

JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM PAMPHLET

RECOMMENDATION 2: The Grand Jury recommends that the Probation Department, the District Attorney, and the Public Defender jointly develop a pamphlet describing the options to and requirements of parents and children entering the juvenile justice system.

Changes in the laws affecting the status of juvenile offenders are currently altering established procedures in Alameda County. The rights of children and their parents are seldom clearly understood. Requirements of children in custody need clarification.

The Grand Jury believes that the above-named agencies can produce a simple document that will enable offenders and their parents to understand the system in which they are involved. The need of all families to comprehend the procedures of juvenile justice could be satisfied by such a document.

JUVENILE HALL EDUCATION

RECOMMENDATION 3: The Grand Jury recommends that the County school system and local school districts begin joint planning to continue patterns of success that delinquents evidence while enrolled in Juvenile Hall schools. School districts within Alameda County should follow the advice of the Juvenile Hall educators for students who have spent two or more months in a Juvenile Hall educational facility and are returning to their communities.

The Alameda County Department of Special Education provides school administrative staff and classroom teachers for youngsters incarcerated at Juvenile Hall. Detainees attend several hours of classes a day, 5 days a week, 52 weeks a year. Individual instruction is the key objective in teaching at Juvenile Hall where students vary widely in age, learning aptitude, skills and emotional stability. While at Juvenile Hall, teachers make assessments of the new detainee's current skills, particularly in reading and mathematics and provide learning materials at the appropriate educational level. This program is successful and invariably leads to youngsters increasing their learning skills at an extremely high rate.

Some students at Juvenile Hall gained 6 months in educational skills in a four month period. Educational surveys are taken every 6 weeks to evaluate student progress.³ One child made 3-1/2 years educational growth in 6 weeks. Eighteen students at Senior Camp passed the General Educational Development test in 1976.

Teachers keep reports on students remaining longer than 20 days and make use of these records in maintaining continuity of work for the many juveniles who return to the Hall. The number of young people staying within the juvenile justice system longer than 30 days is continually increasing. Approximately 25 out of every 35 beds in detention are occupied by long-term detainees who remain more than 14 days, and the average length of stay exceeds 30 days. Longer term detention at the Juvenile Hall will increase as a result of A.B. 3121.

Children leaving the juvenile facilities find it difficult to get into public schools. Generally they end up in the district's continuation schools where gains brought about by the intensified educational program within the juvenile justice system are

3. See Appendix "A".

quickly lost. Apparent reasons are a lack of communication between county and local administrators, as well as inadequate communications at the classroom level.

Project Interface develops reports that go with children into the public schools but does not have the resources to follow through on the recommendations made in these reports. The only school district within Alameda County that provides any liaison between Juvenile Hall educators and the local school district is Oakland. That service is provided by a half-time employee. School districts should be under an obligation to follow through on the recommendations of the county educators. Public School teachers could then concentrate on the weaknesses and strengths found and reported on by the juvenile authorities in individual students.

POLICE OVERTIME

RECOMMENDATION 4: The Grand Jury recommends that the Alameda County District Attorney's Office institute a readiness program that would effectively reduce costs now incurred by city governments for court-related police overtime.

One of the areas of concern brought to the attention of the Grand Jury this year was court-related police overtime. It was pointed out that there is a great deal of time and money wasted because police officers appear in court pursuant to subpoena and are then dismissed without testifying. The reasons for these non-productive police visits to court are as follows:

1. The defendant may plead guilty at the last moment.
2. The defendant jumps bail and therefore does not appear in court on the date set for jury trial.
3. The defense attorney is either assigned to another case or is in trial in another courtroom.
4. A key witness for the prosecution or for the defense may be discovered missing at the last moment and the case is unable to proceed to trial.
5. Either at the request of defense counsel or upon the motion of the court the case is continued because there is no trial court available.

Police overtime as a result of court subpoenas totaled over \$250,000 per year to the Oakland Police Department alone. Under the memorandum of understanding between the Police Officers Association and the City of Oakland, if an appearance by an officer is cancelled the day before the scheduled trial, no overtime has to be paid. If the appearance is cancelled the morning of the trial the officer is still paid 5 hours overtime. A day off has to be changed a week in advance or overtime is paid. If a police officer is in court only five minutes he is still paid for 5 hours. If an officer appears on off duty time he is guaranteed 2-1/2 hours of regular salary; any time over that is time and a half. The additional overtime costs of the police departments in the cities throughout Alameda County plus the Sheriff's Department, and the various governmental agencies in Alameda County exceed \$1 million a year.

The Fremont Police Department did an indepth study of this problem for a ten month period. It was found that 447 subpoenas involving police overtime were

Superior Court
State of California
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA
COURT HOUSE - OAKLAND 94612

CARL WEST ANDERSON
JUDGE

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 17, 1976
TO: Children's Mental Health Task Force
FROM: Carl W. Anderson, Judge of the Juvenile Court
SUBJ: Probation Guidance Clinic Proposal

The present level of Mental Health services for minors within the Juvenile Justice system in Alameda County is inadequate and non-responsive to the needs of the Juvenile Court and Probation. The recent OPE study of the Probation Guidance Clinic has raised many questions about the quality of services being provided. Over the years, concern has been expressed by the Juvenile Court and Probation staff over the interface of clinic services with court related functions.

The level of support to the court in providing speedy diagnostic evaluations is inadequate. Increasingly, the court has relied on outside resources to provide the needed information for the proper adjudication of a case, and probation officers have been concerned over the inability of the Guidance Clinic to provide meaningful case information prior to the dispositional phase of a hearing. It is of little value to the Court, the probation officer, or the client to hear that a psychological study could not be completed within the judicial time limit imposed by law.


While services to the Juvenile Court have been inadequate, so too have services to the Juvenile institutions. Mental health services to Senior Boys Camp and Chabot Ranch simply do not exist. In previous years, agreements have been reached between the Department of Health and Probation concerning a minimum necessary level of services to be provided the institutions, but these have not been maintained. The current situation is indicative of the ongoing problem. (See Attached #1). In addition, those minors on probation in the community receive almost no services. Because of the present inadequacy of service, the Juvenile Court Judges, Referees, and the Probation Department have set forth their minimum mental health needs (See attached #2).

The Probation Guidance Clinic is a specialized program with a long history in Alameda County, beginning as a part of the Probation Department and later being transferred to County Mental Health Services. Since the shift, clinic reports have not been timely received, nor have they reflected an understanding of the relationship between the Courts, the Clinic, and the Probation Department. It is clear that services to the Courts and the Probation Department should not be reduced. It would seem, however, that reorganization of the Clinic could enhance services in those areas.

Re: Probation Guidance Clinic Proposal
November 17, 1976
Page Two

In January 1977 when the new Juvenile Court law takes effect, there will be added pressure to give a clearer picture of behavior exhibited by juvenile clients. It will be encumbant on the Probation Guidance Clinic to participate in this task. The District Attorney and Public Defender join with the Juvenile Court and the Probation Department in stressing the needs for services for those children who come before the Juvenile Court.

The attached proposal, if implemented, could fulfill the basic needs of the Court and other Probation services. It does not take into account new services which might be made available by the assimilation of the Clinic into Probation services. The ultimate goal is to provide the needed services to the Court, the Probation Department, and the minor who finds himself in the Juvenile Justice system. We believe that this can best be accomplished with the Clinic under the direction of the Probation Department enabling the lines of communications to be much clearer and also making the Clinic more attune to the needs of the Juvenile Court and its officers. Short of the implementation of this program, the services outlined must be forthcoming immediately.


CARL WEST ANDERSON
JUDGE OF THE JUVENILE COURT

CWA:cac

cc: Dr. Sue Mandel, Director Mental Health
Mary Jane Schuster, Director of Human Services
John J. Purchio, Presiding Judge of the Juyenile Court
Douglas Rigg, Referee
Michael White, Referee
Loren Enoch, County Administrator
James Callahan, Chief Probation Officer
Robert Shaner, Assistant Chief Probation Officer
Van Reimer, Director of Institutions
Paul Green, Director of Probation Field Services
Ken Moresi, Director, Juvenile Division
District Attorney
Public Defender
Dave Rowland, Deputy Administrative Officer
Marcy Beck, Administrative Analyst
Stanley Collis, Court Administrator