

## What's Inside?

- Meet Kimo Uila, DDAP Program Director.
- DDAP expands to serve reentering youth.
- CJCJ Executive Director Invited to Little Hoover Advisory Committee.
- CJCJ Juvenile Justice Advocacy Updates

## Did You Know?

*CJCJ Sentencing Services Project provides Disposition and Sentencing Reports, including alternative placement referrals for both juveniles and adults. In 2006, CJCJ provided reports and/or testimony in 25 cases at the request of public defenders and panel attorneys statewide. For information, call 415-621-5661 ext. 309.*

*The Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that offers policy analysis, program development, and technical assistance in the criminal justice field.*

## A Plan For Juvenile Justice in SF

The Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice has long promoted reduced reliance on detention and incarceration of youth through its Detention Diversion Advocacy Project and the policy development of CJCJ. In this newly designed CJCJ Bulletin, CJCJ will pay special tribute to its DDAP staff, their work and accomplishments and the special role they play in the future of community-based juvenile justice service.

In 2007, CJCJ will collaborate with local juvenile justice stakeholders to develop a Plan for Effective Juvenile Justice. CJCJ will

propose a reformed organizational structure for service delivery to youth and a strategic plan for capacity building among juvenile justice service providers.

A plan will envision service delivery to youth on a case-by-case basis through community-based programs. CJCJ is currently seeking funding to implement its work to support San Francisco community-based organizations that provide services to youth involved in the juvenile justice system.

San Francisco is well placed to become a pioneering county in changing the manner in which juvenile

justice reaches the community. Santa Cruz County has made great changes within its probation department to reduce detention numbers and rely more heavily on alternatives that keep youth in the community. San Francisco must reduce its reliance on detention and develop a framework to incorporate the resources of the community into the lives of youthful offenders.

CJCJ's juvenile justice plan relies on the continued viability and innovation of local CBOs, recognizing that they are best suited to provide services to the city's youth. *Continued on page 5.*

## A Message from the Executive Director

For the past 13 years the Detention Diversion Advocacy Project (DDAP) has been setting the standards for detention alternatives in San Francisco. Working with the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department, the Department of Children Youth and Their Families, and our community partners, DDAP has done more than just discuss detention alternatives; it has demonstrated how to implement them. After its inception, DDAP quickly

became a national model, earning a *Harvard University Innovations in Government Semifinalist Award* and was replicated in five cities around the country. Most recently, the United States Department of Justice recognized the program as a national model.

We are very proud of the program and the crucial role it plays in promoting detention alternatives and juvenile justice reform. In the next year, the program will be expanding into the

area of juvenile reentry by providing wraparound services to youths returning from residential placement.

As with any program, DDAP's success is due to the quality of the staff and their dedication to helping kids. DDAP is not a 9-5 job and staff is available 24 hours a day.

We look forward to the coming year as we move into the next phase of development.

—Daniel Macallair

## Kimo Uila Leads DDAP: Cool, Calm, Faithful



*“You show the youth and family that you will be there for them; you don’t tell them,” says Kimo Uila, Program Director of DDAP.*

Before DDAP Program Director Kimo Uila came to CJCJ, he was doing similar work for free. Highly involved in his community, he joined forces with other individuals who wanted to stop the violence they saw happening in their neighborhoods around the Bayview, Hunter’s Point and Sunnydale.

A loose organization developed to reach out to youth and let them know that they could count on the adults in the neighborhood to support them. Families arranged picnics, football games and basketball games at Candlestick Park every weekend. Kimo recognized that some of the kids needed more than a mentor—some needed an advocate to speak for them in juvenile court. Kimo offered to stand up in court and tell the judge that these kids should not be removed from their community, asking instead that the judge consider allowing the community to help the kids. In a couple of cases, the judges agreed with Kimo, and some youth found themselves back at home, under the watchful eye of neighbors and friends.

Kimo’s experience with kids in his neighborhood opened his eyes to the problems of detention and institutional or group home placement. He felt that the community can and should care for its youth, even if it takes a great deal of work to make it happen.

Kimo came to DDAP as a Case Manager. Working as a

direct advocate, he became acquainted with the court process, the judges, lawyers and probation officers at San Francisco’s Youth Guidance Center. For every youth in his caseload, Kimo provided progress reports to the court officials describing the efforts of the youth and families. The real work, however, was behind the monthly updates that Kimo wrote.

Kimo started every case by creating a foundation with the referred youth. The foundation required trusting relationships with the youth, his or her family, teachers, church leaders, friends and service providers in the community. Because Kimo believes that these folks have the best interest of the youth in their hearts, Kimo thought of himself as a guide, facilitating interactions and communications between the interested players in the youth’s life. By fostering relationships and support between the many connections surrounding a youth, Kimo knew the youth would be guided to make better decisions in the future.

Kimo has an inherent understanding of the role a community must play in all children’s lives. Born in American Samoa, he points to the more defined and rigid social structure of his homeland as a suggestion to those wondering what a supportive community might look like. He acknowledges and appreciates that San Francisco is more liberated in its lifestyle; however, he

encourages people to remember that supportive connections between people and their places are valuable. It is these connections that Kimo believes are the basis for successful case management of youth involved in the juvenile justice system.

It follows, then, that Kimo not only trains his staff in the many technical practices and methods promoted by researchers, but also in what he calls “the basics.” As he puts it, working successfully with a youth requires patience. He says, “you show the youth and family that you will be there for them; you don’t tell them.” First, Kimo says, you get connected to the individual, the family, the neighbors, and the school. Only when you’re connected does anyone actually believe that you are engaged. “Once you’re engaged,” says Kimo, “you ask everyone else to become more engaged, for the sake of the youth.” He continues, “It’s a personal thing. Every case is different, and every case requires creativity and discovery. But most importantly, every case requires connection.”

Marlon Scott, Michael Mar, Shelley Itelson, and Kimo Uila.



## CJ CJ Executive Director Participates on Little Hoover Commission Advisory Committee

Once again, the Little Hoover Commission has taken up the issue of California corrections. Only three years after its last review of public safety and corrections policies, the Commission convened again in 2006 to research opportunities to improve California's failing corrections system through sentencing reform.

For the third time, CJ CJ Executive Director Dan Macallair has been asked to participate on the Little Hoover Advisory Committee. This time around, the Commission will offer suggestions for a more "holistic approach" to improve California corrections. Sentencing, parole, and prison reform

will all be considered under its current study.

Under the Little Hoover Commission's process, individuals are requested to join the advisory committee to provide expertise and information. Advisory Committee members do not vote on the Commission's final research product; however, their input is solicited throughout the Commission's inquiry and guides the Commission's recommendations.

As a participant on the Advisory Committee, Dan has recommended the formation of a sentencing commission, insulated from the political pressures restricting current reform. "The Little Hoover

Commission is California's voice of sanity in corrections," says Dan. "It sees and understands the obstacles in prison and sentencing reform. Now we have to work on implementation."

The Little Hoover Commission was created in 1962 to assist the California Governor and Legislature to promote economy, efficiency and improved services provided by public agencies and departments.

In 2005, the Little Hoover Commission reviewed the Governor's reorganization of the state's Department of Corrections and supported its intended focus on rehabilitation.



The Little Hoover Commission has consistently recommended that California develop a cooperative system of state, county and community agencies to focus on reducing crime, violence and drug abuse. Its recommendations are based on evidence, not ideology.

For information, visit:  
[www.lhc.ca.gov](http://www.lhc.ca.gov).

## DDAP Expands to Reentry

For 13 years, DDAP has provided diligent advocacy for San Francisco's youth who find themselves involved in the juvenile justice system. DDAP has aimed to divert youthful offenders away from the juvenile justice system based on the theory that processing youth through the system may result in more harm than good.

Youth are referred to DDAP upon entering juvenile hall, in the hope that DDAP will develop a

case plan for release pre-adjudication and convince the judge that the plan will ensure the safety of the community and the youth.

While DDAP continues to perform these services, DDAP will now use its expertise in creating pre-adjudication case plans to develop release plans for youth returning to the community from group home placements, camps or an evaluation period at Division on Juvenile Justice institutions (formerly Youth Authority).

Reentry services respond to California's high recidivism rate immediately following release to the community.

The importance of these services now cannot be overstated. An estimated 75% of youth returning from DJJ confinement are rearrested within 2 years of release. In 2005, 900 of the 1700 youth (53%) sent to DJJ were parole violators.

*Continued on page 6.*

---

***75% of youth returning from DJJ confinement are rearrested within 2 years of release.***



DDAP case managers, Marlon Scott and Vanessa Romero.

---

*CJCJ thanks Shelley, Vanessa, Marc, Michael and Marlon for their diligent work on behalf of San Francisco's youth.*

## Our DDAP Team: The Best of the Best

Under the leadership of Kimo Uila, the DDAP staff has grown into an efficient, productive and friendly team. Trained as case managers, the five staff are capable of taking on any of the various challenges presented by the difficult situations of youth under DDAP supervision.

The individuals who make DDAP work come from various backgrounds and

educations, and each one has his or her own style of working with the youth and families.

"CJCJ case management expertise may come from a university education, familiarity with the street, or both," says Kimo Uila. "I think our diversity is what makes us work together so well."

Of five case managers, three have worked with

DDAP for over a year. Marlon Scott, our senior case manager of four years, often works with special education youth and relates extremely well with families. The staff is multilingual and familiar with all of San Francisco's neighborhoods.

CJCJ thanks Shelley, Vanessa, Marc, Michael and Marlon for their diligent work on behalf of San Francisco's youth.

## Juvenile Justice Advocacy Updates

Since learning about the shifts in funding by San Francisco Mayor's Office on Criminal Justice and the San Francisco Juvenile Probation Department, CJCJ has cooperated with other juvenile justice providers to lobby the city government for appropriate responses and funding for juvenile crime.

Appearing before the Juvenile Probation Commission and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors Budget and Finance Committee, CJCJ has called for a comprehensive approach to juvenile crime that is properly funded. CJCJ has promoted the expanded use of CBO contracting to meet the various needs of youth in

the juvenile justice system.

CJCJ has also called for increased assistance by contracting entities to permit CBOs under contract to undertake evaluations of their programs. While the city demands better accountability, it rarely offers to include funding for that purpose.

## At State Level: DJJ to Issue Reentry Grants

The Juvenile Justice Reentry Grant application is being developed by the Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ). Originally proposed by California State Senator Mike Machado (D-Stockton), the Juvenile Justice Reentry Grant program was approved late in the legislative year.

The program will make \$10 million per year

available for three consecutive years to address deficiencies in parole services for youth and the consequent high failure rate among youth parolees.

The funds will be distributed following a competitive grant process administered by the DJJ, and programs funded may include transitional housing, mental health

and drug treatment, and employment training.

At least 75% of the funds available will be targeted to programs serving DJJ parolees; remaining money may be spent on services for youth released from probation programs, like camps and ranches.

---

*Watch for the DJJ's request for proposals to bid for the Juvenile Justice Reentry Grant.*

## Juvenile Justice Plan, cont. from page 1

The centralized, institutional approach to juvenile justice must be abandoned in favor of a more flexible, accountable and dynamic structure.

Under the proposed system, resources would be directed primarily toward youth who chronically offend and are at the highest risk of reoffending. Secure detention would remain a viable option, however it would become a rarely utilized element of a full continuum of services.

The broader spectrum of services would include all the ingredients essential to ensure a positive, supported, and constructive life that will continue beyond the period a youth remains under an agency's jurisdiction. The services that will compose the continuum will be provided by CBOs under contract with local probation.

By utilizing probation as a brokerage for services, more funding will become available to follow into their neighborhoods. CBOs must be recognized by probation as the most appropriate means for delivering services to youth and adhering to the premise that guides juvenile justice: rehabilitation.

Juvenile justice experts have long recognized that legal intervention by the juvenile justice system may

perpetuate delinquency by processing children and youth into the system when an appropriate remedy may be accessed in informal settings within the community.

In order to best reduce future offending and crime rates in the community, it is imperative that CBO services are not utilized to "widen the net" of social control over juveniles.

The Plan for Effective Juvenile Justice is necessary now as California struggles to identify safe and humane options for youth who offend. The state's youth prison system has been labeled both abusive and failed in recent years, and at least five counties have chosen to reject DJJ placement as an option for their youth.

San Francisco is fortunate to support experienced and dedicated CBOs who have worked with youth for decades. The advocates and frontline workers at these CBOs are interested in collaborating to create alternative services and structures for the city's youth. Local reform of the juvenile justice system can become a model for other cities in the state, and provide insight to California policymakers as they seek to fix the DJJ.

The plan will attempt to

recognize the inherent self-interest of government programming. In order to effect true system change, the instinct to preserve an institutional culture must be shifted toward a new goal: that youth are rehabilitated in their communities. Thus, probation and CBOs must align to ensure that result.

Over the last 20 years, CJCJ has offered research and policy suggestions to improve juvenile justice in San Francisco. When DDAP was initiated in 1993, it responded to a fifty-year old problem in the city's youth detention system. Since 1951, the city had been the target of reports documenting its overuse of detention and lack of alternatives. By 1996, San Francisco had the highest detention rate by far of the eight largest California counties.

Although JPD recently hired a chief interested in reducing the juvenile hall population, San Francisco's juvenile detention numbers have skyrocketed in the last year. The increase coincides with a funding decision reached by Juvenile Probation earlier this year: to cut funding to community-based case management and in-home supervision services in favor of allowing probation officers provide services.



*"The centralized, institutional approach to juvenile justice must be abandoned in favor of a more flexible, accountable and dynamic structure."*

The decision has been met with great disappointment by San Francisco's CBOs, who find themselves marginalized as the city attempts to internalize juvenile services without providing training or transition planning to facilitate the change. Restructuring juvenile justice at the local level will provide a model for other municipalities statewide to follow to improve services and rehabilitative treatment for juveniles. It is CJCJ's hope that a plan will promote discussion and dialogue about the need and steps necessary for reform.

## **Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice**

54 Dore Street  
San Francisco, CA  
94103

PHONE:  
415.621.5661

FAX:  
415.621.5466

E-MAIL:  
cjcj@cjcj.org

---

For more  
information,  
research and  
reports, please visit  
[www.cjcj.org](http://www.cjcj.org)

## **DDAP begins local reentry planning, continued from page 3**

Just as CJCJ promotes increased utilization of CBOs to drive the development of detention alternatives, it encourages local governments to develop reentry programs relying on CBOs to help youth stay out of detention after release.

To implement the new program, DDAP and Juvenile Probation are cooperating to identify youth who will benefit from ongoing case management as they rejoin family or reenter the community after detention. San Francisco juvenile probation officers recently

have observed what families of formerly incarcerated youth have known for years: when a youth is sent to an institution, he or she leaves a child; upon return, the child is suddenly too old for many youth services.

In addition to advocating for placement alternatives, DDAP will now prepare case plans in collaboration with probation officers to guide probation youth ages 14 to 24 who are released from long-term group home placement or probation camps to their community.

The plans may include housing, vocational training, completion of education, therapy or drug treatment, and any additional services a youth may require to succeed outside of placement.

DDAP will also manage the individual case with the cooperation of probation, ensuring a stable contact for the youth, and an open door to a supportive network throughout the community.

**CENTER ON  
JUVENILE AND  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE**  
54 Dore Street  
San Francisco, CA  
94103

