

# ANNUAL STATISTICAL REPORT

Fiscal Year 2024-25



COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO  
PROBATION DEPARTMENT

# SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY PROBATION DEPARTMENT

## Annual Statistical Report Fiscal Year 2024-25

### Contents

List of Figures .....	ii
List of Tables .....	iii
Executive Summary.....	1
FY2024-2025 Key Points of Information .....	2
Juvenile Services .....	2
Juvenile Custody .....	2
Adult Services.....	2
JUVENILE SERVICES .....	3
Referrals to Juvenile Probation.....	3
Youth under Supervision.....	8
Supervised Juvenile Outcomes .....	10
Race and Ethnicity in the local Juvenile Justice System.....	11
JUVENILE DETENTION AND COMMITMENT.....	13
Juvenile Hall .....	13
Coastal Valley Academy .....	18
Coastal Valley Academy Outcomes.....	20
Secure Youth Treatment.....	21
ADULT SERVICES .....	22
Court Services .....	22
Pretrial Services Program.....	23
Pretrial Monitoring Outcomes .....	25
Community Supervision Services.....	28
General Supervision .....	28
Specialized Caseloads.....	28
Post-Release Caseloads.....	28
Community Supervision Outcomes .....	33
Appendix A: Glossary of terms as used in this report.....	36
Juvenile Services .....	36
Adult Services.....	36

## List of Figures

Figure 1. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by Fiscal Year, FY2018-19 - FY2024-25 .....	3
Figure 2. Middle and High School Enrollees FY2018-19 - FY2024-25 .....	4
Figure 3. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by Crime Type, FY2024-25 .....	5
Figure 4. Individuals referred by Law Enforcement by Race/Ethnicity, FY2024-25 .....	5
Figure 5. Youth Referred to Probation by Area of Residency, FY2020-21 - FY2024-25 .....	6
Figure 6. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by result, FY2023-24 .....	7
Figure 7. Disposition of Filed Petitions, FY2024-25 .....	7
Figure 8. Juvenile Population on the Last Day of Each Quarter, FY2022-23 - FY2024-25 .....	8
Figure 9. Youth under Court-ordered Supervision by Region of Residency, June 2025 .....	9
Figure 10. Youth on Court-ordered Supervision by Crime Type, June 2025 .....	10
Figure 11. Juvenile Recidivism Rate, FY2020-21 - FY2024-25 .....	10
Figure 12. Juvenile Recidivism by Case Severity, FY2024-25 .....	11
Figure 13. Number of Bookings into Juvenile Hall, FY2019-20 - FY2024-25 .....	13
Figure 14. Average Daily Population at Juvenile Hall, FY2019-20 - FY2024-25 .....	14
Figure 15. Juvenile Hall Bookings by Type, FY2024-25 .....	15
Figure 16. Booked Youth by Area of Residency, FY2024-25 .....	16
Figure 17. Booked Youth by Race/Ethnicity, FY2024-25 .....	16
Figure 18. Booked Youth by Age Group, FY2024-25 .....	17
Figure 19. Mean and Median Number of Days Detained, FY2020-21- FY2024-25 .....	17
Figure 20. CVA Enrollments and Exits, FY2020-21- FY2024-25 .....	18
Figure 21. Age of Youth enrolled in Coastal Valley Academy (duplicated), FY2016-17 to FY2024-25 .....	19
Figure 22. Enrollment in CVA and Group Homes/STRTP, FY2015-16 – FY2024-25 .....	20
Figure 23. Recidivism outcomes for CVA Participants, March 2017 to June 2025 .....	21
Figure 24. Individuals referred by Quarter, FY2022-23- FY2024-25 .....	23
Figure 25. Number of New Monitoring Clients by Quarter, FY2022-23- FY2024-25 .....	24
Figure 26. Individuals on Pretrial Monitoring, Last Day of Each Quarter, FY2022-23- FY2024-25 .....	24
Figure 27. Number of Individuals Who Closed Pretrial Monitoring, FY2023-24 - FY2024-25 .....	25
Figure 28. Recidivism Rate among Pretrial Clients, FY2023-24 - FY2024-25 .....	25
Figure 29. Failure to Appear Rate among Pretrial Clients, FY2023-24 - FY2024-25 .....	26
Figure 30. Number of Program Participants, Last Day of Each Quarter, FY2022-23- FY2024-25 .....	27
Figure 31. Clients by caseload type, June 2025 .....	29
Figure 32. Probation Population, Last Day of Each Quarter, FY2022-23- FY2024-25 .....	30
Figure 33. Number of New Probation Grants by Quarter, FY2022-23- FY2024-25 .....	30
Figure 34. Probationers by housing status, June 2025 .....	31
Figure 35. Probationers by Risk Level, June 2025 .....	32
Figure 36. Probationers by Crime Type, June 2025 .....	32
Figure 37. Number of Individuals Who Closed Probation, FY2020-21 - FY2024-25 .....	33
Figure 38. Recidivism Rate among Probationers, FY2020-21 - FY2024-25 .....	34
Figure 39. Closing Status among Probationers, FY2024-25 .....	35

## List of Tables

Table 1. Juvenile Referrals by Referring Agencies, FY2024-25 .....	4
Table 2. Recidivism by Risk Level, FY2023-24 .....	11
Table 3. System Decision Points by Race/Ethnicity, FY2022-23 to FY2024-25 .....	12
Table 4. Relative Rates for System Decision Points for by Race/Ethnicity, FY2022-23 to FY2024-25 .....	12
Table 5. Bookings by Arresting Agency, FY2024-25 .....	14
Table 6. Bookings by Length of Detention, Released Youth, FY2022-23 to FY2024-25.....	18
Table 7. Investigation reports by type and fiscal year, FY2021-22 to FY2024-25.....	22
Table 8. Recidivism among Probationers by Risk Level, FY2024-25 .....	34

# Annual Statistical Report Fiscal Year 2024-25

## Executive Summary

The Probation Department is responsible for providing community corrections services, which are mandated by law. This Annual Statistical Report provides basic information and statistics about the Department services including Juvenile Services, Juvenile Custody, and Adult Services.

- Juvenile Services is responsible for school-based prevention and intervention services, processing all referrals from law enforcement, conducting investigations and making dispositional recommendations for the Court, and the full continuum of the supervision of youth placed on probation and home detention.
- Juvenile Detention and Commitment is responsible for the staffing and operation of the 20-bed County Juvenile Hall, the 30-bed Coastal Valley Academy, and the 10-bed Secure Youth Treatment Facility.
  - The Juvenile Hall is a 24-hour detention center, housing youth awaiting court proceedings, awaiting out of home placement into foster care, or serving a time limited period of commitment.
  - Coastal Valley Academy provides educational and residential treatment services for wards of the court who cannot be safely maintained in the community.
  - The Secure Youth Treatment program provides long-term treatment and housing for the population of youth with serious and violent offenses previously committed to the state Division of Juvenile Justice prior to the enactment of SB 823 in 2021.
- Adult Services is responsible for conducting investigations and making sentencing recommendations to the Court as well as supervision of offenders placed on probation or released from prison under Post-Release Community Supervision. The Department has several specialized supervision caseloads, including specialty court caseloads.
- Adult Services collaborates with the Superior Court to provide monitoring and referrals to supportive services for justice involved individuals deemed suitable to remain in the community while their case is pending trial or under conditions of deferred judgement. This includes those receiving substance use disorder treatment pursuant to Proposition 36 Treatment Mandated Felony provisions.

As part of delivering quality community corrections services, the Probation Department utilizes evidence-based practices when supervising justice-involved individuals. The Probation Department supervision approach is based upon “risk, need, responsivity” principles:

- **Risk principle:** prioritize supervision and treatment resources for higher risk individuals
- **Need principle:** target interventions to criminogenic needs
- **Responsivity principle:** consider individual characteristics when developing treatment plans and approaches and adjust treatment intensity to risk and need levels.

The Probation Department’s implementation of evidence-based practices requires commitment to the collection and utilization of accurate data. The collection of statistical data is foundational to evidence-based practices and supports the Department’s decision-making regarding policies, programs, and

resource allocation that supports public safety. There is ongoing effort to provide consistent and clearly explained data.

## FY2024-2025 Key Points of Information

### Juvenile Services

- Fourteen percent (14.3%) of youth on court-ordered supervision and diversion recidivated (committed a new law violation) between the start and end of the supervision term. This was well below the Department's target of 25%.
- Forty-seven percent (47.2%) of juvenile referrals were closed or diverted from the juvenile court system by Probation. This exceeded the Department's target of 40%.
- An analysis of racial and ethnic disparity, reviewing several decision points in the local juvenile justice system, is included in this report, beginning on page 11.

### Juvenile Custody

- The average daily population of Juvenile Hall in FY2024-25 was 9 youth detainees (Figure 13), up 38.5% from the previous year and 30.4% over the past five years.
- Since inception, 76.4% of CVA youth showed some reduction in risk score from pre- to post-assessment on the Youth Level of Service Case Management Inventory assessment.
- One youth was committed to the Secure Youth Treatment program, and one youth was released to Pine Grove Youth Conservation Fire Camp, as a less restrictive program.

### Adult Services

- In the Pretrial Services Program, 95% of monitored defendants completed their grant of monitoring without receiving a new conviction and 76% successfully appeared in court during their grant.
- The Department dedicates four officers to treatment court programs. As of June 2025, there were 91 participants in these programs, including Mental Health Diversion Court.
- The combined recidivism rate for adults on formal supervision and adults on post-release supervision was 27%. This was below the Department's target of 45%.

This data may be used by researchers, grant writers, students, and citizens with an interest in knowing more about the Department and the justice-involved population we supervise. Additional information about departmental programs and services can be found at:

<http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/departments/probation.aspx>

## JUVENILE SERVICES

### Who Probation Supervised in FY2024-25


- 102 youth were supervised on June 30, 2025
- Average current age was 16.8 years
- 24.5% were female, 75.5% were male (sex assigned at birth)
- 56.1% were Hispanic, 36.7% were White, 3.1% were African American, 2.0% were Asian or Pacific Islander, 2.0% were other or unknown

### Referrals to Juvenile Probation


The following statistics reflect the processes that bring youth to Juvenile Probation when they are alleged to have committed a criminal offense or a violation of probation. The process begins with a referral to Juvenile Probation from a law enforcement agency or another county's juvenile justice system, citing the behavior. Additionally, Juvenile Probation may file notices with the Juvenile Court, under Welfare and Institutions Code § 777, when a youth violates a term or condition of court ordered supervision.

Over the past seven years (FY2018-19 - FY2024-25), the number of referrals submitted to Juvenile Probation declined steeply and then rebounded (Figure 1). The 557 referrals received in FY2024-25 were for 502 new law violations and 55 probation violations. Since the previous year, referrals increased 43.2%. Over the last seven years however, referrals decreased 10.2%. For context, the San Luis Obispo County youth population decreased 3.7% over the same period, as measured by middle and high school enrollment (Figure 2).

**Figure 1. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by Fiscal Year, FY2018-19 - FY2024-25**



**Figure 2. Middle and High School Enrollees FY2018-19 - FY2024-25**




Referrals to Juvenile Probation are submitted by local law enforcement agencies, transferred in from another county, or processed as a probation violation by Juvenile Probation (Table 1). ‘Other Agencies’ includes law enforcement entities such as: Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, California State Parks, and San Luis Obispo County District Attorney’s Office.

**Table 1. Juvenile Referrals by Referring Agencies, FY2024-25**

Agency	# of Referrals	Agency	# of Referrals
Arroyo Grande Police Dept.	31	Cal Poly & Cuesta College Police Depts.	2
Atascadero Police Dept.	73	San Luis Obispo Sheriff’s Office	95
Grover Beach Police Dept.	21	CA Highway Patrol	17
Morro Bay Police Dept.	4	Probation Dept.	49
Pismo Beach Police Dept.	36	Other Agencies	7
Paso Robles Police Dept.	167	Other Counties	9
San Luis Obispo Police Dept.	46	<b>Total</b>	<b>557</b>

As mentioned above, of the 557 annual referrals, there were 502 referrals for alleged new law violations. The referrals for new law violations are broadly categorized into: Against Persons (47%), Against Property (32%), Drugs/Alcohol (16%), and Weapons (5%) charges (figure 3).

**Figure 3. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by Crime Type, FY2024-25**



As mentioned above, the 502 referrals received during the year were for 362 individual youth. The majority of the referred youth were male, 68.8%; female, 31.2% (sex at birth). These youth primarily identified as white or Hispanic (36.2% and 57.2% respectively) with smaller groups of youth identifying as African American (3.0%), Asian or Pacific Islander (1.1%) or other or unknown (2.5%) (Figure 4). Further analysis of race and ethnicity in the local juvenile justice system can be found on page 11 of this report.

**Figure 4. Individuals referred by Law Enforcement by Race/Ethnicity, FY2024-25**





Figure 5 shows area of residence for youth referred over the last five fiscal years. More youth have been referred from the North County region than from other regions. This year, North County youth represented 45.6% of referrals from law enforcement compared to 14.4% from the SLO/Coast region, 17.4% from South County and 22.7% Other, which includes transients and out-of-county youth.


**Figure 5. Youth Referred to Probation by Area of Residency, FY2020-21 - FY2024-25**



Juvenile referrals for new charges can be counseled and closed or diverted by Juvenile Probation to Traffic Court or to informal diversion pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) section 654. Referrals for youth who present a need for juvenile court involvement are sent to the District Attorney’s Office for consideration of filing a petition with the Juvenile Justice Court. At the end of the fiscal year, 55 (11.0%) referrals made during the year were pending either Probation or DA action. Of the remaining 447 referrals, approximately half, 211 or 47.2%, had been counseled and closed or diverted by Probation (Figure 6).

When cases are counseled and closed by Probation, the Department will ask that the youth write an essay or letter of apology, complete community service hours or participate in needed services such as restorative practices or drug and alcohol counseling. When youth are diverted pursuant to WIC 654, they are put on a diversion contract, typically including payment of victim restitution, and other required actions. If the youth does not complete the contract, their case can be sent to the District Attorney for consideration of filing a petition with the Juvenile Court.


**Figure 6. Juvenile Referrals to Probation by result, FY2023-24**



In FY2024-25, 236 referrals were submitted by Probation to the District Attorney’s office for processing. This resulted in 222 petitions filed in Juvenile court. These filings involved 133 youth as some youth had multiple petitions filed during the year.

During the court process, juvenile petitions can be sustained, wherein the charge(s) are found or admitted true; or can be dismissed for a variety of reasons. They can also be transferred to another county based on the youth’s residency. Of the 222 juvenile petitions filed in the Juvenile Court in the fiscal year, 166 or 74.8% were sustained (Figure 7).


**Figure 7. Disposition of Filed Petitions, FY2024-25**



## Youth under Supervision


Over the last three fiscal years, the total number of youth under supervision increased by 50.0%, from 68 in the first quarter of FY2022-23 to 102 youth in the last quarter of FY2024-25 (Figure 8). Within the same period, youth under court-ordered supervision (pursuant to WIC sections 654.2, 725(a), 725(b) and 790) increased by 48.5%, from 66 to 98 youth. The number of youth supervised on Juvenile Probation’s diversion program (pursuant to WIC section 654) increased from two to four.

**Figure 8. Juvenile Population on the Last Day of Each Quarter, FY2022-23 - FY2024-25**



As of June 30, 2025, almost half the youth on court-ordered supervision (48.0%) lived in the northern region of the county, while 19.4% and 21.4% lived in the southern and San Luis Obispo/coastal regions of the county, respectively (Figure 9). ‘Other’ includes non-minor transients and out-of-county youth on courtesy supervision; they represented 11.2% of the supervised population.

**Figure 9. Youth under Court-ordered Supervision by Region of Residency, June 2025**




Note: "Other" is out-of-county youth.

Effective supervision practices include the use of a validated risk-need assessment tool, the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI), to determine a youth's likelihood to commit any new criminal offense and to identify issues that could be addressed through treatment and supervision. Youth are grouped according to their risk level, typically based on their YLS/CMI score (High, Medium, Low) but sometimes based on a supervisor-approved override of their score to ensure the youth is being supervised appropriately.

As of June 2025, there were 98 youth on court-ordered supervision. Of these, 90.8% of youth were supervised according to their assessed risk level and 9% based on supervisor-approved override. Including these overrides, youth were categorized as 29.8% high risk, 44.7% medium risk, and 25.5% low risk to reoffend.

These 98 youth can also be grouped by the type of offense that led to being under supervision (Figure 10). The majority of the supervised youth have committed crimes against persons or against property.


**Figure 10. Youth on Court-ordered Supervision by Crime Type, June 2025**



### Supervised Juvenile Outcomes

Outcomes are measured at the close of court-ordered supervision. In FY2024-25, a total of 77 court-ordered juvenile probation cases closed. Of those 77 youth, 85.7% ended supervision without having a new petition found true or obtaining an adult conviction before their supervision ended, i.e., without recidivating. Eleven youth, 14.3%, did have new charges adjudicated in either juvenile or adult court (Figure 11).

**Figure 11. Juvenile Recidivism Rate, FY2020-21 - FY2024-25**




Risk-based supervision is based upon the use of the YLS/CMI risk and needs assessment tool. Table 2 shows the recidivism rate among youth on court-ordered supervision and Figure 12 reflects recidivism according to the severity of the youth’s case, felony or misdemeanor.

**Table 2. Recidivism by Risk Level, FY2023-24**

Risk Level	# Closed	# Recidivated	% Recidivated
High	13	2	15.4%
Medium	36	7	19.4%
Low	28	2	7.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14.3%</b>

**Figure 12. Juvenile Recidivism by Case Severity, FY2024-25**



### Race and Ethnicity in the local Juvenile Justice System

Tables 3 and 4 compare race/ethnicity for the various decision points in the local juvenile justice system. In other sections of the report, data is presented for the FY2024-25 fiscal year. For this section, analysis was conducted for a three-year time period from July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2025. This time period was used in order to arrive at larger numbers for the analysis but some of the numbers are still very small and should be interpreted with caution. During this time, 809 unique youth were referred to the department for new crimes. Of those, 191 were booked into Juvenile Hall and 328 youth had a referral sent to the District Attorney’s office. Of those who were referred to the District Attorney’s Office, 294 had a petition filed in court, and 225 of those youth were placed on some form of court-ordered supervision. The number and percentage of youth at each decision point are shown in Table 3 and the relative rate index is shown in Table 4. Asian, Pacific Islander and Native youth were combined with “other” due to very small numbers.

**Table 3. System Decision Points by Race/Ethnicity, FY2022-23 to FY2024-25**

Race/ Ethnicity Population Age 12-17 (2023)			Decision Points									
			Referred to Probation		Booked in Juv. Hall		Sent to the DA		Filed by the DA		Court Ordered Supervision	
White	9449	54%	321	40%	55	29%	125	38%	108	37%	92	41%
Hispanic	6504	37%	420	52%	125	65%	172	52%	158	54%	115	51%
African Amer	508	3%	29	4%	7	4%	14	4%	14	5%	7	3%
Other	1139	6%	39	5%	4	2%	17	5%	14	5%	11	5%
Total	17600	100%	809	100%	191	100%	328	100%	294	100%	225	100%

The relative rate index is one of many ways to compare the experiences of different groups of youth within the juvenile justice system. When groups are treated equally to white youth, they will have a relative rate of one (1). National data shows that the 2019 national relative arrest rate for African American youth was 2.4, meaning that they were almost two and a half times more likely than white youth to be arrested. The relative arrest rate for Asian youth during the same time period was 0.3, meaning that Asian youth were less than half as likely as a white youth to be arrested. Table 4 shows relative rates for several decision points in the local juvenile justice system for the period of July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2025.

**Table 4. Relative Rates for System Decision Points for by Race/Ethnicity, FY2022-23 to FY2024-25**

Race/Ethnicity	Referred to Probation	Booked in Juv. Hall	Sent to the DA	Filed by the DA	Court Ordered Supervision
White	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Hispanic	1.90	1.74	1.05	1.06	0.85
African American	1.68	1.41	1.24	1.16	0.59
Other	1.01	0.60	1.12	0.95	0.92

**Notes:**

1. Population data accessed from *Easy Access to Juvenile Populations* were derived from data originally collected by the U.S. Census Bureau and subsequently modified by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). Citation: Puzzanchera, C., Sladky, A. and Kang, W. (2024). "Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2023." Online. Available: <https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop/>
2. Racial and ethnic data categories collected by the Probation Department differ from those collected by the US Census Bureau (Table 3). Thus, assumptions have been made about how to match these categories to each other.
3. Very small numbers of youth at some of the decision points means that there is a broader range of possible variability for given percentages or relative rates.

## JUVENILE DETENTION AND COMMITMENT

### Juvenile Detention and Commitment in FY2024-25


- At Juvenile Hall, there were 136 bookings for 103 individual youth.
- Coastal Valley had ten (10) enrollments and six (6) exits during the year.
- In the Secure Youth Treatment Program, one youth started the program during the year, and another youth was released to a less restrictive program.

### Juvenile Hall


The Juvenile Hall is a 24-hour detention center. This facility houses youth while they are awaiting court proceedings, awaiting out of home placement into foster homes, Short Term Residential Therapeutic Programs (STRTPs), or awaiting commitments to the Coastal Valley Academy or Secure Youth Treatment Facility.

In FY2024-25, there were 136 bookings into Juvenile Hall (Figure 17), involving 103 individual youth. The average number of bookings per youth was 1.3. Between FY2018-19 and FY2024-25 the total number of bookings decreased 47.9%, from 261 bookings. The average daily population in FY2024-25 was 6.6 youth detainees (Figure 14), up slightly from 6.5 the previous year.

**Figure 13. Number of Bookings into Juvenile Hall, FY2019-20 - FY2024-25**



**Figure 14. Average Daily Population at Juvenile Hall, FY2019-20 - FY2024-25**




The Juvenile Hall admits youth directly from arresting agencies as well as youth arrested by probation officers for violations of their conditions of probation (Table 5). The Juvenile Hall also receives in-custody transfers from courts in other counties. ‘Other Agency’ may include: CA Highway Patrol, CA State Parks , and CA State Parole. More than half, 60.3%, of the annual bookings were for allegations of a new criminal offense (Figure 19).

**Table 5. Bookings by Arresting Agency, FY2024-25**

Agency	# of Bookings	Agency	# of Bookings
Arroyo Grande Police Dept.	1	San Luis Obispo Police Dept.	9
Atascadero Police Dept.	15	Cal Poly/Cuesta Police Dept.	0
Grover Beach Police Dept.	6	San Luis Obispo Sheriff’s Office	26
Morro Bay Police Dept.	0	Probation Dept.	41
Pismo Beach Police Dept.	7	Other Agencies	5
Paso Robles Police Dept.	25	Other Counties	1
			<b>Total Bookings:</b>
			<b>136</b>


**Figure 15. Juvenile Hall Bookings by Type, FY2024-25**



Figures 20, 21 and 22 describe the general demographics of the 103 individual youth booked into Juvenile Hall during FY2024-25, including area of residency, race/ethnicity, and age. The majority of the booked youth were male, 78.7%; 21.3% were female (sex at birth).


Each time a youth is booked into the Juvenile Hall, they are given a questionnaire related to their sexual orientation, gender identity and expression (SOGIE). These questionnaires showed that during the last fiscal year, 75.0% of bookings identified as “boy or man”, 21.3% identified as “girl or woman,” and 1.5% (two youth) indicated that they identify as “other.” No youth identified themselves as “transgender” at booking and three youth (2.2%) did not complete the survey. In terms of sexual orientation, 93.4% of booked youth identified themselves as heterosexual, 1.5% as bisexual, 1.0% lesbian, and 1.5% as questioning.

**Figure 16. Booked Youth by Area of Residency, FY2024-25**




Note: 'Other' includes non-minor transients and out-of-county youth.

**Figure 17. Booked Youth by Race/Ethnicity, FY2024-25**




**Figure 18. Booked Youth by Age Group, FY2024-25**



During FY2024-25, there were 129 releases from detention, involving 101 individual youth. Among releases, the mean (average) length of detention was 19.4 days, down from 22.4 days in the previous year. The median ('middle' value) was 9 days (Figure 23). The longest period of detention was 162 days. Table 6 provides further details about the length of detention.

**Figure 19. Mean and Median Number of Days Detained, FY2020-21- FY2024-25**



**Table 6. Bookings by Length of Detention, Released Youth, FY2022-23 to FY2024-25**


Length of Detention	FY2022-23		FY2023-24		FY2024-25	
	# Youth	Percent	# Youth	Percent	# Youth	Percent
0 – 2 days	38	32.5%	43	38.4%	55	42.6%
3 – 6 days	15	12.8%	10	8.9%	18	14.0%
7 – 14 days	5	4.3%	9	8.0%	8	6.2%
15 – 22 days	13	11.1%	12	10.7%	21	16.3%
23+ days	46	39.3%	38	33.9%	27	20.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

### Coastal Valley Academy

The Coastal Valley Academy (CVA) is a program that provides residential treatment for wards of the Juvenile Court who cannot be safely maintained in the community. The program is designed to serve youth, aged 14 to 18 years old. These youth likely would have been sent to group home placement prior to CVA’s inception. The program utilizes evidence-based interventions to improve the youth’s decision-making skills and to enhance involvement in pro-social activities. The program has two phases: an intensive in-custody phase and a supportive aftercare in-community phase. The program’s goal is to safely return youth to the community after reducing their risk of future delinquent behavior.

Between March 2017 and June 2025, CVA has had 94 enrollments and 85 exits<sup>1</sup> (Figure 13). At program start, 93.8% of youth were assessed as high risk to reoffend, 5.0% were medium risk and 1.3% were low risk.


**Figure 20. CVA Enrollments and Exits, FY2020-21- FY2024-25**



<sup>1</sup> A few youth have participated in the program more than once—these numbers reflect duplicate enrollments for those youth.

Program enrollees were 78.8% male and 21.3% female (sex assigned at birth). They were 47.5% white, 43.8% Hispanic, 6.3% African American, and 2.5% Asian or Pacific Islander. Figure 14 shows the age at program start for youth enrolled in the program. The majority (93.3%) of enrollees are 15-17 years old with only a few youth starting at 14 or 18 years of age.

**Figure 21. Age of Youth enrolled in Coastal Valley Academy (duplicated), FY2016-17 to FY2024-25**



The CVA program is designed to reduce the risk of future delinquent behavior. Accordingly, the goal is to provide intensive intervention while youth are in the custody phase, as measured by the number of hours spent in programming focused on criminogenic needs. The standard for hours spent in this type of programming is:


- 90 minutes of cognitive behavioral intervention curriculum (two 45 sessions) per week
- 100 minutes of skills group per week
- 50 minutes of individual counseling per week
- 50 minutes of family counseling per month

The actual number of hours differs, based on the needs of each youth but in total, youth are expected to complete approximately 100 hours during the in-custody phase and 50 hours while under community supervision in the aftercare phase.

Youth in CVA also participate in activities and programming which do not count toward their intervention hours, but build prosocial skills, physical fitness, public speaking, meeting facilitation, and independent living skills.

Figure 15 demonstrates how the use of group homes/short term residential therapeutic programs (STRTPs) as a placement option has decreased since CVA was launched in March 2017. Between July 2014 and June 2017 (three years), 51 youth were enrolled in group homes. In the years since CVA opened, group homes/STRTPs have been used sparingly.

**Figure 22. Enrollment in CVA and Group Homes/STRTP, FY2015-16 – FY2024-25**



**Coastal Valley Academy Outcomes**

A total of 80 unique youth have exited the program since inception. Of those, 57.5% completed successfully, 41.3% exited unsuccessfully and one youth (1.3%) was determined not to be a good fit for the program, representing a neutral exit.


In addition to participating in treatment and programs mentioned above, CVA participants attend an on-site school administered by the County Office of Education. Among the 80 youth who have exited the program since it began in March 2017, 65 youth could reasonably be expected to have graduated high school during the program. Of these, 51 (78.5%) received their high school diploma.

As mentioned above, the CVA program is designed to reduce the risk of future delinquent behavior. Risk of delinquent behavior is measured at the start and end of program participation utilizing a validated risk-need assessment tool, the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI). YLS/CMI scores were available for 55 youth who exited the program.

- Overall, 42 youth or 76.4% of youth showed some reduction in risk score from pre- to post-assessment on the YLS.
- During FY2024-25, average risk reduction was 18.3 points on a 42-point scale, an improvement of 43.6%.

Recidivism for the CVA program is measured from the date the youth exit the in-custody portion of the program to the end of their probation term to better capture the impact of the program. Of the 64 unique youth who have exited the program and ended their probation term, 47 youth or 73.4% did not have a new juvenile court adjudication or adult conviction. Seventeen youth or 26.6% had a new juvenile court adjudication or adult conviction.

**Figure 23. Recidivism outcomes for CVA Participants, March 2017 to June 2025**



### Secure Youth Treatment

As noted on page one of this report, Juvenile Detention and Commitment is responsible for the staffing and operation Juvenile Hall, Coastal Valley Academy and the Secure Youth Treatment Facility (SYTF) program. The Secure Youth Treatment program provides long-term treatment and housing for the population of youth with serious and violent felony offenses committed at fourteen (14) years of age or older who would have been previously eligible to be committed to the state Division of Juvenile Justice prior to the enactment of SB 823 in 2021.

During this fiscal year, one youth was committed to the Secure Youth Treatment program, bringing the total youth in the program to four (4). One youth was released during the fiscal year and transferred to Pine Grove Youth Conservation Fire Camp, where they will continue serving their term of confinement in a less restrictive program. Three youth remained in the program at the end of the fiscal year.

Youth committed to the County's SYTF program receive an intense level of treatment and services coordinated through an Individual Rehabilitation Plan (IRP) which includes but is not limited to services such as individual and family counseling, substance use disorder treatment, cognitive behavioral interventions, high school and post-secondary education, employment readiness and independent living skills programming.

## ADULT SERVICES

The Probation Department’s Adult Services Division is organized to provide a continuum of services for adults at all stages of the criminal justice system, from pretrial and court services to formal and post-release community supervision, re-entry services, and specialized enforcement services. In the sections below, information and data are presented about Court Services, the Pretrial Services Program and Community Supervision Services offered by the Probation Department.

### Court Services

Court Services are state mandated. Officers prepare written reports for the San Luis Obispo Superior Court by conducting investigations into an individual’s background, education and employment history, prior probation/arrest history, impact on victims, and other relevant information. Officers assess risk of re-offense and needs related to criminal behavior using validated assessment tools (including the Level of Service/Case Management Inventory, the Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment, and the Static 99 to inform their recommendations.

Reports contain recommendations for or against release on probation and sentencing options which conform to statutory and case law requirements. These reports include the terms and conditions of probation (if eligible) to promote accountability, community safety, and rehabilitation for the defendant. Through the court process, Probation works to ensure victims’ rights and establishes victim restitution.

During FY2024-2025, court services staff wrote 1286 reports related to 1041 individuals. This represents a 12.8% decrease from the previous fiscal year. Table 7 shows the type of reports produced during the past several fiscal years.

**Table 7. Investigation reports by type and fiscal year, FY2021-22 to FY2024-25**

Report Type	FY2021-22	FY2022-23	FY2023-24	FY2024-25
Diversion	11	9	10	13
Post-Sentencing Report	54	73	78	39
Pre-Plea Report	50	77	104	84
Sentencing	573	687	794	684
Sentencing-Domestic Violence	204	203	204	218
Restitution Report	203	184	225	197
Supplemental Report	23	31	59	51
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1118</b>	<b>1264</b>	<b>1474</b>	<b>1286</b>

## Pretrial Services Program


### Pretrial Services Program in FY2024-2025

- 472 individuals were referred for assessment
- 223 clients were placed on monitoring during the fiscal year
- As of June 2025, client average age was 38.8 years
- 78% were male, 22% were female
- 57% were White
- 35% were Hispanic
- 5% were African American
- 4% were other or unknown

The Pretrial Services Program supports judicial officers in making release and detention decisions, utilizing the Public Safety Assessment, a validated assessment tool. The Court refers recently arrested individuals to probation officers in the Pretrial Services Program, who complete the assessment, gather information on the individual, and prepare a report regarding suitability to release with monitoring conditions. Individuals released are monitored to ensure public safety and increase the likelihood of appearances at future court hearings. Monitoring activities include referrals to supportive services, electronic or phone check-ins, office meetings, community-based contacts, global positioning system electronic monitoring, and remote alcohol monitoring.

In FY2024-2025, 472 individuals were referred for assessment and possible release (Figure 24). This was down slightly from 497 referred individuals in the previous fiscal year.


**Figure 24. Individuals referred by Quarter, FY2022-23- FY2024-25**




It should be noted that this program became fully operational in April of 2022. During the first full fiscal year of the program (FY22-23), a total of 128 individuals were ordered to pretrial monitoring. During

the second full fiscal year, 176 individuals were ordered to pretrial monitoring and in the most recent fiscal year 223 individuals were ordered to monitoring (Figure 25). From program inception to fourth quarter of FY2024-25, the number of active pretrial clients at a given time increased steadily (Figure 26).

**Figure 25. Number of New Monitoring Clients by Quarter, FY2022-23- FY2024-25**




**Figure 26. Individuals on Pretrial Monitoring, Last Day of Each Quarter, FY2022-23- FY2024-25**



### Pretrial Monitoring Outcomes


The following outcomes are measured at the close of the pretrial monitoring period (either due to sentencing or due to revocation). In FY2024-25, 167 individuals closed their pretrial monitoring status for any reason (Figure 27).

**Figure 27. Number of Individuals Who Closed Pretrial Monitoring, FY2023-24 - FY2024-25**




Among the pretrial monitoring cases that closed during the year, 94.6% closed with no new convictions and 76.0% closed with no new charges. Of the 167 closures, 75.4% closed without being issued a warrant for failure to appear in court (Figures 28 and 29).

**Figure 28. Recidivism Rate among Pretrial Clients, FY2023-24 - FY2024-25**




**Figure 29. Failure to Appear Rate among Pretrial Clients, FY2023-24 - FY2024-25**



## MENTAL HEALTH DIVERSION COURT

The Probation Department participates in the Mental Health Diversion Court. This program diverts eligible individuals with mental health disorders from the criminal justice system. The Mental Health Diversion Court is a problem-solving court, providing ongoing judicial supervision in conjunction with treatment, case management and community supervision. As of June 2025, there were 30 clients active in the program (Figure 30).

**Figure 30. Number of Program Participants, Last Day of Each Quarter, FY2022-23- FY2024-25**



## Community Supervision Services

### Who Probation Supervised in FY2024-25

- 1218 formal probationers and 249 post-release individuals were supervised on June 30, 2025
- 75.1% were on probation for a felony offense, 24.9% were on for a misdemeanor
- Average age was 37.7 years
- 78.7% were male, 21.3 % were female (sex at birth)
- 55.9% were White
- 36.0% were Hispanic
- 3.3% were African American
- 1.7% were Asian/Pacific Islander
- 0.2% were Native American
- 2.9% were of other or unknown race/ethnicity

Probation officers provide community supervision, reentry and case management services to individuals who were convicted of a crime (Formal Probation), returning from state prison (Post Release Community Supervision), or released from the County Jail following a local prison commitment (Mandatory supervision).

### General Supervision

General supervision includes enforcing court orders, office contacts, community-based contacts, drug and alcohol testing, and Global Positioning System electronic monitoring. Officers use validated assessment tools, case plans, and treatment interventions to address offender needs, especially those likely to contribute to future criminal behavior. Officers collaborate with County agencies and community-based organizations to support reentry and rehabilitation needs by connecting individuals to mental health and substance use disorder services, sober living residences and/or residential treatment programs, housing support, and employment and job placement services.

### Specialized Caseloads

In addition to general supervision strategies described above, some officers receive additional training and resources to serve specialized caseloads. These include the following:

- Adult treatment courts<sup>2</sup>
- Family violence caseloads
- Unhoused caseload
- Drug sales caseload
- Gang caseload
- Sex-offense caseload
- Treatment Mandated Felony caseload (Proposition 36)

### Post-Release Caseloads


The post-release populations originated pursuant to Public Safety Realignment (Assembly Bill 109) in October 2011. These populations include offenders with non-violent, non-serious, or non-registered sex offenses who have been released from state prison onto Post-Release Community Supervision (PRCS)

---

<sup>2</sup> See page 31 for more detail

and those placed on Mandatory Supervision following a prison sentence served at the local jail. Both PRCS and Mandatory Supervision individuals are supervised by the PRCS Unit within the Adult Services Division and are collectively referred to as post-release individuals in this report. Figure 31 shows the proportion of clients in each of the various supervision areas.


**Figure 31. Clients by caseload type, June 2025**




Over the past three years, the number of formal adult probationers increased by 26.5% and the number of post-release individuals increased by 13.2%. In total, the number of individuals on probation has increased 24% over the last three years (Figure 32).

During FY2024-25, the Adult Division received a total of 579 new grants of formal probation and 179 new grants of post-release supervision (figure 33). From FY2022-23 to FY2024-25, new formal grants increased 11.6% new post-release grants increased 34.6% and total new probation grants increased 16.3%.

**Figure 32. Probation Population, Last Day of Each Quarter, FY2022-23- FY2024-25**




**Figure 33. Number of New Probation Grants by Quarter, FY2022-23- FY2024-25**



Probationers were 78.7% males and 21.3% female (sex assigned at birth). The average age at supervision start was 37.7 for those on supervision as of June 30, 2025. Average age has increased slightly over the past several years.


As of June 2025, 69.9% of probationers were residing in stable housing, 20.1% were unhoused or unstably housed, and 12.6% were residing in residence types which don't provide a clear picture of housing stability—like sober living homes, residential treatment, recreational vehicles (figure 34). To address unhoused individuals under supervision, the department has two dedicated caseloads focusing on the unique needs of this population. Both of the officers assigned to these caseloads utilize the Mobile Probation Services Center which provides remote reporting and access to probation supervision and services while reducing responsiveness issues for the unhoused individuals being served.

**Figure 34. Probationers by housing status, June 2025**



Effective supervision practices include the use of a validated risk-need assessment tool. Adult probationers are assessed with the Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI), to determine the probationer's likelihood to commit any new offense and to identify issues that could be addressed through treatment and supervision. Probationers are grouped according to their risk level, typically based on their LS/CMI score (High, Medium, Low) but sometimes based on a supervisor-approved override of their score to ensure they are being supervised appropriately (Figure 35). In the graph below, 89.0% of probationers were categorized according to their assessed risk level and 11.0% based on supervisor override.


**Figure 35. Probationers by Risk Level, June 2025**



Note: Invalid risk level is when assessment information is over a year old. Assessments are not updated while probationers are in custody or on a limited supervision caseload. No score is when the probationer's risk level has not been assessed. Excluding those who do not have a valid risk score, formal probationers were 22.9% high, 34.5% medium, and 42.6% low risk to reoffend.

Figure 36 reflects the breakdown of probationers by type of crime committed as of June 30, 2025.

**Figure 36. Probationers by Crime Type, June 2025**



## ADULT TREATMENT COURT PROGRAMS

Adults on Formal Probation may be eligible to participate in one of several collaborative treatment court programs. Probation partners with the Court, attorneys, and treatment providers to deliver services in these programs. Treatment courts are an effective method of reducing recidivism; programs utilize judicial monitoring, community-based treatment, and supervision in lieu of incarceration. In addition to the Mental Health Diversion Court program, Probation works with clients in the following programs:


- Adult Drug Court
- Veterans Treatment Court
- Behavioral Health Treatment Court
- Adult Treatment Court Collaborative

As of June 30, 2025, there were a total of 61 probationers in these programs. Their demographic information and outcomes are included above and below.

### Community Supervision Outcomes


The following outcomes are measured at the close of probation supervision. In FY2024-25, 636 formal and 171 post-release probationers closed their grant(s) of probation for any reason; combined, 807 (figure 37).

**Figure 37. Number of Individuals Who Closed Probation, FY2020-21 - FY2024-25**



Among the probation cases that closed during the year, 25.6% of formal probationers and 32.2% of post-release probationers were convicted of at least one new law violation, i.e. recidivated, while on probation. Combined, 27.0% of probationers who closed had recidivated (figure 38 and table 8).

**Figure 38. Recidivism Rate among Probationers, FY2020-21 - FY2024-25**




**Table 8. Recidivism among Probationers by Risk Level, FY2024-25**

Risk Level	# Closed	# Recidivated	% Recidivated
High	150	70	46.7%
Med	164	53	32.3%
Low	201	25	12.4%
Invalid Assessment	244	59	24.2%
No Score	48	11	22.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>807</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>27.0%</b>

Among the formal probationers who closed probation in FY2024-25, 52.5% completed their grant of probation, 21.9% transferred out, 2.4% were deceased and 23.2% were revoked (figure 39). Revocations to local and state prison include both revocations for violations of probation and those due to new convictions.

**Figure 39. Closing Status among Probationers, FY2024-25**



## Appendix A: Glossary of terms as used in this report

### Juvenile Services

**Probation Diversion:** Pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code 654, eligible youth can agree to be placed on informal probation in lieu of the filing of a 602 Petition (criminal charge) with the juvenile justice court.

**Youth:** A person referred to the Probation Department for an alleged criminal offense that occurred when the person was under the age of 18.

**Youth under supervision:** Includes youth on both court-ordered and non-court ordered types of probation.

**Youth under court-ordered supervision:** Includes youth for whom a petition has been filed with the juvenile court and results in a term of probation.

**Juvenile referral:** A matter brought to the attention of the Probation Department alleging a Youth engaged in unlawful behavior under Welfare and Institutions Code Section 601 and/or 602.

**Petition:** A formal declaration to the juvenile court of information surrounding the alleged offense by a youth and requesting the court adjudicate the matter.

**Probation violation:** When a Youth under court-ordered supervision violates a condition of his/her probation but does not commit a new offense.

### Adult Services

**Adult Probationer:** An adult offender who has been convicted of a felony or a misdemeanor offense and been granted formal probation, suspending the imposition of a sentence.

**Post-Release Individual:** A non-violent, non-serious, or non-high risk sex crimes offender who has been released from state prison onto Post-Release Community Supervision (PRCS) or who has been placed on Mandatory Supervision following a prison sentence served at the local jail.

**Revocation (of probation):** When a probationer/post-release offender violates his/her conditions of probation/community supervision, the grant of probation may be revoked or terminated, and the sentence imposed.