



# 2013 ANNUAL STATISTICAL REPORT

January 1, 2013 - December 31, 2013

SAN DIEGO COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT

MACK JENKINS, CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER

# MISSION

Protect Community Safety, Reduce Crime and Assist Victims,  
Through Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation

# VISION

Enhancing the quality of life of San Diego County residents by  
creating safer communities

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

2013 Overview .....	1
Juvenile Field Services.....	2
• Juvenile Field Services Outcome Data .....	12
• Juvenile Special Operations .....	14
Adult Field Services.....	20
• Adult Field Services Outcome Data .....	26
• Adult Gang Unit .....	28
Post Release Offender (PRO) Division .....	32
• Post Release Offender Division Outcome Data .....	36
• Post Release Community Supervision.....	37
• Mandatory Supervision Offenders .....	41
Institutional Services .....	45

# LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1. Ward Population on the Last Day of Each Quarter 2009-2013 .....	2
Figure 2. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of Wards Supervised .....	3
Figure 3. Wards by Region .....	4
Figure 4. Wards by Specialized Program on 12/31/13.....	6
Figure 5. Wards by Assessed Risk Level .....	6
Figure 6. Wards by Crime Type ... ..	6
Figure 7. Juvenile Monthly Referrals 2009 to 2013 .....	7
Figure 8. Juveniles who were Referred to Probation by Ethnicity .....	8
Figure 9. Juveniles who Received Probation Referrals by Region.....	8
Figure 10. Juvenile Referrals by Crime Type .....	8
Figure 11. Outcome of Referrals .....	9
Figure 12. Juveniles with Petitions by Ethnicity .....	9
Figure 13. Percentage of Juveniles who had a Petition Filed by Region .....	9
Figure 14. Juvenile Petitions Filed 2009 to 2013 .....	10
Figure 15. Juvenile Petitions by Crime Type .....	10
Figure 16. Disposition of Juvenile Petitions Filed .....	11
Figure 17. Ward Petitions Found True by Crime Type .....	11
Figure 18. Number of Wards who Left Probation FY 09-10 to FY 13-14.....	12
Figure 19. Number of Wards who Recidivated FY 09-10 to FY 13-14 .....	12
Figure 20. Wards Recidivism Rate FY 09-10 to FY 13-14 .....	13
Figure 21. Special Operations Wards by Region .....	14
Figure 22. Map Showing Concentration of Special Operations: Wards Supervised .....	16
Figure 23. Wards in Specialized Program .....	17
Figure 24. Map of Wards Supervised by the Gang Suppression Unit .....	19
Figure 25. Probationer Population on the Last Day of Each Quarter 2009-2013 .....	20
Figure 26. Number of Monthly New Probation Grants 2009-2013 .....	21
Figure 27. Percentage of Probationers by Region .....	21

Figure 28. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of Probationers .....	22
Figure 29. Probationers by Supervision Level .....	24
Figure 30. Percentage of Probationers by Crime Type .....	24
Figure 31. Percentage of Sex Offenders by Static-99 Risk Level .....	25
Figure 32. Probationers – Ending Status .....	25
Figure 33. Probationers on DUI Enforcement Caseloads by Region .....	25
Figure 34. Number of Probationers who Terminated Probation FY 2009-10 to FY 2013-14 .....	26
Figure 35. Number of Probationers who Recidivated FY 2009-10 to FY 2013-14.....	26
Figure 36. Probationer Recidivism Rate FY 2009-10 to FY 2013-14 .....	26
Figure 37. Percentage of Probationers by the Adult Gang Unit by Region .....	28
Figure 38. Map Showing Concentration of Probationers by the Adult Gang Unit .....	29
Figure 39. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers by Crime Type .....	31
Figure 40. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers by Risk Level .....	31
Figure 41. Percentage of PRCS and MS Offenders Supervised by Region.....	32
Figure 42. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of PRCS and MS Offenders .....	33
Figure 43. Percentage of PRCS and MS by Crime Type .....	35
Figure 44. Percentage of PRCS by Region .....	37
Figure 45. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of PRCS .....	37
Figure 46. Percentage of PRCS by Crime Type .....	40
Figure 47. Percentage of MS by Region.....	41
Figure 48. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of MS.....	42
Figure 49. Percentage of MS by Crime Type.....	44
Figure 50. Average Daily Attendance – Juvenile Detention Facilities .....	45
Figure 51. Reason for Detention at East Mesa and Kearny Mesa .....	46
Figure 52. Average Daily Attendance at the Juvenile Camps .....	47

# LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Wards by Region and Ethnicity .....	4
Table 2. Wards by Risk Level and Region .....	4
Table 3. Wards by Risk Level and Age .....	4
Table 4. Wards by Risk Level and Ethnicity .....	5
Table 5. Wards by Risk Level and Gender .....	5
Table 6. Wards Specialized Program Yardstick and Actual Caseload Ratio .....	5
Table 7. Top 10 Agencies that Refer Juveniles to Probation .....	7
Table 8. Ward FY 13-14 Recidivism by Risk Level .....	13
Table 9. Special Operations: Wards by Region and Ethnicity .....	14
Table 10. Special Operations: Wards by Risk Level and Region .....	15
Table 11. Special Operations: Wards by Risk Level and Age .....	15
Table 12. Special Operations: Wards by Risk Level and Ethnicity .....	15
Table 13. Special Operations: Wards by Risk Level and Gender .....	15
Table 14. Wards by Risk Level and Specialized Program.....	17
Table 15. Special Operations: Ward Yardstick and Actual Caseload Ratio .....	17
Table 16. Number of Gang-involved Wards by Region .....	18
Table 17. Probationers by Region and Ethnicity .....	21
Table 18. Probationers by Risk Level and Region .....	23
Table 19. Probationers by Risk Level and Age .....	23
Table 20. Probationers by Risk Level and Ethnicity .....	23
Table 21. Probationers by Risk Level and Gender.....	23
Table 22. Probationers by Risk Level and Supervision Level .....	24
Table 23. Probationers Yardstick and Caseload Size .....	24
Table 24. Adult FY 13-14 Recidivism by Risk Level.....	27
Table 25. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers by Region and Ethnicity .....	28
Table 26. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers by Risk Level and Region .....	30
Table 27. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers by Risk Level and Age .....	30
Table 28. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers by Risk Level and Ethnicity .....	30
Table 29. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers by Risk Level and Gender .....	30

Table 30. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Yardstick Actual Caseload Ratio.....	31
Table 31. Number of Gang-Involved Probationers by Region.....	31
Table 32. PRCS and MS by Region and Ethnicity .....	34
Table 33. PRCS and MS by Risk Level and Region .....	34
Table 34. PRCS and MS by Risk Level and Age .....	34
Table 35. PRCS and MS by Risk Level and Ethnicity .....	34
Table 36. PRCS and MS by Risk Level and Gender.....	35
Table 37. PRCS and MS Division FY 13-14 Recidivism by Risk Level.....	36
Table 38. PRCS FY 13-14 Recidivism by Risk Level.....	36
Table 39. MS FY 13-14 Recidivism by Risk Level .....	36
Table 40. PRCS by Region and Ethnicity .....	39
Table 41. PRCS by Risk Level and Region .....	39
Table 42. PRCS by Risk Level and Age .....	39
Table 43. PRCS by Risk Level and Ethnicity .....	39
Table 44. PRCS by Risk Level and Gender.....	40
Table 45. MS Offenders by Region and Ethnicity .....	43
Table 46. MS Offenders by Risk Level and Region .....	43
Table 47. MS Offenders by Risk Level and Age .....	43
Table 48. MS Offenders by Risk Level and Ethnicity .....	43
Table 49. MS Offenders by Risk Level and Gender.....	43
Table 50. Juvenile Detention Facilities Maximum and Average Length of Stay .....	46
Table 51. Description of Reasons for Detention.....	46
Table 52. Detainees Average Age and Gender by Facility.....	47
Table 53. Detainees Ethnicity by Facility .....	48
Table 54. Detainees Home Region by Facility .....	48
Table 55. Detainees Most Serious Offense by Facility.....	48



The County of San Diego Probation Department consisted of 1,047 sworn and 277 non-sworn staff.

The Chief Probation Officer, Assistant Chief Probation Officer, Chief of Administrative Services, three Deputy Chief Probation Officers, and 14 Division Chiefs administered a budget of \$207 million for Fiscal Year 2012 - 2013.

Staff were located in 17 main facilities. In addition, staff were out-stationed at community-based organizations and law enforcement offices.

This Annual Statistical Report is a calendar year report and was designed to provide answers to commonly asked questions about the Probation Department. The report provides information and statistics about: Juvenile Field Services, Adult Field Services, and Institutional Services. This data can be used by researchers, grant writers, students or citizens with an interest in knowing more about the department and the populations we supervise.

This report was produced by the Research, Policy & Science Division of the San Diego County Probation Department. The data was provided by Lilibeth Lumbreras and the report was created by Darla Newman. If you require information that is not included here, please contact Research, Policy and Science at [PSG\\_Probation\\_RPS\\_Inquiries@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:PSG_Probation_RPS_Inquiries@sdcounty.ca.gov).

Three totals are used in each section, each with a different focus. In the feature box, at the beginning of each section, we show a snapshot of the population on the last day of the year. The second number in the box reflects the population throughout the year. Numbers sorted by region are based on the total number throughout the year, but then excludes people who are transient or live out of the county.

Additional information about programs and services delivered by the department can be found in the Annual Report at:

[http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/probation/docs/Annual\\_Report\\_2011-2012.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/probation/docs/Annual_Report_2011-2012.pdf)

# JUVENILE FIELD SERVICES

(Including Special Operations)

## Wards Supervised

**2,870**

on December 31, 2013

**5,309**

throughout the year

## Ethnic Group

African American	15%
Asian Pacific Islander	2%
Caucasian	23%
Hispanic	56%
Other	4%

## Average Age

**16**

Male

**77%**




Female

**23%**




**Figure 1. Ward Population on the Last Day of Each Quarter 2009-2013**



The number of wards supervised for the past five years (2009-2013), has decreased by 46%. Over the past three years (2011-2013), the population of wards on probation has decreased by 36%. The number of 602 wards decreased by 43% in the past five years, and 32% in the past three years. Wards supervised reside in many areas of the county. The following map indicates where the lowest to highest concentrations of probation wards lived in 2013.


Figure 2. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of Wards Supervised



**Figure 3. Wards Supervised by Region\***

\*Excludes transient and out-of-county wards

- Central – 31%
- East – 18%
- South – 16%
- North – 35%



*In the following tables, two totals are shown (4,880 and 5,309). The larger number (5,309) reflects all youth supervised, the lower number (4,880) is sorted by region and excludes transient and out-of-county wards.*

**Table 1. Wards Supervised by Region\* and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Region								Total	%
	Central		East		South		North			
African-American	387	25%	174	20%	86	11%	94	5%	741	15%
Asian	36	3%	7	1%	24	3%	38	2%	105	2%
Caucasian	231	15%	329	38%	88	11%	460	27%	1,108	23%
Hispanic	830	54%	289	34%	544	71%	1,077	63%	2,740	56%
Other	44	3%	57	7%	27	4%	58	3%	186	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,528</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>856</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>769</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1,727</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4,880</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*Excludes transient and out-of-county wards

All wards supervised in San Diego County are assessed using a validated risk-need assessment tool known as the San Diego Regional Resiliency Check-Up (SDRRC). The wards are grouped according to their score (High, Medium, Low) and are shown in the following tables.

**Table 2. Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Region\***

Region	Risk Level								Total	%
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored			
Central	1,062	33%	245	27%	68	27%	153	31%	1,528	31%
East	587	18%	177	20%	20	8%	72	15%	856	18%
South	504	16%	156	17%	36	14%	73	14%	769	16%
North	1,079	33%	323	36%	128	51%	197	40%	1,727	35%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,232</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>901</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>495</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4,880</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*Excludes transient and out-of-county wards

**Table 3. Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Age**

Age	Risk Level								Total	%
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored			
Under 15 years	472	13%	166	17%	57	21%	102	19%	797	15%
15 – 16 years	1,440	41%	412	42%	89	34%	209	40%	2,150	40%
17 – 18 years	1,429	40%	371	37%	108	41%	203	39%	2,111	40%
Over 18 years	193	6%	36	4%	11	4%	11	2%	251	5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,534</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>985</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5,309</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 4. Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	%
African-American	607	17%	138	14%	22	8%	63	12%	830	15%
Asian	60	2%	27	3%	6	2%	17	3%	110	2%
Caucasian	680	19%	247	25%	70	26%	207	39%	1,204	23%
Hispanic	2,092	59%	519	53%	147	56%	204	39%	2,962	56%
Other	95	3%	54	5%	20	8%	34	7%	203	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,534</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>985</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5,309</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Table 5. Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Gender**

Gender	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	%
Male	2,769	78%	747	76%	217	82%	370	70%	4,103	77%
Female	765	22%	238	24%	48	18%	155	30%	1,206	23%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,534</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>985</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5,309</b>	<b>100%</b>

The department maintains a variety of caseload ratios for juveniles. Lower caseload sizes are designed to allow officers to engage wards in meaningful interactions to encourage behavior change. Target ratios are referred to as a yardstick. Table 6 below provides information on the yardstick as well as the actual ratio of wards to officers.


**Table 6. Wards Specialized Program Yardstick and Actual Caseload Ratios\***

Specialized Program	Wards	Yardstick	Actual Ratio	+/-
Juvenile Forensic Assistance for Stabilization/Treatment (JFAST)	36	1:15	1:18	20%
Women and their Children (WATcH)	18	1:25	1:18	-28%
Youthful Offender Unit (YOU)	121	1:25	1:20	-20%
Sex Offender	105	1:30	1:26	-13%
Drug Court	79	1:35	1:25	-29%
Placement	185	1:20	1:26	30%
WINGS/CAT	69	1:20	1:23	15%
Aftercare	138	1:40	1:34	-15%
Gang Unit	261	1:40	1:42	5%
Breaking Cycles	316	1:40	1:35	-13%
Regular	873	1:50	1:38	-24%
Truancy	187	1:50	1:47	-6%
Medium	144	1:75	1:48	-36%
Minimum	40	1:200	1:20	-90%
Bank	298	1:400	1:298	-26%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,870</b>			


\*As of December 31, 2013

Youth who have been designated to need specialized supervision are placed, as space is available, in programs designed to address their risk level and need profile. Specialized programs are shown in Figure 4 below.

**Figure 4. Wards Supervised by Specialized Program on 12/31/13**




**Figure 5. Wards by Assessed Risk Level**



**Figure 6. Wards Supervised by Crime Type (Most Serious True Finding)**

This graphic represents wards under supervision by the most serious crime or action that led them to being under supervision. Status offenses are those actions which are only illegal if engaged in by a minor.




## Juvenile Justice System Statistics

The following statistics reflect the processes that bring youth to the probation department when they commit a status or criminal offense. The process begins with a referral to the probation department citing a juvenile’s behavior and recommending intervention.

**In 2013, 7,622 referrals were received by the probation department.** These referrals represented 5721 individual juveniles. Over the past five years (2009-2013), referrals decreased by 40%. In the past three years (2011-2013), there was a 16% decrease.

**Figure 7. Juvenile Monthly Referrals 2009 to 2013**




The agencies that made a significant number of referrals are seen in Table 7.

**Table 7. Top 10 Agencies that Refer Juveniles to Probation**

Referring Agency	# of Referrals	Referring Agency	# of Referrals
San Diego Police Department	2,234	Chula Vista Police Department	401
San Diego Sheriff’s Office	1,803	El Cajon Police Department	367
Escondido Police Department	514	Carlsbad Police Department	228
Oceanside Police Department	503	Metropolitan Transit Authority	199
San Diego Unified School District	454	School Attendance Review Board	181


**Figure 8. Juveniles Who Were Referred to Probation by Ethnicity**

The statistics provided are based on youth who received referrals to Probation in 2013.




**Figure 9. Juveniles who Received Probation Referrals by Region\***

\*Excludes transient and out-of-county wards




**Figure 10. Juvenile Referrals by Crime Type**



Referrals are acted on in a number of ways. Only those referrals that are sent to the District Attorney can result in a petition.


**Figure 11. Outcome of Referrals**

The next stage in the process is for the District Attorney's office to evaluate the case for filing. **In 2013, there were 2,681 petitions filed, involving 2,733 juveniles.** Figure 12 shows the percentage of juveniles with petitions filed by ethnicity.



**Figure 12. Juveniles with Petitions\* by Ethnicity**

\*601 (Status Offenses) and 602 (Criminal Offenses) N=2733



**Figure 13. Percentage of Juveniles who had a Petition Filed by Region\***

\*Excludes transient and out-of-county wards





Figure 14 shows the trend line of petitions filed per year for a five year period. The number of petitions filed decreased 38% from 2009 to 2013. The number of petitions filed decreased 16% from 2011 to 2013.


**Figure 14. Juvenile Petitions Filed 2009 to 2013**



\*601 (Status Offenses) and 602 (Criminal Offenses)


Petitions have been categorized by the most serious offense on that petition. Figure 15 shows the percent of juvenile petitions by crime type. The highest percentage in 2013 was in crimes against persons.

**Figure 15. Juvenile Petitions by Crime Type**




Petitions can be found true by the court (a disposition called a True Finding), can be admitted true by the minor, or can be dismissed for a variety of reasons. The dispositions on petitions filed in 2013 are shown in Figure 16.

**Figure 16. Disposition of Juvenile Petitions Filed**



Each petition that is found or admitted true is characterized by the most serious charge on the petition. Of the **1,935 petitions that were found true in 2013**, Figure 17 shows the breakdown by crime type.

**Figure 17. Petitions Found True by Crime Type**





**JUVENILE  
FIELD  
SERVICES  
OUTCOME  
DATA**

The recidivism rate reflects the percentage of 602 wards with a new juvenile true finding or adult misdemeanor or felony conviction during the period of probation supervision. Recidivism is calculated based on Fiscal Year 2013- 2014 data.

Of the 1,781 wards who terminated probation in 2013-2014, 1,231 or 69% terminated without committing a new law violation.


The FY 2013-14 recidivism rate is **31%**.

***ALL RECIDIVISM DATA IS BASED ON FISCAL YEARS  
(2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014)***


**Of the 1,781 wards who terminated probation in 2013-2014, 1,231 or 69% terminated without committing a new law violation.** Recidivism is defined as juvenile true finding or an adult conviction for a felony or misdemeanor offense while under probation supervision. For 2013-2014, the recidivism rate for 602 wards was 31 percent.

The number of wards supervised by probation has decreased 34% since FY 2011. As the number of wards supervised declined, the number of wards who leave probation also decreased. There was an almost 29% reduction in the number of wards leaving probation since FY 09-10.

**Figure 18. Number of Wards who Left Probation FY 09-10 to FY 13-14**




**Figure 19. Number of Wards who Recidivated FY 09-10 to FY 13-14**



The number of wards who recidivated decreased 26% from FY 09-10 to FY 13-14 (741 to 550). The recidivism rate is based on the number of 602 wards who terminated probation divided by the number who recidivated.


**Figure 20. Ward Recidivism Rate FY 09-10 to FY 13-14**



Risk based supervision is based on the San Diego Risk and Resiliency Checkup score. Table 8 shows that the juvenile recidivism rates are correlated with the assessed risk score.

**Table 8. Ward FY 13-14 Recidivism by Risk Level**

Risk Level	# Who Left Probation	# Recidivated	% Recidivated
High	1347	504	37%
Medium	293	30	10%
Low	141	16	11%
No Score	0	0	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,781</b>	<b>550</b>	<b>31%</b>



Wards in Special Operations are supervised in one of three programs: Community Transition Unit (CTU), Gang Suppression Unit (GSU) and Youthful Offender Unit (YOU).

**Figure 21. Special Operations Wards Supervised by Region\***

\*Excludes transient and out of county wards




Table 9 shows the breakdown of wards supervised in Special Operations by region and ethnicity.

**In the following tables, two totals are shown. The larger number (771) reflects all youth supervised by special operations, the lower number (685) is sorted by region and excludes transient and out-of-county**

**Table 9. Special Operations: Wards Supervised by Region\* and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Region								Total	%
	Central		East		South		North			
African-American	58	24%	30	31%	5	6%	12	4%	105	15%
Asian	9	4%	3	3%	0	0%	4	2%	16	2%
Caucasian	12	5%	19	20%	2	3%	11	4%	44	6%
Hispanic	159	66%	41	42%	71	91%	239	89%	510	75%
Other	3	1%	4	4%	0	0%	3	1%	10	2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>685</b>	<b>100%</b>

\* Excludes transient and out-of-county youth

**Table 10. Special Operations: Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Region\***

Region	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	%
Central	233	36%	8	24%	0	0%	0	0%	241	35%
East	86	13%	7	21%	2	67%	2	67%	97	14%
South	71	11%	6	18%	0	0%	1	33%	78	11%
North	256	40%	12	37%	1	33%	0	0%	269	40%
Total	646	100%	33	100%	3	100%	3	100%	685	100%

\* Excludes transient and out-of-county wards

**Table 11. Special Operations: Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Age**

Age	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	%
Under 15 years	58	8%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	61	8%
15-16 years	222	30%	11	31%	3	100%	0	0%	236	31%
17-18 years	368	51%	18	50%	0	0%	1	33%	387	50%
Over 18 years	81	11%	4	11%	0	0%	2	67%	87	11%
Total	729	100%	36	100%	3	100%	3	100%	771	100%

**Table 12. Special Operations: Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity**


Ethnicity	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	%
African-American	122	17%	5	14%	0	0%	2	67%	129	17%
Asian	17	2%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	18	2%
Caucasian	47	6%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	50	6%
Hispanic	531	73%	27	75%	2	67%	1	33%	561	73%
Other	12	2%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	13	2%
Total	729	100%	36	100%	3	100%	3	100%	771	100%

**Table 13. Special Operations: Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Gender**

Gender	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	%
Male	678	93%	32	89%	3	100%	3	100%	716	93%
Female	51	7%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	55	7%
Total	729	100%	36	100%	3	100%	3	100%	771	100%

Wards supervised by Special Operations reside in many areas of the county. Some areas have a higher concentration of probation youth. The following map indicates where the lowest to highest concentrations of probation youth supervised by the Special Operations were found in 2013.

Figure 22. Map Showing Concentration of Special Operations: Wards Supervised



County of San Diego Probation Department  
 Concentration of Wards  
 Supervised by Special Operations

Created by the  
 Geo-Spatial Intelligence  
 Support Team - June 2013



The following table shows the assignment of wards to specialized programs by risk level. It is a one day snapshot of youth in specialized programs on December 31, 2013.

**Table 14. Wards Supervised by Risk Level and Specialized Program\***


Specialized Program	Risk Level								Total	%
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored			
CTU	41	9%	1	5%	0	0%	3	75%	45	9%
Gang	289	62%	17	90%	1	100%	1	25%	308	63%
YOU	136	29%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	137	28%
Total	466	100%	19	100%	1	100%	4	100%	490	100%

\*One day snapshot of youth on December 31, 2013

**Figure 23. Wards Supervised in Specialized Program\***

\*One day snapshot of youth on December 31, 2013

The figure to the right shows the breakdown of wards who are in each program within the Special Operations division.



### Special Operations: Juvenile Caseload Ratios

The department maintains a variety of caseload ratios for juveniles. Ratios are referred to as a yardstick. Table 15 below provides information on the yardstick as well as the actual ratio of wards to officers. It is a one day snapshot of youth in specialized programs on December 31, 2013.

**Table 15. Special Operations: Ward Supervision Yardstick and Actual Caseload Ratio\***

Specialized Program	Yardstick	Caseload Ratio	% +/-
Community Transition Unit (CTU)	1:25	1:37	48%
Gang Suppression Unit (GSU)	1:49	1:42	5%
Youthful Offender Unit (YOU)	1:25	1:20	-20%

\*One day snapshot of youth on December 31, 2013

In 2013, the YOU program had caseload ratios under the yardstick. Lower caseload sizes allow officers to engage wards in meaningful interactions to encourage behavior change.

## Special Operations: Gang Statistics

Probation officers supervise gang involved wards throughout the county. Officers perform intensive supervision and case management and accountability steps that include 4<sup>th</sup> waiver searches, curfew checks, drug testing, and face-to-face contacts with wards at school, community programs, employment, and at home. Ninety-four percent (94%) of wards assigned to gang supervision have been assessed as high risk, six percent (6%) are assessed as medium risk and less than one percent (<1%) as low risk.

When the Probation Department provides information on gang members in the community under probation supervision, three groups are identified:

1. Wards who are supervised by our specialized gang officers.
2. Wards who had, as conditions of their probation, prohibitions against certain activities, thought to show affiliation with a gang.
3. Wards who have been documented as gang members or gang associates by local law enforcement and catalogued by the CalGang system. Percentages are not given due to the fact that a ward can be in more than one category.

**Table 16. Number of Gang-Involved Wards under Supervision by Region\***

Region	Supervised By Gang Unit	With Gang Registration Conditions	Identified as Gang Member or Associate
Central	71	34	91
East	35	8	29
South	23	15	20
North	152	74	136
Total	281	131	276



\* Percentages are not given due to the fact that an offender can be in more than one category

Wards supervised by the Gang Unit reside in many areas of the county. Some areas have a higher concentration of probation youth. The following map indicates where the lowest to highest concentrations of probation wards lived in 2013.



# ADULT FIELD SERVICES

(Including Adult Gang Unit)

## Probationers Supervised

**12,937**

on December 31, 2013

**18,559**

throughout the year

## Ethnic Group

African American	16%
Asian Pacific Islander	4%
Caucasian	42%
Hispanic	35%
Other	3%

## Average Age

**35**

Male

**77%**



Female


**23%**



Probationers are adult offenders who are supervised in regular supervision caseloads. Some probationers are supervised by the Gang Unit if they have gang affiliations or gang conditions placed on them by the Court. This section shows data on Probationers under supervision as well as those offenders supervised by the Gang Unit.


**Figure 25. Probation Population on the Last Day of Each Quarter 2009-2013\***

\* Includes Adult Gang Unit



The number of probationers supervised for the past five years (2009-2013), has decreased by 27% from 17,605 to 12,937. Over the past three years (2011-2013), the population of probationers has decreased by 20% from 16,170 to 12,937.


**Figure 26. Number of Monthly New Probation Grants 2009-2013**



The number of new probation grants to adults decreased 18% from March 2009 to December 2013. The number of new grants decreased 6% from March 2009 to December 2013.

**Figure 27. Percentage of Probationers Supervised by Region\***

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers



**The 18,559 probationers who were supervised in 2013 were a diverse group of individuals**, both ethnically and geographically. Table 17 shows the breakdown of probationers by region and ethnicity.

*In the following tables, two totals are shown. The larger number (18,559) reflects all adults supervised, the lower number (14,677) is sorted by region and excludes transient and out-of-county probationers.*


**Table 17. Probationers Supervised by Region\* and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Region								Total	%
	Central		East		South		North			
African-American	1,350	27%	444	18%	277	11%	269	6%	2,340	16%
Asian	269	5%	59	2%	136	5%	138	3%	602	4%
Caucasian	1,931	38%	1,406	56%	575	22%	2,403	54%	6,315	43%
Hispanic	1,418	28%	505	20%	1,538	60%	1,487	33%	4,948	34%
Other	120	2%	107	4%	57	2%	188	4%	472	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,088</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,521</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,583</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4,485</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>14,677</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

Probationers supervised reside in many areas of the county. Some areas have a higher concentration of probationers. The following map indicates where the lowest to highest concentrations of probationers supervised were found in 2013.

**Figure 28. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of Probationers Supervised**



Probationers supervised in San Diego County are assessed to determine the likelihood that they will offend again. In the beginning of 2009, a validated risk-need assessment tool known as the COMPAS was implemented. For those probationers who began their probation prior to early

2009, the Federal Salient Factor Score was used to assess risk. Probationers were grouped according to their score as shown in Tables 18, 19, 20 and 21.

**Table 18. Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Region\***

Region	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	%
Central	1,617	37%	1,075	35%	2,187	33%	209	30%	5,088	35%
East	758	17%	511	17%	1,103	17%	149	22%	2,521	17%
South	692	16%	527	18%	1,261	19%	103	15%	2,583	18%
North	1,278	30%	886	30%	2,094	31%	227	33%	4,485	30%
Total	4,345	100%	2,099	100%	6,645	100%	688	100%	14,677	100%

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

**Table 19. Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Age**

Age	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	%
18-24 years	1,697	30%	1,040	28%	951	12%	194	22%	3,882	21%
25-34 years	2,126	37%	1,312	36%	2,801	34%	264	30%	6,503	35%
35-44 years	947	16%	657	18%	1,972	24%	193	22%	3,769	20%
Over 45 years	976	17%	684	18%	2,516	30%	229	26%	4,405	24%
Total	5,746	100%	3,693	100%	8,240	100%	880	100%	18,559	100%

**Table 20. Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity**


Ethnicity	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	%
African-American	1,289	21%	652	17%	970	12%	101	11%	3,012	16%
Asian	153	3%	143	4%	373	5%	17	2%	686	4%
Caucasian	2,187	34%	1,477	37%	3,684	42%	484	53%	7,832	42%
Hispanic	1,968	40%	1,315	39%	2,928	38%	244	31%	6,455	35%
Other	142	2%	101	3%	243	3%	23	3%	509	3%
Total	5746	100%	3,693	100%	8,240	100%	880	100%	18,559	100%

**Table 21. Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Gender**

Gender	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	%
Male	4,619	8%	2,748	74%	6,257	76%	616	70%	14,240	77%
Female	1,127	20%	945	26%	1,983	24%	264	30%	4,319	23%
Total	5,746	100%	3,693	100%	8,240	100%	880	100%	18,559	100%

**Figure 29. Probationers Supervised by Supervision Level**

There are three supervision levels: High, Medium, and Low Risk. There is a separate supervision category called Proposition 36. Prop 36 allows first- and second-time nonviolent, simple drug possession offenders the opportunity to receive substance abuse treatment instead of incarceration.



**Table 22. Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Supervision Level**

Supervision Level	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	%
High Risk	4,684	81%	707	21%	1,259	16%	40	7%	6,690	36%
Medium Risk	184	4%	1,861	51%	694	9%	25	4%	2,764	15%
Low Risk	513	9%	931	23%	6,021	72%	226	27%	7,691	41%
Prop 36	365	6%	194	5%	266	3%	589	62%	1,414	8%
Total	5,746	100%	3,693	100%	8,240	100%	880	100%	18,559	100%

\* Probationers fall into a variety of categories including unassigned, ended year on supervisor case load without supervision level or last caseload assignment was to Investigations


**Table 23. Probationer Supervision Yardstick and Caseload Size\***

The department maintains a variety of caseload ratios for adults. Ratios are referred to as a yardstick. Table 23 provides information on the yardstick as well as the actual ratio of probationers to officers. Lower caseload sizes allow officers to engage wards in meaningful interactions to encourage behavior change.

Supervision Level	Caseload Standard	Caseload Ratio	% +/-
High Risk	1:50	1:60	20%
Medium Risk	1:150	1:132	-12%
Low Risk	1:1400	1:548	-61%
Prop 36	1:125	1:545	336%


\*One day snapshot of probationers as of December 31, 2013

**Figure 30. Percentage of Probationers by Crime Type**




**Figure 31. Percentage of Sex Offenders Supervised by Static-99 Risk Level**

The law requires that sex offenders convicted of certain offenses register with local law enforcement as a “registered sex offender.” Some of these offenders are under probation supervision. They are required by state law to be assessed for risk of committing another sex offense using a tool known as the “Static 99.” Figure 31 shows the registered sex offenders under supervision in 2013 by assessed risk level.




**Figure 32. Probationers under Supervision – Ending Status**



**DUI OFFENDERS**

**On any given day in 2013, the department supervised 633 DUI offenders on specialized caseloads.** DUI offenders are eligible for supervision on these caseloads when they commit felony DUI offenses. In 2013, 381 high risk probationers wore a Secure Continuous Remote Alcohol Monitoring (SCRAM) bracelet which detects alcohol abuse around the clock. Figure 33 shows the DUI probationers under supervision by region.

**Figure 33. Probationers on DUI Enforcement Caseloads by Region**



# ADULT FIELD SERVICES OUTCOME DATA


The recidivism rate reflects the percentage of adult probationers (including adults supervised by the Gang Suppression Unit) who received a felony or misdemeanor conviction during the term of supervision. Recidivism is calculated based on Fiscal Year 2013-14 data.

Of the 5,647 adults who terminated probation during FY 2013-14, 3,745 or 66% terminated without committing a new law violation.

The FY 2013-14 recidivism rate is **34%**.


## ***ALL RECIDIVISM DATA IS BASED ON FISCAL YEARS (2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, 2013-2014)***

**Figure 34. Number of Probationers who Terminated Probation FY 09-10 to FY 13-14**




From FY 2009-10 to FY 2013-14 the number of probationers who terminated probation decreased by 13%. The number of probationers who recidivated decreased by 5% in that same time period. The recidivism rate increased from 31% to 34%.

**Figure 35. Number of Probationers who Recidivated, FY 09-10 to FY 13-14**




**Figure 36. Probationer Recidivism Rate FY 09-10 to FY 13-14**




**Table 24. Adult Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Recidivism by Risk Level**

<b>Risk Level</b>	<b># Who Left Probation</b>	<b># Recidivated</b>	<b>% Recidivated</b>
High	1,499	738	49%
Medium	414	165	40%
Low	3,218	897	28%
No Score	892	394	44%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6,023</b>	<b>2,194</b>	<b>36%</b>



**Figure 37. Percentage of Probationers Supervised by the Adult Gang Unit by Region\***

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers



*In the following tables, two totals are shown. The larger number (659) reflects all adults supervised by the gang unit, the lower number (518) is sorted by region and excludes transient and out-of-county probationers*

**Table 25. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Region\* and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Region								Total	%
	Central		East		South		North			
African-American	72	35%	25	32%	13	11%	4	3%	114	22%
Asian	16	7%	1	1%	3	5%	6	3%	26	5%
Caucasian	5	1%	5	4%	4	6%	5	5%	19	4%
Hispanic	104	56%	26	57%	72	77%	147	88%	349	68%
Other	3	1%	2	6%	2	1%	3	1%	10	1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers



All probationers supervised by the Adult Gang Unit in San Diego County are assessed to determine the likelihood that they will offend again. In the beginning of 2009 a validated risk need assessment tool known as the COMPAS was implemented. For those probationers who began their probation prior to early 2009, the Federal Salient Factor Score was used to assess risk. Probationers are grouped according to their score. These groupings are shown in Tables 26, 27, 28 and 29.

**Table 26. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Region\***

Region	Risk Level								Total	%
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored			
Central	134	43%	37	46%	26	37%	3	65%	200	39%
East	43	12%	7	4%	8	14%	1	35%	59	11%
South	57	15%	16	14%	21	28%	0	0%	94	18%
North	114	30%	38	36%	13	21%	0	0%	165	32%
Total	348	100%	98	100%	68	100%	4	100%	518	100%

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

**Table 27. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Age**

Age	Risk Level								Total	%
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored			
18-24 years	309	51%	70	59%	37	47%	6	69%	422	64%
25-34 years	124	36%	34	37%	30	48%	1	31%	189	29%
35-44 years	28	12%	6	4%	8	5%	0	0%	42	6%
Over 45 years	5	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	6	1%
Total	466	100%	110	100%	76	100%	7	100%	659	100%

**Table 28. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Risk Level								Total	%
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored			
African-American	106	25%	29	18%	21	27%	1	16%	157	24%
Asian	16	2%	9	14%	3	3%	0	0%	28	4%
Caucasian	17	4%	4	3%	5	4%	0	0%	26	4%
Hispanic	322	68%	65	63%	43	62%	6	84%	436	66%
Other	5	1%	3	2%	4	4%	0	0%	12	2%
Total	466	100%	110	100%	76	100%	7	100%	659	100%

**Table 29. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Risk Level and Gender**

Gender	Risk Level								Total	%
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored			
Male	444	96%	103	97%	69	93%	7	100%	623	95%
Female	22	4%	7	3%	7	7%	0	0%	36	5%
Total	466	100%	110	100%	76	100%	7	100%	659	100%

**Table 30. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervision Yardstick and Actual Caseload Ratio\***


The department maintains a variety of caseload ratios. Ratios are referred to as a yardstick. Table 30 below provides information on the yardstick as well as the actual ratio of probationers to officers. In 2013 the adult gang unit had caseload ratios under the yardstick. Lower caseload sizes allow officers to engage probationers in meaningful interactions to encourage behavior change.

Supervision Level	Yard stick	Caseload Ratio	% +/-
High Risk	1:50	1:39	-22%

\*One day snapshot of probationers on December 31, 2013

Figure 39 shows the breakdown of probationers supervised by the most serious crime that led them to being under probation supervision.

**Figure 39. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Crime Type**



Probation officers supervise gang members under supervision throughout the county. Officers perform intensive supervision and case management that includes 4<sup>th</sup> waiver searches, drug testing, and face-to-face contacts, community programs, employment, and at home.


The Court can impose the requirement to register with local law enforcement as a gang member. The number of probationers shown in the “gang registration” column had this condition placed on them by the Court. Probationers in the “identified as a gang member or associate” column had been documented by law enforcement as being either a gang member or a gang associate. These probationers have been entered into statewide gang database.

**Table 31. Number of Gang-Involved Probationers under Supervision by Region\***

Region	Supervised by Gang Unit	With Gang Registration Conditions	Identified as Gang Member or Associate
Central	110	43	159
East	44	13	58
South	61	18	82
North	101	51	132
Total	316	125	431

\* Percentages are not given due to the fact that a probationer can be in more than one category

**Figure 40. Adult Gang Unit: Probationers Supervised by Risk Level**



## Post Release Offender (PRO) Division (Post Release Community Supervision and Mandatory Supervision)

**Adults Supervised**  
**2,140**  
on December 31, 2013  
**4,035**  
throughout the year

Ethnic Group	
African American	27%
Asian Pacific Islander	4%
Caucasian	36%
Hispanic	30%
Other	3%


**Average Age**  
**40**

<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
<b>89%</b>	<b>11%</b>
	

The PRO Division supervises offenders realigned to the County under AB109, Public Safety Realignment. Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) are felons released from prison for non-violent, non-serious, or non-high risk sex crimes. Prior to the implementation of AB109, these offenders would have been supervised by State parole. Mandatory Supervision (MS) offenders are offenders sentenced to an 1170(h)(5)(b) crime. These individuals serve a portion of their time in custody in the Sheriff’s jail rather than State prison, and the balance in the community under mandatory Probation supervision.


**Figure 41. Percentage of PRCS and MS Supervised by Region\***

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers



The PRCS and MS offenders, who are supervised in the PRO Division, reside in many areas of the county. The following map indicates where the lowest to highest concentrations of PRCS and MS offenders supervised by Probation were found in 2013.

Figure 42. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of PRCS and MS Offenders



*In the following tables, two totals are shown. The larger number (4,035) reflects all adults supervised by the PRO Division, the lower number (3,121) is sorted by region and excludes transient and out-of-county offenders*

**Table 32. PRCS and MS Supervised by Region\* and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Region									
	Central		East		South		North		Total	%
African-American	486	41%	151	27%	84	18%	124	14%	845	27%
Asian	51	4%	8	1%	22	5%	31	3%	112	4%
Caucasian	344	29%	275	48%	87	19%	405	45%	1,111	36%
Hispanic	285	24%	112	20%	256	55%	298	33%	951	30%
Other	25	2%	21	4%	14	3%	42	5%	102	3%
Total	1,191	100%	567	100%	463	100%	900	100%	3,121	100%

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

**Table 33. PRCS and MS Supervised by Risk Level and Region\***

Region	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	%
Central	775	38%	146	38%	192	38%	78	42%	1,191	38%
East	354	17%	71	19%	91	18%	51	28%	567	18%
South	297	14%	53	14%	88	18%	25	13%	463	15%
North	629	31%	110	29%	130	26%	31	17%	900	29%
Total	2,055	100%	380	100%	501	100%	185	100%	3,121	100%

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

**Table 34. PRCS and MS Supervised by Risk Level and Age**

Age	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	%
18-24 years	214	8%	17	3%	24	4%	8	3%	263	6%
25-34 years	987	36%	139	29%	121	22%	47	18%	1,294	32%
35-44 years	719	27%	153	32%	154	27%	87	32%	1,113	28%
Over 45 years	793	29%	176	36%	268	47%	128	47%	1,365	34%
Total	2,713	100%	485	100%	567	100%	270	100%	4,035	100%


**Table 35. PRCS and MS Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	%
African-American	773	28%	125	26%	117	21%	87	32%	1,102	27%
Asian	75	3%	18	4%	38	7%	6	2%	137	4%
Caucasian	966	36%	179	37%	237	42%	80	29%	1,462	36%
Hispanic	833	31%	144	29%	149	26%	85	31%	1,211	30%
Other	66	2%	19	4%	26	4%	12	4%	123	3%
Total	2,713	100	485	100%	567	100%	270	100%	4,035	100%

**Table 36. PRCS and MS Supervised by Risk Level and Gender**

Gender	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	%
Male	2,458	91%	417	86%	479	84%	251	93%	3,605	89%
Female	255	9%	68	14%	88	16%	19	7%	430	11%
Total	2,713	100%	485	100%	567	100%	270	100%	4,035	100%

**Figure 43. Percentage of PRCS and MS by Crime Type**



# PRO DIVISION OUTCOME DATA

The recidivism rate reflects the percentage of PRO Division offenders (PRCS & MS) who received a felony or misdemeanor conviction during the term of supervision. Recidivism is calculated based on Fiscal Year 2013-14 data.

Of the 1,934 adults who terminated probation during FY 2013-14, 1,233 or 64% terminated without being convicted of a new law violation.

The FY 2013-14 recidivism rate is **36%**.

**Table 37. PRCS and MS FY 2013-2014 Recidivism by Risk Level**

Risk Level	# Who Left Probation	# Recidivated	% Recidivated
High	1,166	515	44%
Medium	166	24	14%
Low	322	52	16%
No Score	280	110	39%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,934</b>	<b>701</b>	<b>36%</b>

**Table 38. PRCS FY 2013-2014 Recidivism by Risk Level**

Risk Level	# Who Left Probation	# Recidivated	% Recidivated
High	981	454	46%
Medium	123	21	17%
Low	260	46	18%
No Score	247	100	40%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,611</b>	<b>621</b>	<b>39%</b>

**Table 39. MS FY 2013-2014 Recidivism by Risk Level**

Risk Level	# Who Left Probation	# Recidivated	% Recidivated
High	185	61	33%
Medium	43	3	7%
Low	62	6	10%
No Score	33	10	30%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>25%</b>

## Post Release Community Supervision (PRCS) (A subset of the PRO Division)

**Adults Supervised**  
**1,823**  
on December 31, 2013  
**3,445**  
throughout the year


Ethnic Group	
African American	28%
Asian Pacific Islander	3%
Caucasian	35%
Hispanic	30%
Other	4%

**Average Age**  
**40**

<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
<b>91%</b>	<b>9%</b>
	


**Figure 44. Percentage of PRCS Supervised by Region\***

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers



The PRCS, who are supervised in the PRO Division, reside in many areas of the county. The following map indicates where the lowest to highest concentrations of PRCS supervised by probation were found in 2013.

Figure 45. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of PRCS



*In the following tables, two totals are shown. The larger number (3,445) reflects all PRCS supervised by the PRO Division, the lower number (2,672) is sorted by region and excludes transient and out-of-county offenders.*

**Table 40. PRCS Supervised by Region\* and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Region									
	Central		East		South		North		Total	%
African-American	440	42%	140	28%	71	18%	97	13%	748	28%
Asian	45	4%	7	1%	18	5%	24	3%	94	4%
Caucasian	286	27%	244	48%	72	18%	324	44%	926	35%
Hispanic	249	24%	99	20%	217	55%	249	35%	814	30%
Other	24	3%	17	3%	14	4%	35	5%	90	3%
Total	1044	100%	507	100%	392	100%	729	100%	2672	100%

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

**Table 41. PRCS Supervised by Risk Level and Region\***

Region	Risk Level								Total	%
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored			
Central	678	38%	124	40%	164	39%	78	43%	1044	39%
East	317	18%	58	19%	83	20%	49	27%	507	19%
South	259	15%	45	15%	64	15%	24	13%	392	15%
North	512	29%	81	26%	106	26%	30	17%	729	27%
Total	1766	100%	308	100%	417	100%	181	100%	2672	100%

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

**Table 42. PRCS Supervised by Risk Level and Age**

Age	Risk Level								Total	%
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored			
18-24 years	175	7%	13	3%	16	4%	8	3%	212	6%
25-34 years	824	36%	112	28%	94	20%	47	18%	1,077	31%
35-44 years	618	27%	135	34%	130	28%	84	32%	967	28%
Over 45 years	702	30%	139	35%	224	48%	124	47%	1,189	35%
Total	2,319	100%	399	100%	464	100%	263	100%	3,445	100%


**Table 43. PRCS Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Risk Level								Total	%
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored			
African-American	673	29%	105	26%	110	24%	86	33%	974	28%
Asian	62	3%	16	4%	31	7%	6	2%	115	3%
Caucasian	806	35%	145	36%	186	40%	77	29%	1,214	35%
Hispanic	721	31%	118	30%	114	25%	82	31%	1035	30%
Other	57	2%	15	4%	23	4%	12	5%	107	4%
Total	2,319	100%	399	100%	464	100%	263	100%	3,445	100%

**Table 44. PRCS Supervised by Risk Level and Gender**

Gender	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Score		Total	%
Male	2,125	92%	353	88%	402	87%	245	93%	3,125	91%
Female	194	8%	46	12%	62	13%	18	7%	320	9%
Total	2,319	100%	399	100%	464	100%	263	100%	3,445	100%

**Figure 46. Percentage of PRCS by Crime Type**



## Mandatory Supervision (MS) (A subset of the PRO Division)

### Adults Supervised

**317**

on December 31, 2013

**590**

throughout the year

### Ethnic Group

African American 21%

Asian Pacific Islander 4%

Caucasian 42%

Hispanic 30%

Other 3%

### Average Age

**38**

Male

Female


**81%**

**19%**




**Figure 47. Percentage of MS Supervised by Region\***

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers



The MS, who are supervised in the PRO Division, reside in many areas of the county. The following map indicates where the lowest to highest concentrations of MS supervised by probation were found in 2013.

Figure 48. Map of San Diego County Showing Concentration of MS



*In the following tables, two totals are shown. The larger number (590) reflects all MS supervised by the PRO Division, the lower number (449) is sorted by region and excludes transient and out-of-county offenders*

**Table 45. MS Supervised by Region\* and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Region									
	Central		East		South		North		Total	%
African-American	46	31%	11	18%	13	18%	27	16%	97	22%
Asian	6	4%	1	2%	4	6%	7	4%	18	4%
Caucasian	58	40%	31	52%	15	21%	81	47%	185	41%
Hispanic	36	24%	13	22%	39	55%	49	29%	137	30%
Other	1	1%	4	6%	0	0%	7	4%	12	3%
Total	147	100%	60	100%	71	100%	171	100%	449	100%

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

**Table 46. MS Supervised by Risk Level and Region\***

Region	Risk Level								Total	%
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored			
Central	97	34%	22	31%	28	33%	0%		147	33%
East	37	13%	13	18%	8	9%	2	50%	60	13%
South	38	13%	8	11%	24	29%	1	25%	71	16%
North	117	40%	29	40%	24	29%	1	25%	171	38%
Total	289	100%	72	100%	84	100%	4	100%	449	100%

\*excludes transient and out-of-county probationers

**Table 47. MS Supervised by Risk Level and Age**

Age	Risk Level								Total	%
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored			
18-24 years	39	10%	4	5%	8	8%	0	0%	51	9%
25-34 years	163	41%	27	31%	27	26%	0	0%	217	37%
35-44 years	101	26%	18	21%	24	23%	3	43%	146	24%
Over 45 years	91	23%	37	43%	44	43%	4	57%	176	30%
Total	394	100%	86	100%	103	100%	7	100%	590	100%


**Table 48. MS Supervised by Risk Level and Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Risk Level								Total	%
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored			
African-American	100	25%	20	23%	7	7%	1	14%	128	21%
Asian	13	3%	2	2%	7	7%	0	0%	22	4%
Caucasian	160	41%	34	40%	51	49%	3	43%	248	42%
Hispanic	112	28%	26	30%	35	34%	3	43%	176	30%
Other	9	3%	4	5%	3	3%	0	0%	16	3%
Total	394	100%	86	100%	103	100%	7	100%	590	100%

**Table 49. MS Supervised by Risk Level and Gender**

Gender	Risk Level									
	High		Medium		Low		Not Scored		Total	%
Male	333	85%	64	74%	77	75%	6	86%	480	81%
Female	61	15%	22	26%	26	25%	1	14%	110	19%
Total	394	100%	86	100%	103	100%	7	100%	590	100%

**Figure 49. Percentage of MS by Crime Type**



# INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES

The department operates five 24-hour institutions. Kearny Mesa and East Mesa Juvenile Detention Facilities, KMJDF and EMJDF, house male and female detainees while they are awaiting placement in a treatment facility, a return to home, fostercare, or as a short-term placement for violating their probation conditions. These two facilities admit detainees directly from arresting agencies throughout the county as well as youth who are arrested by probation officers for failing to comply with their conditions of probation.

**4,829**

Bookings into KMJDF and EMJDF throughout the year


**16 Days**

Average length of stay for detainees booked into KMJDF and not released within 72 hours

**725**

Detainees booked and released within 72 hours

**Figure 50. Average Daily Attendance – Juvenile Detention Facilities**




**Table 50. Juvenile Detention Facilities Maximum and Average Length of Stay**

Institution	Maximum Length of Stay	Average Length of Stay
EMJDF	612	42
KMJDF	599	16
CB	380	179
GRF	177	57
JRF	221	39

Detainees were held in juvenile detention facilities for a variety of reasons. Both pre- and post-dispositional detainees were held. Thirteen percent of all detainees held in detention facilities were post-dispositional. In 2013, 21% were part of the YOU program, 18% had been committed to Breaking Cycles and 13% were short-term commitments (STOP).

**Figure 51. Reason for Detention at East Mesa and Kearny Mesa**




**Table 51. Description of Reasons for Detention**

YOU	Rehabilitating high risk youth between the ages of 15 and 21
Residential Treatment (RTF)	Youth awaiting transfer to a long term, live in treatment facility
Awaiting Transfer	Awaiting transfer to another facility to serve their commitment, Residential Treatment Facility, or placement, assessment
Breaking Cycles	Youth between the ages of 13 and 18 awaiting transfer to Juvenile Ranch Facility (JRF) or youth serving their commitment at EMJDF due to medical or behavior reasons
Camp Barrett	Youth between the ages of 16 and 19 awaiting transfer to Camp Barrett (CB) or youth serving their commitment at EMJDF due to medical or behavior reasons
DJJ Commitment	Youth whom the court committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice who

	are awaiting transfer
Drug Court	Youths in the Drug Court program. Typically short term commitments or awaiting transfer to JRF/CB
Other	Youth serving weekend commitments or youth pending release to ICE
Placement	Youths awaiting placement in a RTF, Foster Care
Pre-Disposition	Youth awaiting Disposition Hearings
Short Term Commitment	Youth serving weekend commitments, 21-day commitments, or short-term Drug Court commitments
Adult Court	Youth who are being tried under Prop 21 or are over the age of 18
Warrant	Holds youth with Bench Warrant, Juvenile Detention Order, Arrest Warrant pending future Court proceedings

The **Girl’s Rehabilitation Facility** houses up to 50 female detainees for an average of four months focusing on behavior modification and substance abuse treatment. The **Juvenile Ranch Facility and Camp Barrett** are camp programs for male detainees offering substance abuse treatment, job training, education, and pro-social behavior. The camp programs have a capacity of 352 detainees on any given day. The Average Daily Attendance (ADA) of the Juvenile Ranch Facility, Camp Barrett and Girls Rehabilitation Facility are divided among the facilities as shown in Figure 46.

**Figure 52. Average Daily Attendance at the Juvenile Camps in 2013**



**Table 52. Detainees: Average Age and Gender by Facility \***

Institution	Average Age	Male	%	Female	%	Total
KMJDF	16	122	70%	52	30%	174
EMJDF	16	132	100%	0	0%	132
CB	17	102	100%	0	0%	102
JRF	15	83	100%	0	0%	83
GRF	16	0	0%	19	100%	19

\*Represents average population on any given day

**Table 53. Detainees: Ethnicity by Facility\***

Institution	African-American		Asian		Caucasian		Hispanic		Other		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
KMJDF	32	18%	4	2%	31	18%	100	58%	7	4%	174	100%
EMJDF	25	19%	1	1%	15	11%	91	69%	0	0%	132	100%
CB	22	21%	0	0%	17	17%	59	58%	4	4%	102	100%
JRF	13	16%	1	1%	7	9%	60	72%	2	2%	83	100%
GRF	4	21%	0	0%	5	26%	10	53%	0	0%	19	100%

\*Represents average population on any given day

**Table 54. Detainees: Home Region by Facility\***

Institution	Central	East	South	North	Other	Total
KMJDF	45	22	17	65	25	174
EMJDF	38	9	14	60	11	132
CB	40	8	13	35	6	102
JRF	6	15	15	40	7	83
GRF	3	4	1	7	4	19

\*Represents average population on any given day

**Table 55. Detainees: Most Serious Offense by Facility\***

Institution	Crime Against Person	Crime Against Property	Drug Offense	Weapon Offense	Status Offense	Other	Total
KMJDF	76	58	23	1	1	15	174
EMJDF	65	41	4	4	1	17	132
CB	50	33	7	2	0	10	102
JRF	36	27	8	2	0	10	83
GRF	11	8	0	0	0	0	19

\*Represents average population on any given day