

**SANTA BARBARA COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT  
JUVENILE SERVICES DIVISION**

*Policy/Procedure Directive*

|                   |  |                       |           |
|-------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------|
| <b>Subject:</b>   | Supervision Caseload Audits                  | <b>Policy Number:</b> | J-2019-01 |
| <b>Category:</b>  | Field Supervision                            |                       |           |
| <b>Authority:</b> | Holly Benton, Deputy Chief Probation Officer |                       |           |
| <b>Issued:</b>    | 03/04/19                                     | <b>Revised:</b>       |           |
| <b>Note:</b>      |  |                       |           |

In order to ensure effective and consistent oversight of juvenile cases, supervisors shall audit the caseload of each officer they supervise monthly.

Supervising Probation Officers (SPOs) shall first check the following general issues:

- Is the case on warrant status and if so, is it due to be moved off the caseload?
- Are there any 601 youth being supervised and if so, why?
- Are there any youth on 654.2, 725 or 790 status who have been on supervision past the statutorily required time?
- For intake caseloads: are there any referrals still open after 30 days without initial action, and if so, why has no action been taken?
- With the exception of pending terminations, there any 18+ cases that need to be terminated?

SPOs shall then randomly select cases from each officer's caseload – no less than 5, no more than 10 - and audit for the following:

- Were field contact guidelines met on the youth? If not, why not?
- For placement cases: has the monthly contact standard been met? There is no acceptable reason for a monthly placement contact to be missed.
- If the youth is in long-term custody, is there at minimum 1 entry per week on officer contacts with the youth while in custody, ongoing efforts to work the case, etc.?
- If youth is at camp, has an officer been to camp within the last 2 weeks to visit the youth? If detained pending the outcome of subsequent/supplemental petition, has their probation officer been to the hall to see them within the last 2 weeks?

- How many referrals to services has the officer made for the youth, and were those referrals appropriate? If the referrals haven't been made, why not? Note: the default expectation is that there will be referrals on every eligible youth on wardship probation.
- Is the documentation in events appropriate for the case?
- If the case is awaiting transfer, why?
- Has the IR/RC form (PRO-555) been completed?
- Does the case plan reflect what's on the IR/RC (PRO-555) and does it contain information about the family?
- Has the case plan been signed by all parties (including youth, parents, officer, and SPO)?
- Has the case plan been reviewed and modified as applicable to reflect current Title IV-E status?
- Has the case plan been reviewed and modified at each six month mark from the start of supervision?
- Has follow-up been done on community service work?

On a monthly basis, SPOs should also review any reports available in IMPACT to assist with early identification of supervision discrepancies, including but not limited to:

- Juvenile Case Plan Roster  
Clients with Open Programs
- CSW Open Cases
- Juvenile Violation Roster
- Last Field Contacts
- Overdue Title IV-E Reviews
- Incentive Report

For any discrepancies or issues noted, SPO should discuss the identified case management issues with the officer, document the discussion, and note any corrective case action(s) required. Cases requiring action should be checked by the SPO the month following the discussion, in order to ensure the case has been updated.

Supervisors should turn in a caseload audit worksheet (PRO-236) to their manager for each officer by the 15<sup>th</sup> of the month. Manager will review and forward to the DCPO by the 25<sup>th</sup> of each month.