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Discussion Topics

• Tracking, Understanding & Reporting Delinquency
• Racial & Ethnic Disparities in Juvenile Justice
• What Drives Delinquent Behavior?
• A Comprehensive Strategy for Juvenile Justice
• Serious, Violent & Chronic Juvenile Offenders
• Understanding the Risk Principle and Matching Youth to Appropriate Interventions
The Florida Department of Juvenile Justice:

Quick Facts
FDJJ 101: Quick Facts

• Established in 1994.

• Largest “centralized” Juvenile Justice system in the U.S.

• JJIS is the most comprehensive juvenile justice information system in the U.S.

• FDJJ has 5 primary service areas:
  • Executive Direction
  • Prevention
  • Detention
  • Probation
  • Residential
FDJJ Operating Budget

FY 2010-11 Appropriations as of 7/1/2010: $603,131,161

- $241,930,144 (40%)
- $143,781,202 (24%)
- $130,553,915 (22%)
- $59,840,991 (10%)
- $27,024,909 (4%)

FY 2015-16 Appropriations as of 7/1/2015: $593,452,107

- $203,637,647 (34%)
- $143,781,202 (24%)
- $136,785,893 (25%)
- $96,444,886 (15%)
- $126,949,448 (20%)
- $29,634,233 (5%)

Source: Florida Department of juvenile Justice, Bureau of Budget. Detention and Residential figures include fixed capital outlay for facility repair.
Delinquency Arrests: National Trends
National Juvenile Arrest Trends

Between 1960 and 2015, juvenile court delinquency caseloads more than doubled (118%)
National Juvenile Arrest Trends by Type

Delinquency caseloads for all offense groups were at their lowest level in 2015

Delinquency Arrests:
Florida Trends
Total Delinquency Arrests (All Florida)

-24% reduction in delinquency arrests since FY 2013-14

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2017-18) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Felony Delinquency Arrests (All Florida)

-10% reduction in juvenile felony arrests since FY 2013-14

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2017-18) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Misdemeanor Delinquency Arrests (All Florida)

-38% reduction in juvenile misdemeanor arrests since FY 2013-14

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2017-18) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
“Other” Delinquency Arrests (All Florida)

-22% reduction in "other" juvenile arrests since FY 2013-14

Source: PRELIMINARY (FY 2017-18) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Understanding Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Juvenile Arrests and Case Processing
Arrests by Race (National)

The number of delinquency cases decreased substantially for all race groups between 2005 and 2015.

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity (Statewide)

Source: (FY 2016-17) Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
FY 2017-18 Percentage of Cases Involving Black Youth at Various Stages of Florida’s Juvenile Justice System (Statewide preliminary)

Source: PRELIMINARY analysis of FY 2017-18 data. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research & Data Integrity. Official statistics will be available in October, 2018.
Common Risk Factors Predict Delinquency (The Big Eight)

1. Antisocial Attitudes
2. Antisocial Peers
3. Antisocial Personality Patterns (impulsivity, low self-control, risk taking)
4. History of Antisocial Behavior
5. Problems at School/Work
6. Problematic Family Circumstances
7. Problematic Leisure Activities/use of free time
8. Substance Abuse
The Positive Achievement Change Tool (PACT)
# The PACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Screen</th>
<th>Full Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Criminal History</td>
<td>• Criminal History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social History</td>
<td>• Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mental Health</td>
<td>• School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attitudes and Behaviors</td>
<td>• Use of Free Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Family History &amp; Living Arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Substance Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attitudes and Behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIG 8</strong></td>
<td><strong>PACT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Social attitudes &amp; beliefs</td>
<td>Domains 10, 11, 12 Attitudes/Behaviors, Aggression, Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social peers (and isolation from pro-social peers)</td>
<td>Domain 6 Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of anti-social behavior</td>
<td>Domain 1 Record of Referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-social personality pattern</td>
<td>Domains 10, 11, 12 Attitudes/Behaviors, Aggression, Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic circumstances at home (family/marital)</td>
<td>Domain 7 Family/Living Arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic circumstances at school or work</td>
<td>Domain 3 &amp; 5 School &amp; Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic leisure circumstances</td>
<td>Domain 4 Use of Free Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>Domain 8 Alcohol &amp; Drugs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sample from Instrument

### DOMAIN 4: Attitude/Behavior Indicators

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Attitude toward responsible law abiding behavior:** | • Abides by conventions/values  
• Believes conventions/values sometimes apply to him or her  
• Does not believe conventions/values apply to him or her  
• Resents or is hostile toward responsible behavior |   |
| **2. Accepts responsibility for anti-social behavior:** | • Accepts responsibility for anti-social behavior  
• Minimizes, denies, justifies, excuses, or blames others  
• Accepts anti-social behavior as okay  
• Proud of anti-social behavior |   |
| **3. Belief in yelling and verbal aggression to resolve a disagreement or conflict:** | • Believes verbal aggression is rarely appropriate  
• Believes verbal aggression is sometimes appropriate  
• Believes verbal aggression is often appropriate |   |
| **4. Belief in fighting and physical aggression to resolve a disagreement or conflict:** | • Believes physical aggression is never appropriate  
• Believes physical aggression is rarely appropriate  
• Believes physical aggression is sometimes appropriate  
• Believes physical aggression is often appropriate |   |
# Example PACT Overview Report

## PACT 1.1 - Overview Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name:</th>
<th>Sharon</th>
<th>Last Name:</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>DJJID:</th>
<th>532950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOB:</td>
<td>9/1/2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created By:</td>
<td>Laurie Workman</td>
<td>Last Modified By:</td>
<td>Laurie Workman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created Date:</td>
<td>Mar 2 2017 2:52PM</td>
<td>Last Modified Date:</td>
<td>Mar 2 2017 2:52PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall Level of Risk to Re-Offend: High
- Record of Referrals Risk Score: 21
- Social History Risk Score: 6

### Risk Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factors</th>
<th>Static and Dynamic Combined</th>
<th>Protective Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</td>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>0% 25% 50% 75% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Attitudes/Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Record of Referrals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A: History of Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B: Current Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A: Family History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A: Mental Health History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A: Alcohol and Drug History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B: Current Alcohol and Drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A: School History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B: Current School Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A: Historic Use of Free Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B: Current Use of Free Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A: Employment History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B: Current Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B: Current Living Arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B: Current Mental Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Comprehensive Strategy
Matching Services...
Why a Comprehensive Strategy?

- Unbalanced emphasis on “deep end” graduated sanctions v. prevention and early intervention
- Overreliance on detention and residential placement
- Poor targeting of SVC youth
- Poor matching of youth to appropriate services and levels of supervision
- Use of ineffective programs
- Poor program planning
A Graduated Sanctions Model

Increasing Sanctions:
- Diversion
- Teen Court
- Probation
- Intensive PS
- Day Treatment
- Redirection
- Residential Placement

Decreasing Sanctions:
- Probation
- Intensive PS
- Redirection
- C/R Day Treatment
- Residential Placement
• Understanding the Risk Principle and Matching Youth to Appropriate Interventions
Prevalence of Serious, Violent & Chronic Juvenile Offenders
Serious, Violent & Chronic Youth

- What is the definition of a serious, violent and chronic offender?
  - **Serious** = (1) or more felony offenses
  - **Violent** = (1) or more “violent” felony offenses
  - **Chronic** = (4) or more separate arrest events

Serious, Violent, Chronic Youth (FY 2016-17)

- **SERIOUS** = 53%
- **VIOLENT** = 24%
- **CHRONIC** = 17%
- **SVC** = 10.3%

**NOT** S, V, or C = 46%

## Changes in Progression to SVC Status

### Serious, Violent & Chronic Juvenile Offenders by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Chronic</th>
<th>SVC</th>
<th>Not S, V, or C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
<td>46.70%</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
<td>16.80%</td>
<td>10.0% (n=5259)</td>
<td>51.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
<td>45.80%</td>
<td>22.10%</td>
<td>16.90%</td>
<td>9.9% (n=4785)</td>
<td>52.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>44.90%</td>
<td>20.90%</td>
<td>16.20%</td>
<td>9.3% (n=4051)</td>
<td>53.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>45.30%</td>
<td>19.50%</td>
<td>16.20%</td>
<td>9.0% (n=3509)</td>
<td>53.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>45.90%</td>
<td>19.80%</td>
<td>16.30%</td>
<td>8.9% (n=3059)</td>
<td>52.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014-15</td>
<td>47.30%</td>
<td>20.90%</td>
<td>16.20%</td>
<td>9.3% (n=2861)</td>
<td>51.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015-16</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>22.40%</td>
<td>17.30%</td>
<td>10.1% (n=2769)</td>
<td>48.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016-17</td>
<td>53.10%</td>
<td>24.30%</td>
<td>17.10%</td>
<td>10.3% (n=2532)</td>
<td>45.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average**  
47.40%  
21.60%  
16.60%  
9.60%  
51.20%

## SVC Youth: Why does it Matter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Youth</th>
<th>Not S, V, or C</th>
<th>Not SVC</th>
<th>SVC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recidivism Rates</strong></td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gang Association</strong></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 50% of SVC youth were 12 or under at age of first referral

*Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity*
Importance of Matching Youth to the Appropriate Level of Supervision
## Targeting High-Risk Offenders

### Risk Level and Treatment Recidivism Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Level of Treatment</th>
<th>Dispersion</th>
<th>Intensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O’Donnell et al. (1971)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird et al. (1979)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonta et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recidivism Rate for all Low Risk to Re-offend Youth by Placement Type

Note: Data from 2012 Comprehensive Accountability Report (CAR) final files
Recidivism rate for IDDS significantly lower than all other placement types for the low risk sample. Diversion and IDDS significantly lower than Probation Supervision. Probation Supervision, CBIS, Probation Enhancement rates statistically equivalent. Probation, CBIS, and Probation Enhancement rates significantly lower than Day Treatment, Redirection, Residential, and PCP. Day Treatment, Redirection, Residential, and PCP recidivism rates are statistically equivalent.

Source: Michael T. Baglivio (2013). The Risk Principle. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Note: Data from 2012 Comprehensive Accountability Report (CAR) final files
"High Needs" defined as youth greater than 1 standard deviation above the mean on the Social History Score subcomponent of the PACT. Statistically significant differences found in the recidivism rates for low risk "high needs" youth versus youth not identified as such for the following Placement Types: Diversion, IDDS, Probation Supervision, with low risk "high needs" youth having significantly higher recidivism rates. Differences in recidivism rates for Probation Enhancement, Day Treatment, Redirection, Residential, and Post Commitment Probation were not significant.
Evidence Based Programs: Our Mantra

- The right service
- For the right kid
- At the right time
- In the correct dosage
The Dispositional Matrix

- Identifies the right dosage for each youth

- Two separate validation studies strongly support its use to protect public safety
The Dispositional Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Serious Presenting Offense</th>
<th>PACT Risk Level to Reoffend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Risk to Reoffend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Citation Eligible¹</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor²</td>
<td>Level 2 or 3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious³</td>
<td>Level 2 or 3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent⁴</td>
<td>Level 2 or 3a-b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Eligibility for civil citation is outlined in F.S. 885.12. Youth deemed ineligible for civil citation (based on community standards) should be reviewed under the "Minor" offense category based on the PACT risk level to reoffend.
² All misdemeanor offenses.
³ Felony offenses that do not include violence.
⁴ Violent felony offenses (do not include misdemeanor assault and battery which are captured under "Minor").

Level 1 – Alternatives to Arrest
Level 2 – Diversion & Non-DJJ Probation
Level 3 – Community Supervision
(3a) – Probation Supervision
(3b) – Probation Enhancement Services (ART, EPICS, LifeSkills, etc.)
(3c) – Day Treatment, MST, FFT, Minimum Risk Commitment
Level 4 – Non-Secure Residential Commitment
Level 5 – Secure Residential Commitment (High & Maximum Risk Programs)

Updated January 2016
2014 Validation Study Results

All Youth 12 Month Recidivism by Matrix Adherence Level

- Below Guidelines: 53.5%
- Optimum Placement: 18.9%
- Appropriate Placement: 21.3%
- Above Guidelines: 34.0%

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
2017 Validation Study Results

All Youth 12-Month Recidivism by Matrix Adherence Level

- Below: 28%
- Appropriate: 20%
- Optimum: 15%
- Above: 39%

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
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