

Mono County Probation

SB 678 EBP Annual Assessment: 3 Year Summary

Beginning in the fall of 2011, and annually since, California counties have completed the SB 678 Evidence-Based Practices Annual Assessment. This report presents a summary of results from the first 3 years. The results below show your county's self-reported Annual Assessment score for each section of the Annual Assessment.

The scores presented here are meant to show progress on your county's reported implementation of EBP. It is not intended to point out deficiencies in services or recommend policy changes. Although the tool has been slightly modified, the questions used to calculate these scores have remained unchanged.

Page 3 includes an overview of the survey, as well as information on how the Annual Assessment scores were created. Page 4 shows the county make-up for each CPOC region and population size quartile used for making comparisons. Page 5 lists the questions that comprise each score group.

Please use caution when interpreting year-to-year variations in scores. A number of factors (e.g., changes to case management software and/or data analysis capacity, personnel changes, availability of treatment programs, etc.) may influence responses to individual items. Your county's individual responses are available upon request.

For comparison purposes, your county's scores are presented with the average scores for the state, region, and size quartile.

Mono County is in the **Central** CPOC Region, and is in the **Smallest** population size quartile.

SB 678 Evidence-Based Practices Annual Assessment: 3 Year Summary

Overall EBP Implementation

	Mono County	State	Central Region	Size: Smallest
FY 2010-11	10%	44%	35%	43%
FY 2011-12	56%	57%	59%	59%
FY 2012-13	90%	64%	67%	66%

The overall percent of evidence-based practices (EBP) implementation number represents an average of the implementation scores in each area below. It is meant to suggest about how far along the road to full implementation the county was at the time of the annual assessment.

Risk and Needs Assessment

	Mono County	State	Central Region	Size: Smallest
FY 2010-11	0%	57%	38%	55%
FY 2011-12	81%	76%	78%	80%
FY 2012-13	86%	79%	82%	78%

The level of risk and needs assessment implementation is based on six questions covering the use and validation of risk and needs assessment tools and how thoroughly the department trains and oversees users of assessment.

Effective Supervision

	Mono County	State	Central Region	Size: Smallest
FY 2010-11	19%	50%	40%	50%
FY 2011-12	63%	64%	68%	65%
FY 2012-13	96%	71%	73%	74%

The level of effective supervision implementation is based on fifteen questions focused on the relationship between the probation officer and the probationer. Effective supervision encompasses a focus on assessed criminogenic needs, effective case planning, the swift and consistent use of proportionate responses to probation behavior, and training for officers on how to use these and other evidence-based techniques.

Collaboration

	Mono County	State	Central Region	Size: Smallest
FY 2010-11	22%	46%	43%	49%
FY 2011-12	39%	59%	61%	64%
FY 2012-13	100%	68%	74%	71%

The level of collaboration implementation is based on six questions about the ways in which the department works with its justice partners, including but not limited to courts and treatment providers.

Management and Administration

	Mono County	State	Central Region	Size: Smallest
FY 2010-11	0%	28%	21%	23%
FY 2011-12	40%	41%	38%	40%
FY 2012-13	73%	50%	48%	46%

The level of management and administration implementation is based on nine questions about department policies and procedures that support the use of evidence-based practices. Questions within this area focus on hiring and performance review procedures, supervisory support for the use of EBP, and the use of data and evaluation within the department.

Treatment and Intervention

	Mono County	State	Central Region	Size: Smallest
FY 2010-11	11%	34%	27%	30%
FY 2011-12	56%	44%	48%	43%
FY 2012-13	94%	53%	62%	65%

The level of treatment and targeted intervention implementation is based on five questions about how referrals are made and the existence of treatment programs that have been evaluated for effectiveness.

The scoring methodology used to calculate the Treatment and Intervention category score was modified to more closely reflect the progress counties have made in implementing evidence-based treatment/targeted intervention programs. The treatment category scores for FYs 2010–2011 and 2011–2012 were adjusted based on this new scoring criterion and the treatment

category and overall EBP implementation scores presented in this report reflect these revised figures.

Background

What is the Annual Assessment?

Because of the complex set of principles and practices making up evidence-based practices (EBP), it is difficult to measure its implementation in a comprehensive and easy-to-understand way. To meet this challenge, the AOC created the Annual Assessment, an EBP implementation assessment tool, with the following five goals in mind:

1. Provide meaningful measures of EBP implementation to the state legislature.
2. Give probation departments a guide for what full implementation of EBP might look like in a California probation department.
3. Provide actionable information to county probation departments and to the state legislature based on assessed areas of strength and areas for improvement in EBP implementation.
4. Measure change in EBP implementation over time by creating an instrument that would be able to capture both the expected early levels of implementation in 2011, and future progress.
5. Carry out goals 1-4 in a low-impact and cost way that could be deployed in 58 counties.

The Annual Assessment was developed in the fall and winter of 2010 in consultation with staff from California probation departments as well as national experts in evidence-based practices such as Dr. Latessa of the University of Cincinnati and Dr. Taxman of the University of Virginia.

How are the implementation levels calculated?

The Annual Assessment consists of 41 scaled questions, divided into quantitative, caseload-focused questions and qualitative questions. Implementation levels are calculated by adding up a department's responses to questions related to a particular EBP area (such as Risk and Needs Assessment) and dividing by the total possible points for that area. Quantitative/caseload questions are worth a total of 4 possible points (where an answer of "Less than 5%" would give 0 points and an answer of "More than 75%" would give 4 points) while qualitative questions are worth a total of 3 possible points, with scaled options worth from 0 to 3. Questions that are left blank are counted as 0 for the purpose of scoring.

For example, there are six questions related to Risk and Needs Assessment on the Annual Assessment, three quantitative questions and three qualitative questions. There are a total of 21 possible points available for Risk and Needs Assessment. A county's implementation level is how many points they received on those six questions divided by 21.

The total score is an average of the scores in the 5 topic areas:

- Risk and Needs Assessment
- Effective Supervision
- Collaboration
- Management and Administration
- Treatment and Intervention

Comparison Groups

CPOC Region

Bay	Central	North	Sacramento	South
Alameda	Fresno	Butte	Alpine	Imperial
Contra Costa	Inyo	Colusa	Amador	Los Angeles
Marin	Kern	Del Norte	Calaveras	Orange
Mendocino	Kings	Glenn	El Dorado	Riverside
Monterey	Madera	Humboldt	Lake	San Bernardino
Napa	Mariposa	Lassen	Nevada	San Diego
San Benito	Merced	Modoc	Placer	San Luis Obispo
San Francisco	Mono	Plumas	Sacramento	Santa Barbara
San Mateo	Stanislaus	Shasta	San Joaquin	Ventura
Santa Clara	Tulare	Sierra	Sutter	
Santa Cruz	Tuolumne	Siskiyou	Yolo	
Solano	Siskiyou	Tehama	Yuba	
Sonoma	Sutter	Trinity		
	Tuolumne			

County size groupings, by number of adult felony probationers

Smallest <i>(n=26 to 523)</i>	Second Smallest <i>(n=586 to 1,486)</i>	Second Largest <i>(n=2,012 to 4,903)</i>	Largest <i>(n=5,844 to 84,172)</i>
Alpine	Butte	Contra Costa	Alameda
Amador	El Dorado	Kings	Fresno
Calaveras	Humboldt	Madera	Kern
Colusa	Imperial	Merced	Los Angeles
Del Norte	Lake	Monterey	Orange
Glenn	Marin	Placer	Riverside
Inyo	Mendocino	San Francisco	Sacramento
Lassen	Napa	San Luis Obispo	San Bernardino
Mariposa	San Benito	San Mateo	San Diego
Modoc	Shasta	Santa Cruz	San Joaquin
Mono	Siskiyou	Santa Barbara	Santa Clara
Nevada	Sutter	Solano	Stanislaus
Plumas	Tehama	Sonoma	Tulare
Sierra	Tuolumne	Ventura	
Trinity	Yuba	Yolo	

Question in each grouping

Risk/Needs Assessment

- 1a: Percent of Probationers Assessed for Risk with Validated Risk Assessment Tool
- 1b: Percent of Probationers Assessed for Risk within 30 Days of Contact
- 5a: Percent of MHR Probationers Assessed for Needs with a Validated Needs Assessment Tool
- 16: The risk assessment tool used by the department has been validated locally.
- 17: Staff members who conduct risk and need assessments have been fully trained
- 18: The department ensures that risk and needs assessments are filled out correctly

Effective Supervision

- 1c: Percent of Probationers Assessed as Low Risk on a Banked Caseload
- 5b: Percent of MHR Probationers in Caseloads of 75 or Smaller
- 5c: Percent of MHR Probationers with Supervision Plans Based on Criminogenic Needs
- 5d: Percent of MHR Probationers with Supervision Plans with Specific Goals and Steps
- 5e: Percent of MHR Probationers Engaged in the Change Process
- 7a: Percent of Officers Who Focus on Top Criminogenic Needs
- 7b: Percent of officers trained in Motivational Interviewing
- 7c: Percent of Officers Trained in Cognitive Behavioral Therapy
- 7d: Percent of Officers Using Positive Reinforcement
- 19: The department ensures that responses to probationer behavior are consistently proportionate to that behavior.
- 20: Sanctions and incentives are clearly communicated to medium and high risk probationers at the start of supervision.
- 21: Probation officers consistently respond to negative probationer behavior.
- 22: Probation officers apply departmental incentives and sanctions swiftly in response to probationer behavior.
- 23: Sanctions and controls are used in proportion to the probationer's level of risk and negative behavior.
- 25: The department has a clear written policy on when probationers should be revoked to prison that allows for the consideration of risk level, need level, behavior on probation, motivation to change, and severity of violation.

Collaboration

- 24: The department has worked with the courts to identify and implement swift responses to probationer behavior.
- 26: Supervising officers communicate with treatment providers about individual probationer progress and use treatment provider feedback to revise supervision plans.
- 27: The department has used aggregate data on probationer needs to advocate for or develop internal or external treatment programs.
- 28: Members of the local Community Corrections Partnership works together to develop strategies for implementing EBP.
- 29: Local justice partners are involved with EBP implementation across the county.
- 30: Outcome measures are shared with justice partners.

Management and Administration

- 31: Hiring guidelines and practices are linked to EBP skills
- 32: Performance review guidelines and practices are linked to EBP skills.
- 33: Supervisors or other trained staff uses a regular process to monitor evidence-based probationer supervision practices by observing probationer contacts in person or via recording.
- 34: The department collects service and outcome data on probationers that can be accessed at the individual or aggregate level.
- 35: Data on supervision practices and outcomes are used internally with the purpose of improvement of services and practices.
- 36: The department has conducted or contracted for a formal evaluation of the effectiveness of departmental supervision practices.
- 12a: Supervisors Support and Monitor Use of Risk and Needs Assessment
- 12b: Supervisors Support and Monitor Use of Motivational Interviewing
- 12c: Supervisors Support and Monitor Use of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy

Treatment

- 8a: Percent of MHR Probationers Referred to Treatment Based on Top Criminogenic Needs
- 8b: Percent of MHR Probationers in Programs that Have Been Demonstrated to be Evidence-Based in Other Localities
- 8c: Percent of MHR Probationers in Programs that Have Been Demonstrated to be Evidence-Based Locally
- 26: Supervising officers communicate with treatment providers about individual probationer progress and use treatment provider feedback to revise supervision plans.
- 27: The department has used aggregate data on probationer needs to advocate for or develop internal or external treatment programs.

SB 678 Evidence-Based Practices Annual Assessment: 3 Year Summary

If you have comments, questions, or would like copies of your Annual Assessment reports, please contact:

Criminal Justice Court Services Office
Judicial Council of California
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688

415-865-8994

crimjusticeoffice@jud.ca.gov