services, Petition Dispositions

This section outlines petition dispositions in 2021 in comparison to 2020. A petition disposition reflects the court’s resolution of the case. It is important to note that the year when a petition is sustained (when the charges are found to be true) will not always be the year in which the court issues a disposition. Therefore, the number of petitions sustained in a given year may not align with the number of petition dispositions in that year.

Once a petition has been sustained, the court has several dispositional options: it may dismiss the case; transfer to jurisdiction of residence (“transfer out”); make the youth a ward of the court by placing them on wardship or formal probation; place the youth on non-wardship probation; or place the youth on informal probation. More intensive alternatives include commitments to out of home placement, Juvenile Hall, or a Secure Youth Treatment Facility (“Secure Track”). Youth committed to these alternative placements are also placed on wardship probation.

Petition Dispositions by Year

Table 14 outlines petition dispositions by year for 2020 and 2021.

One case can have multiple subsequent petition dispositions. In prior years, petition dispositions were calculated by the most recent petition disposition for a given petition case number. This metric has switched to showing all petition dispositions in a given year to provide a complete overview of all petition dispositions and better align with how JPD reports data in the monthly data report.

Due to the significant declines seen across juvenile delinquency system touchpoints, almost all petition disposition outcomes have seen significant declines since 2020. The two exceptions are commitments to Secure Track and to Juvenile Hall, which were rare (or nonexistent in the case of Secure Track) prior to 2021, but have become more common with the closure of DJJ and California’s discontinued use of out-of-state STRTPs.
Section 2.5: Probation Services, Probation Termination

This section outlines probation terminations in 2021. A probation termination is when a young person who has had a petition filed in court is released from one of the following types of supervision:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probation Type</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal Probation</td>
<td>Prior to making a determination of whether the charges are true, the court may allow a youth to participate in a program of supervision. If the young person successfully completes the program within the allotted time (typically six months), then the petition will be dismissed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Wardship Probation</td>
<td>The court has found the charges to be true and placed the young person under the supervision of JPD, but has not declared the young person to be a ward of the court and will not remove them from their home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardship Probation</td>
<td>The court has found the charges to be true, and the court has declared the young person to be a ward of the court. This allows the court to make decisions about the care, treatment, living situation, and guidance of the young person, instead of their parents. Youth who are on wardship probation are under the supervision of probation, and may be supervised either in the community or in an alternative placement setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probation Terminations by Type of Probation

**Figure 46** shows probation terminations in 2021 by the type of probation that ended.

Overall, **25% of terminations were for informal probation**, **4% were for non-wardship probation**, and **71% were for wardship probation**.

Probation Terminations by Outcome

**Figure 47** displays probation terminations by the outcome of probation.

**For all youth who terminated probation in 2021, the majority of them terminated successfully (96%).**
Juvenile Justice Case Flow and Glossary
### Adjudication

Adjudication refers to the court process, starting with the filing of charges by the District Attorney, through which the judge determines if a youth committed the offense. The term “adjudicated” is similar to convicted and indicates that the court concluded that the youth committed the offense (sustains the charge or finds that the charge is true).

- **Pre-adjudication** refers to the period prior to the court’s final determination. During this period, there are court hearings during which the District Attorney and Defense Attorney try to resolve the case. Some youth will have their case dismissed during this phase and will never be adjudicated.
- **Post-adjudication** refers to the period after the court has sustained the charges and resolved the case by ordering a disposition, which may include some form of probation supervision, out of home placement, or commitment to Juvenile Hall or a Secure Youth Treatment Facility.

### Admission to Juvenile Hall

Depending on the nature of the alleged offense and the legal circumstances, a youth who is arrested may be admitted to Juvenile Hall to be securely housed (“detained”) until they appear before the court. The admission may be associated with one or more incidents alleging new law violations and/or other legal circumstances, such as a warrant.

### Allegation

An unproven accusation or claim that someone has broken the law/committed a crime. Police may make an arrest alleging that someone has committed a crime based on probable cause. The allegation may eventually result in a conviction (in criminal court) or disposition (in juvenile court) if proven true through the court process.

### Arrest

The taking of a person into legal custody by a law enforcement officer either under a valid warrant or based on probable cause that the person has committed a crime or a delinquent act. In the juvenile justice system, referrals are the equivalent of arrests in the adult system.

### Assessment

An evaluation of an individual’s strengths, needs, and risks to inform case planning and service referrals.

### Average Daily Population (ADP)

Average daily population (ADP) is a measure of how many youth are detained in Juvenile Hall, on average, over a specified period of time.

### Average Length of Stay (ALOS)

Average length of stay is a measure of how long it takes youth to be released from Juvenile Hall, on average, which is calculated by counting the number of days between the admission date and release date, divided by the number of youth.
<p>| <strong>Booking</strong> | The process whereby an individual is taken into custody and “booked” or “processed.” During the booking process, an officer typically takes the individual’s personal information, photo, fingerprints; records information about the alleged offenses; performs a criminal background check; and places the youth in formal detention. A youth is processed for each incident alleged by the arresting agency, thus one admission to Juvenile Hall may be associated with multiple incidents (for example for offenses that occurred on different days) and multiple bookings. |
| <strong>Citation</strong> | A written order, also called a notice to appear or summons, issued by the arresting agency, to appear before a judge or probation officer at a later date in response to a law violation. Depending on the nature of the alleged offense and the legal circumstances, a youth who is arrested may be issued a citation and released to their parent or legal guardian (cited and released), rather than admitted to Juvenile Hall. |
| <strong>Commitment</strong> | A court order giving guardianship of a youth with sustained charges to the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department, to be committed to Juvenile Hall or a Secure Youth Treatment Facility (SYTF). Commitment to Juvenile Hall or SYTF is similar to incarceration for adults. |
| <strong>Community Assessment &amp; Resource Center (CARC)</strong> | The Community Assessment and Resource Center (CARC) is San Francisco’s community-based diversion program, and a single point of entry for crisis intervention, assessment, service integration, and referral of youth arrested in San Francisco for misdemeanors and non-707(b) felony offenses. Eligible youth are assessed through a collaborative process, involving JPD, case managers from Huckleberry Youth Programs, and other partner community-based organizations. CARC case managers work with youth to reintegrate them into their schools, arrange for special educational services as appropriate, obtain mental health services, complete community service and probation requirements, and engage the youth in positive social, arts, athletic, employment, and youth development programs. |
| <strong>Community-based Organization</strong> | A community-based organization (CBO) is a nonprofit organization that is representative of a community or significant segments of a community; and provides educational or related services to individuals in the community. |
| <strong>Counselor</strong> | A Juvenile Hall counselor is responsible for the care, custody, safety, and welfare of youth housed in Juvenile Hall. |
| <strong>Courtesy Hold</strong> | The temporary detention of an individual at the request of another county, state, or federal law enforcement agency who has jurisdiction. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Decline to File</strong></th>
<th>After police make an arrest for suspected criminal or delinquent activity, the arresting agency presents its evidence to the District Attorney’s (DA) Office to determine what, if any, charges can be proven beyond a reasonable doubt, and form the basis of a complaint or petition, thereby initiating the court process. If the DA’s office cannot prove the charges beyond a reasonable doubt, they will <em>decline to file</em> the charges.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detention</strong></td>
<td>Detention is the temporary holding of individuals accused of crimes or those awaiting disposition. In San Francisco, if detained, youth are housed in secure custody at Juvenile Hall. In California, subsequent to an arrest resulting in detention, the court must make a decision within 72 hours (or 3 court days) regarding whether to release the youth or to continue detaining them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detention Hearing</strong></td>
<td>The Detention Hearing is the first court hearing after a youth is arrested and detained, at which the court will determine whether the youth will be released from custody, placed on Home Detention, or remain at Juvenile Hall pending further order of the court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dismissal</strong></td>
<td>A judge’s ruling to terminate the charges, thus ending the court case. When a case is dismissed, it means that the charges are dropped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disposition</strong></td>
<td>If the judge determines that a youth committed the act for which he or she is charged by the District Attorney, the judge will issue a disposition to address the youth’s behavior. This is similar to sentencing for an adult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Attorney (DA)</strong></td>
<td>The District Attorney is a public official elected to represent the state in judicial proceedings in a particular county. Attorneys (lawyers) at the DA’s Office review charges alleged by the police and based on the evidence decide whether to file charges by way of a petition, initiating court proceedings that will determine whether a youth broke the law, and if so, the court’s response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversion</strong></td>
<td>Diversion refers to a wide range of interventions, which vary from county to county, that may be implemented as an alternative to traditional justice system responses. At the point of arrest, police may divert a youth to a community-based organization for services (not currently available in San Francisco). Once an arrest is presented to the Juvenile Probation Department, excluding certain offenses, rather than presenting the case to the DA for charging, the probation officer may divert the youth to the Community Assessment and Resource Center (CARC), or other special classes, counseling, or community service (“informal probation”). Once a case is presented to the DA, the DA may divert the youth to a pre-filing diversion program. Even after a petition is filed, the court may divert the youth to informal probation. If a youth successfully completes the diversion program, at whatever stage it occurs, the youth will not face subsequent court proceeding, avoiding either arrest, prosecution, or a disposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ)</strong></td>
<td>The Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), formerly known as the California Youth Authority (CYA), is California’s youth prison system for individuals with sustained charges for 707(b) offenses or sex offenses. DJJ ceased intake, with limited exceptions, on July 1, 2021, and responsibility for the custody, care, and supervision of youth who would have otherwise been eligible for DJJ has been shifted from the state to counties (DJJ Realignment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electronic Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>Electronic monitoring is a GPS monitor that tracks the location of the wearer 24 hours a day. The court may order a youth to wear an ankle bracelet that electronically monitors their movement as a condition of release from detention or probation. Youth may also be placed on Alcohol Monitoring, which automatically samples the wearer’s perspiration to test for alcohol consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Detention/Home Supervision</strong></td>
<td>Home supervision (or “Home Detention”) is a program in which persons who would otherwise be detained in Juvenile Hall are permitted to remain in their homes pending court disposition of their cases, with court-ordered conditions, under the supervision of a deputy probation officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interstate Compact for Juveniles</strong></td>
<td>Pursuant to Welfare &amp; Institutions Code 1400, “each state is responsible for the proper supervision or return of juveniles, delinquents, and status offenders who are on probation or parole and who have absconded, escaped, or run away from supervision and control and in so doing have endangered their own safety and the safety of others,” and that, “each state is responsible for the safe return of juveniles who have run away from home and in doing so have left their state of residence.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jurisdiction</strong></td>
<td>A geographical area (such as the county) where a court or government agency may exercise its authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juvenile Delinquency</strong></td>
<td>An act of breaking the law committed by a person who has not yet turned 18 years old for which an adult could be prosecuted in a criminal court, but when committed by a youth is within the jurisdiction of the juvenile delinquency court. Delinquent acts include crimes against persons, crimes against property, drug offenses, and crimes against public order, when juveniles commit such acts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juvenile Hall</strong></td>
<td>Juvenile Hall is the official reception and detention center for youth detained as a result of an arrest for alleged delinquent misconduct or a juvenile court order in San Francisco. Juvenile detention is short-term confinement, primarily used after a youth has been arrested, but before a court has determined whether the youth has committed the alleged act. The court may also commit a youth to placement at Juvenile Hall as a disposition/consequence for delinquent acts. San Francisco Juvenile Hall is a 150-bed, secure facility operated 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and 365 days a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Make It Right</strong></td>
<td>Make it Right is a pre-filing diversion program operated by the San Francisco District Attorney’s Office: “Through Make it Right, eligible young people are given the option, before their cases are charged, to participate in restorative community conferencing. In this process, the youth come together with their victim and their supporters (including family/caregivers, youth services, schools, coaches, and others) in a community-based facilitated dialogue to develop an agreement for the young person to repair harm, address root causes, and make amends. This collective agreement identifies concrete actions the youth will take to address harm caused to the victim, the community, the youth’s family, and him/herself. With support from a community-based case manager, the young person has a six-month period to complete their agreement. If successful, the case is not prosecuted.” 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Law Violation</strong></td>
<td>A new law violation refers to the act of breaking a law or committing a crime. When a juvenile breaks the law, this is called a delinquent act. A new law violation is distinguished from a probation violation or a warrant, which are related to previous law violations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offense</strong></td>
<td>An offense is an act of breaking the law. Ranging from most serious to least serious, offenses are categorized as either a felony, misdemeanor, or infraction. San Francisco Juvenile Probation does not handle infractions. The arrest offense is the act of allegedly breaking the law for which an individual is arrested by the police. The charged offense is the act charged by the district attorney when they file a petition, initiating court proceedings. The sustained offense is the offense the court finds that a youth has committed, either through a trial or through a plea agreement process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out of Home Placement</strong></td>
<td>Through the juvenile delinquency court process, the court may find that returning a youth home would be contrary to the child’s welfare if a youth poses a genuine risk to public safety and requires treatment that cannot be provided while they remain in their home, or if their family home has been proven to be unsafe. Out of Home Placement youth are youth whom the court has ordered to be removed from their home and placed in the foster care system through juvenile delinquency proceedings. This group includes youth for whom the court has sustained charges and issued an out of home placement disposition who are awaiting placement with a Resource Family (foster care family, which also can include a relative) or Short-Term Residential Therapeutic Program (STRTP, previously called a group home); and youth who were previously ordered to out of home placement, have been brought before the court for a subsequent matter (either a new law violation or unsuccessful placement) and are awaiting adjudication or pending disposition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 “Make it Right,” San Francisco District Attorney, access date 7/20/21, [https://www.sfdistrictattorney.org/policy/restorative-justice/make-it-right/](https://www.sfdistrictattorney.org/policy/restorative-justice/make-it-right/)
<p>| <strong>Petition</strong> | The legal document the District Attorney files with the court, which describes the law violations (charges) a youth is alleged to have committed. Filing a petition formally begins the court process. |
| <strong>Probable Cause</strong> | Probable cause is a requirement found in the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution that must usually be met before police make an arrest, conduct a search, or receive a warrant, requiring that there is a reasonable basis for believing that a crime may have been committed. |
| <strong>Probation Officer (PO)</strong> | The law enforcement official assigned to investigate a delinquent act alleged by the police, develop a plan to help youth succeed and avoid further justice system involvement, support youth in meeting court ordered conditions, and report back to the court on their progress. |
| <strong>Probation/Supervision</strong> | Court-ordered supervision of youth in the community by a probation officer requiring youth to meet court ordered conditions, including, for example, school attendance, community service, restitution, counseling, substance abuse treatment, behavioral and/or mental health treatment, or other services, as a response to sustained delinquency charges. |
| <strong>Public Defender</strong> | A public defender is a lawyer appointed to represent people who otherwise cannot reasonably afford to hire a lawyer to defend themselves in court proceedings. In San Francisco, the Public Defender is a public official elected to provide defense services. |
| <strong>Record Sealing</strong> | When a record is sealed, it means that it can only be accessed under certain, limited circumstances, and that the subject of the record can legally and truthfully say that they do not have a criminal record. Police and Juvenile Probation may seal arrest records for youth for whom a petition was not filed and who have successfully completed diversion. The court may seal records for cases in which a petition was filed if the case was dismissed or after a specified time period. Under certain circumstances, the court may order that sealed records are also destroyed, which means that they must be physically obliterated and can no longer be accessed under any circumstance. For more information about sealing juvenile records, please visit the California Judicial Council website: <a href="https://www.courts.ca.gov/28120.htm">https://www.courts.ca.gov/28120.htm</a> |
| <strong>Resource Family</strong> | In California, a Resource Family is a caregiver who provides home-based care for children in foster care. Resource Families include individuals, couples, and families. They may be related, have a familiar or mentoring relationship, or no previous relationship with the child. The Resource Family is approved to provide care on a temporary (foster care) and/or permanent (adoption and legal guardianship) basis and includes all types of caregivers in the child welfare and probation systems formerly known as foster parents, approved relatives, or approved Non-Relative Extended Family Members. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secure Youth Treatment Facility</th>
<th>A Secure Youth Treatment Facility (SYTF) is a secure facility operated, utilized, or accessed by the county of commitment to provide appropriate programming, treatment, and education for youth, age 14 or over, who would have otherwise been eligible for confinement at a Division of Juvenile Justice facility, having been adjudicated for a 707(b) offense or a registerable sex offense. San Francisco currently operates an SYTF in Juvenile Hall.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short-term Residential Therapeutic Program (STRTP)</td>
<td>A short-term residential therapeutic program (STRTP), formerly called a group home, is a licensed residential congregate care setting for youth ordered to out of home placement. STRTPs must provide a set of core services, which include mental health services, to be licensed by the state. The placement must be reviewed by the court every six months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Violation</td>
<td>A technical violation is a violation of the conditions of probation or home detention. For example, removing a court ordered electronic monitor is a technical violation of a court ordered condition, as is leaving an out of home placement without permission. A probation officer may file a probation violation with the court in response to the technical violation, which may result in additional court-ordered conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer In/Out</td>
<td>When a youth who resides in San Francisco is adjudicated in another county, the case may be sent to San Francisco for disposition. When a youth that lives in another county is adjudicated in San Francisco, the case may be sent to the youth’s home county for disposition. In either scenario, if the youth is placed on probation by the court, the youth may be transferred to their home county to be supervised by the local probation department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward/ Wardship</td>
<td>If a youth under the juvenile court’s jurisdiction has broken the law, the court may determine the youth to be a ward of the court, whereby the court has legal authority to act as their parent/guardian. Wardship probation is when the court orders a ward to be placed on probation and supervised by the probation department in the community. Youth may remain on juvenile wardship probation until they turn 21 for most offenses, and up to 23 or 25 for select offenses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Warrant**

A warrant is an order issued by a juvenile court judge, which can be issued before a youth’s charges have been adjudicated (pre-trial), or after adjudication and/or disposition (for example, while on probation).

- A **bench warrant** is issued by a sitting judge, typically when a youth has failed to appear at a court hearing.
- Any law enforcement agency, most often the Police or the District Attorney, including agencies from other jurisdictions, may request that the court issue an **arrest warrant** for alleged criminal conduct.
  - When the police request an arrest warrant directly from the court, it is called a **Ramey Warrant**.
  - In San Francisco, when the DA requests an arrest warrant, it is colloquially called a **Back Door Warrant**.
- The Juvenile Probation Department may also request an arrest warrant from the court if a petition has already been filed, and probation demonstrates to the court that there is a concern for the safety of the youth or the community, the youth’s whereabouts are unknown, or the youth has willfully evaded the court/probation.

---

**Welfare & Institutions Code (WIC)**

The Welfare & Institutions Code is the section of California law that relates to welfare, dependent children, mental health, handicapped, elderly, delinquency, foster care, Medi-Cal, food stamps, rehabilitation, and long-term care, and including juvenile delinquency.

**WIC 602**

Welfare & Institutions Code 602 is the California law that states that if the court finds that a youth aged 12-17 has broken the law, they may determine the youth to be a ward of the court, whereby the court has legal authority to act as their parent/guardian.

**WIC 707(b)**

Welfare & Institutions Code 707(b) is the California law that defines specific serious categories of crime, including but not limited to, robbery, rape, assault with great bodily injury, murder, and attempted murder that, when alleged, charged, or sustained carry special consequences for youth. Youth who are age 14 or older who are arrested for a 707(b) offense must be detained by the Juvenile Probation Department until they can appear before a judge.

**Youth**

As used by JPD, the term youth refers to individuals under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. This includes children age 12-17 who are arrested for delinquent acts. It also includes transitional age youth (TAY) up to age 25, who may still be under juvenile court jurisdiction due to probation or parole status, out of home placement status, or extended foster care status.