

**PROPOSED RECOMMENDATION
REGARDING EVIDENCE-BASED PROGRAMS**

The Committee on Accountability and Administrative Review may consider the following recommendation:

- Prepare legislation to begin shifting state-administered crime prevention and juvenile justice programs toward evidence-based practices. There is a growing body of evidence about which programs can cost-effectively reduce crime and recidivism. Despite this, most state administered programs do not require the use of evidence-based practices. To improve effectiveness, save money and improve accountability, the state, over a three-year period, should steadily increase the use of evidence-based practices. Specifically, the state should:
 - Require that all state-administered youth crime prevention and juvenile justice programs devote 50 percent of their funding to evidence-based practices in Fiscal Year 2010-11.
 - Require that all state-administered youth crime prevention and juvenile justice programs devote 75 percent of their funding to evidence-based practices in Fiscal Year 2011-12.
 - Require that all state-administered youth crime prevention and juvenile justice programs devote 85 percent of their funding to evidence-based practices in Fiscal Year 2012-13. The remaining 15 percent of funding can be used by counties to develop new, innovative programs that address local needs. All new programs must include an independent evaluation component.

Evidence-based practices will be defined by the Governor's Office of Gang and Youth Violence Policy, which is currently developing a list of practices and strategies.

PROPOSED CONSOLIDATIONS/SUNSETS

The Committee on Accountability and Administrative Review can consider these recommendations to consolidate or eliminate programs and funding streams:

- **Consolidate the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act, the Juvenile Probation and Camp Fund, and the Youthful Offender Block Grant.** (\$380 million) All three of these programs are administered by the Corrections Standards Authority and distributed to county probation departments, but there are different funding and reporting processes for each. Only one, the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act, has required an evaluation of outcomes. The recently enacted budget requires counties to submit reports on how they spend Youthful Offender Block Grant money. The three programs could be provided to counties in one funding stream with one outcomes-based report, based on the requirements of the Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act, due on an annual basis.
 - *Recommend by the Legislative Analyst's Office in its 2008-09 Budget Analysis, the Little Hoover Commission in its July 2008 report, "Juvenile Justice Reform: Realigning Responsibilities" and the State Commission on Juvenile Justice in its 2009 report, "Juvenile Justice Operational Master Plan: Blueprint for an Outcome Oriented Juvenile Justice System."*
 - **Benefits:** *Small monetary savings, as state administrative costs are low, but will lead to better management of funding streams.*

- **Sunset the Gang Violence Suppression Program, City of Fresno, and consolidate the Gang Violence Suppression Program into the Gang Reduction, Intervention and Prevention Program.** (\$11.9 million) The Gang Violence Suppression Program has been funded since 1981. A 2002 report by the Legislative Analyst's Office noted the program was unable to prove it had reduced gang violence or shown any results. The program currently measures outputs, such as arrests and number of gang members on intensely-supervised programs, but not outcomes, such as gang prevalence, reduction in gang-related crimes or recidivism rates for gang members on probation or parole. The program also funds intensive probation supervision, which the Washington State Institute for Public Policy lists as one of the least cost-effective programs for juvenile offenders. The Gang Violence Suppression Program, City of Fresno, funds one law enforcement position in Fresno. The Gang Reduction, Intervention and Prevention Program was created two years ago and is funding evidence-based programs and conducting outcomes-based evaluations.
 - **Benefits:** *Small monetary savings by sunsetting the Fresno program, which has fluctuated between \$49,000 and \$93,000 per year. Moves more than \$1.5 million of funding from a program with few requirements for evidence-based practices into a program that is incentivizing evidence-based practices and requiring measurable outcomes.*

- **Sunset the Proud Parenting Program.** (\$837,000) This program, which provides parenting instruction for at-risk youth and juvenile parolees who have children, has operated for more than 10 years without any evaluation of effectiveness. The Corrections Standards Authority, which distributes funding to community-based organizations, suspended the program this year due to uncertainty over funding and in an attempt to revamp the program after at least one organization acknowledged that it was improperly using its funding.

 - ***Benefits:** Saves \$837,000 by sunsetting a long-running program that has not been proven effective.*

- **Sunset the School Community Violence Prevention Program, and reform the School Community Violence Prevention Block Grant to improve accountability.** (\$94.3 million) Both the School Community Violence Prevention Program and the School Community Violence Prevention Block Grant provide funding to local education agencies to address school safety and violence prevention issues. In 2007/08, all of the local agencies that received funding from the program also received funding from the block grant. Created in the wake of the Columbine High School shootings, the School Community Violence Prevention Block Grant (AB 1113) provides funding to schools with very few requirements. Most schools do not have to report to the state on how they spent the money, and Department of Education reports suggest some schools have purchased items such as curtains and golf carts with the money. In contrast, the School Community Violence Prevention Program requires each provider to use evidence-based programs and report how they spent the money. The School Community Violence Prevention Program could be sunsetted, and the School Community Violence Prevention Block Grant could be reformed to include the same accountability requirements as the School Community Violence Prevention Program. The Committee could recommend that \$4 million from the \$14-million School Community Violence Prevention Program be shifted to the reformed block grant program, for a total savings to the state of \$10 million.

Note: Per the February budget agreement, the requirements of both of these programs have been suspended until the 2012-13 budget year, when they will resume.

 - *Recommended by the Legislative Analyst's Office in its 2008-09 Budget Analysis.*
 - ***Benefits:** A savings to the state of \$10 million, and stronger accountability requirements for the remaining funds.*

- **Consolidate the administration of all juvenile justice and anti-gang funding streams under the Governor's Office of Gang and Youth Violence Policy.** (\$309 million) Currently, the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) administers most federal- and state-funded juvenile justice programs. The Authority is housed within the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR), is chaired by the Secretary of CDCR and also sets standards for correctional facilities and correctional employees. CSA may not be the appropriate entity to administer prevention programs aimed at keeping juvenile offenders out of the state system.

The California Emergency Management Agency (CalEMA) administers several federal- and state-funded anti-gang programs that were administered by the Office of Criminal Justice Planning before it was abolished in 2003. The legislation ending the Office of Criminal Justice Planning noted that the placement of anti-gang and other programs in the emergency services department was intended as temporary, and the legislation required the Department of Finance to develop a reorganization plan to find a permanent administrative home for these programs. That plan was never developed, and it is questionable whether anti-gang programs belong in an office devoted to homeland security and natural disaster response. Neither the CSA or CalEMA have fully utilized their powers to steer state dollars to the most proven practices.

In contrast, the Governor's Office of Gang and Youth Violence Policy was created in 2007 and is responsible for "monitoring, assessing, and coordinating the state's programs, strategies and funding that address gang and youth violence in a manner that maximizes the effectiveness and coordination of those programs, strategies and resources." The office has so far created an inventory of funding streams and helped steer money in the Gang Reduction, Intervention and Prevention Program toward evidence-based practices, and is currently developing a list of California-specific evidence-based programs.

- *Consolidating these programs under the Governor's Office of Gang and Youth Violence would implement the Little Hoover Commission's recommendation to create one office to oversee these programs in their 2008 report, "Juvenile Justice Reform: Realigning Responsibilities."*
- **Benefits:** *Combined, the Corrections Standards Authority and the California Emergency Management Agency spend nearly \$1.8 million administering the programs that would be consolidated under the Governor's Office of Gang and Youth Violence Policy. Some savings could be achieved by consolidating the administration of these programs. In addition, moving these programs to one office would likely lessen administrative costs for local governments and community based organizations. Finally, this reorganization would improve state leadership and oversight.*