

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

312 SOUTH HILL STREET, THIRD FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90013 (213) 974-6100 http://oig.lacounty.gov HILDA L. SOLIS

MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS

SHEILA KUEHL

IANICE HAHN

KATHRYN BARGER

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

RODRIGO A. CASTRO-SILVA INTERIM INSPECTOR GENERAL

March 8, 2019 Report Summary

• The Office of Inspector General (OIG) found that the Probation Department's (Department) data-collection methods may negatively impact the accuracy of its use-of-force and youth-on-staff assaults data and impede the assessment of data trends that could inform use-of-force practices. Department personnel were transparent and accommodating throughout the OIG's review, and they informed many of the recommendations included in the report.

Methodology

• The OIG reviewed force-related data provided by the Department, including data on youth-on-staff assaults. The OIG, in consultation with the Department, also examined the Department's data-collection and assessment processes. Its review was, in part, informed by its previous assessment of 21 force-incidents that took place in 2017 and 2018.

Select Recommendations and Findings

- The Department should continue to improve its information technology systems to improve accuracy and reliability of its use-of-force and violence data, and to allow the Department to track trends over time.
 - The Department's data-collection methodologies make it difficult both for staff to input relevant and accurate data, and for management to make use of the data for trends analysis. The Department's force-related data is entirely derived from its Physical Intervention Reports (PIRs), which are created by staff who participate in or witness a qualifying use of physical or chemical force. Staff cannot currently automatically extract this data. Instead, staff must manually enter information contained in the reports into spreadsheets.
 - PIRs do not capture certain information that, if available, would enable the Department to more completely and effectively track force trends.
- The Department should continue to update its force-related policies to include clear definitions for assaultive behavior and to specify reporting guidelines.
 - O Department staff use their own judgment and discretion in determining whether a youth-on-staff assault took place and whether it merits reporting.
- The Department should continue to implement its plan to increase transparency, which includes input from and on-going communication with community members, families of justice-involved youth, and other stakeholders.

Use-of-force Data Provided by the Department

The 2017 and 2018 data (Figure 1) provided by the Department suggests the use of OC spray and physical force increased in its juvenile halls over the course of two years. Department data also reflects a decrease in both types of force at camps. Some of the trends may be affected by data-collection and review issues.

Facility	Physical Force		Chemical Force		Average Daily Population	
	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018
Juvenile Halls	1,114	1,265	519	558	687	615
Central	517	592	267	232	239	212
Los Padrinos	293	397	78	165	230	205
Barry J. Nidorf	304	276	174	161	218	198
Juvenile Camps	944	815	257	104	455	353
McNair [†]	61	37	54	29	46	40
Onizuka [†]	49	31	74	40	36	27
HOPE Center [†]	39	22	8	5	6	6
Afflerbaugh	32	32	N/A	N/A	40	35
Paige	23	49	N/A	N/A	35	33
Scott	60	86	N/A	N/A	27	26
Dorothy Kirby	278	256	N/A	N/A	53	49
Rockey	94	83	N/A	N/A	39	42
Scudder (Closed 3/2017)	4	_	N/A	N/A	9	_
Kilpatrick (Opened 7/2017)	28	101	N/A	N/A	19	30
Smith [†] (Closed 9/2017)	13	_	4	_	20	_
Gonzales (Closed 2/2018)	26	0	N/A	N/A	41	6
Jarvis† (Closed 6/2018)	144	42	84	12	44	28
Mendenhall/Scobee [†] (Closed 11/2018)	93	76	33	18	40	31
Annual Totals	2,058	2,080	776	662	1,142	968

Figure 1: Number of use-of-force incidents per facility, by type of force, 2017-2018.

[†]Juvenile camps where the use of OC spray is authorized.