2019-116 AUDIT SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES
Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act Funds

The audit by the California State Auditor will provide independently developed and verified information related to the spending, decision-making, reporting, and evaluation of Juvenile Justice Crime Prevention Act (JJCPA) funds by the counties of Kern, Los Angeles, Mendocino, San Joaquin, and Santa Barbara. The audit’s scope will include, but not be limited to, the following activities:

1. Review and evaluate the laws, rules, and regulations significant to the audit objectives.

2. Identify the agencies that lead the administration of each county’s JJCPA program.

3. Evaluate the counties’ processes for soliciting JJCPA funding applications and awarding JJCPA funds, including the following:
   (a) Whether the application process is the same for all potential grantees, and the availability, extent, and timing of any technical assistance provided.
   (b) The process for JJCPA funding disbursement and whether contracts differ based on the type of grantee.

4. Review the counties’ processes related to their Comprehensive Multi-Agency Juvenile Justice Plans (plans) and determine the following for each county:
   (a) The number of times the county revised its plan since the JJCPA was enacted, when the last revision occurred, and whether the revision incorporated applicable statutory requirements.
   (b) The processes and accountability measures for writing the plan and ensuring its accuracy.
   (c) Whether the county’s Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council (council) is required to obtain approval of the plan from the county board of supervisors, as authorized by statute, and, if so, whether the council’s decisions have ever been overturned during the last five fiscal years.

5. Determine whether the counties had any accumulated, unspent JJCPA funds from fiscal years 2013–14 through 2017–18, the amount and explanations for any unspent funds, and whether there is a plan for distributing unspent funds.

6. Evaluate the authorities, roles, and responsibilities of each county’s council and its individual members, and determine whether the council has complied with state law. Determine the following information related to each council:
   (a) The members of the council over the past five fiscal years and what categories of representation they fulfill.
   (b) Whether all council members have equal powers, access to information, and decision-making authority.
   (c) Which agency and position facilitates council meetings, how frequently those meetings occur, and whether the meetings comply with state law applicable to open meetings.
(d) The bylaws, protocols, procedures, or other governance guidelines the county has established to support the council’s decision-making process.

7. Identify the data JJCPA grantees provide to each council and whether this varies based on the type of grantee. Determine the following for each county:

(a) The steps the county takes to ensure JJCPA funds are allocated to programs and community-based organizations that are effective in achieving the goals of the JJCPA.

(b) The county’s process for monitoring program funding.

8. For fiscal years 2013–14 through 2017–18, analyze the following county data by fiscal year, including agency name, organization name, and expenditure description, where applicable:

(a) Total JJCPA funds budgeted per program.

(b) Total JJCPA-reported expenditures per program.

(c) Total JJCPA funds spent on probation department salaries and benefits.

(d) Total JJCPA funds spent on other law enforcement agency salaries and benefits.

(e) Total JJCPA funds spent on non-law enforcement public agency salaries and benefits.

(f) Total JJCPA funds spent on community-based organizations, identifying those organizations whose primary locations (headquarters) are in the communities they are serving.

9. Determine the percentage of each county’s probation department budget that JJCPA funded for each year from fiscal years 2013–14 through 2017–18.

10. Determine the dollar amount and percentage of each county’s JJCPA expenditures for the last five fiscal years that was used to supervise “at-risk” youth with no prior arrests or contact with the juvenile court. Perform the following for each county:

(a) Identify expenditures and program descriptions by agency and fiscal year.

(b) Identify the probation department’s definition of “at-risk” youth for service design, or indicate if no definition exists.

11. To the extent possible, determine the total number of youth that have been served by each county’s JJCPA-funded programs and services in the past five fiscal years by program, race, age, gender, zip code, and charges or activities warranting intervention, and list by program and fiscal year.

12. Determine whether each county spends JJCPA funds for services or programs for youth described under state law, including, but not limited to, specific sections of the Welfare and Institutions Code, including but not limited to 236, 654, and 654.2. Under each of the above referenced code sections, identify the amount of JJCPA funds spent on programs or services run by probation, other law enforcement agencies, non-law enforcement public agencies, and community-based organizations.
13. To the extent possible, determine whether JJCPA-funded programs effectively reduce interactions between youth and the juvenile justice system, including law enforcement agencies.

14. To understand the State’s JJCPA grant program administration, evaluate the following information related to the role of the Board of State and Community Corrections (BSCC) in administering the JJCPA grant program:
   
   (a) How the BSCC uses its budget for purposes of administering the JJCPA grant program.

   (b) BSCC’s processes and standards for ensuring county compliance with JJCPA statutory requirements, and the established protocol if the BSCC finds that a county is not in compliance with state law.

15. To understand the State’s JJCPA program data collection process, determine the following information related to the BSCC’s data on JJCPA-funded programs, to the extent possible:

   (a) The number of youth statewide who have been served by JJCPA-funded programs or services in the past five fiscal years, disaggregated by race, gender, age, zip code, and charges or activities warranting intervention.

   (b) To the extent that statewide data are available, from fiscal years 2013–14 through 2017–18, analyze the following statewide data by fiscal year:

   i. Total JJCPA funds budgeted per program.

   ii. Total JJCPA-reported expenditures per program.

   iii. Total JJCPA funds spent on probation department salaries and benefits.

   iv. Total JJCPA funds spent on other law enforcement agency salaries and benefits.

   v. Total JJCPA funds spent on non-law enforcement public agency salaries and benefits.

   vi. Total JJCPA funds spent on community-based organizations.

   (c) The number of counties statewide that have reported using JJCPA funds to provide services or programs for youth identified under state law, including, but not limited to, Welfare and Institutions Code 236, 654, and 654.2. Under each of the above referenced code sections, determine the amount of JJCPA funds spent on services and programs run by probation, other law enforcement agencies, non-law enforcement public agencies, and community-based organizations.

16. Review and assess any other issues that are significant to the audit.