The Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project (JJSIP): An Overview of Delinquency, JJSIP, the Comprehensive Strategy, and Florida’s Disposition Matrix
Discussion Topics

- Delinquency Trends (National, Florida & Local)
- Overview of JJSIP
- The Disposition Matrix
- Continuum of Services Mapping
- Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)
Delinquency Arrests:
National, Florida and Circuit 4 Trends
National Arrest Trends

Delinquency Arrests (Statewide)

Source: FY 2015-16 Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests (Circuit 4)

Source: FY 2015-16 Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests - Clay

Source: FY 2015-16 Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests - Duval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Delinquency Arrests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>4,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>3,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>3,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014-15</td>
<td>3,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015-16</td>
<td>3,212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FY 2015-16 Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests - Nassau

Source: FY 2015-16 Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Residential Commitment And Transfer to Adult Court Trends
Residential Commitments (Statewide)

Source: FY 2015-16 Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Residential Commitments (Circuit 4)

Source: FY 2015-16 Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
FY 2015-16 Commitment Rates

Source: FY 2015-16 Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Racial and Ethnic Disparities: (RED)
Arrests by Race (National)

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity (Statewide)

Source: FY 2015-16 Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Arrests by Race/Ethnicity (Circuit 4)

Source: FY 2015-16 Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Percentage of Cases Involving Black Youth at Various Stages of Florida’s Juvenile Justice System

Statewide

- 10-17 Population: 21%
- Arrests: 50%
- Diversion: 38%
- Probation: 51%
- Secure Detention: 60%
- Commitment: 62%
- Transfers to Adult: 63%

Source: FY 2014-15 Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Percentage of Cases Involving Black Youth: Statewide & Circuit 4 Comparison

Source: FY 2014-15 Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
The Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project (JJSIP): Application in Florida
Matching Services...
Making Informed Decisions

- Quality Research
- “Consensus” in the Research
- Process, Output & Outcome Evaluation
- Valid Assessment Tools
Understanding Tiers of Evidence

- The lowest form is anecdotal evidence; stories, opinions, testimonials, case studies, etc.

- The highest form is empirical evidence; research, data, results from controlled studies, etc.

- We do not want to norm an entire system on anecdotes or unusual outliers…

Dr. Ed Latessa, University of Cincinnati, School of Criminal Justice. "Criminogenic Risk and Mental Health: What Works and What Doesn’t in Reducing Recidivism".
Overview of JJSIP

- Grant sponsored by Georgetown University: Center for Juvenile Justice Reform

- 4 sites chosen out of over 150 applications:
  - Florida
    - Initial pilot site: Pinellas County
  - Arizona
  - Pennsylvania
  - Connecticut
JJSIP Components

- A Comprehensive Strategy
- Structured Decision Making
- Evaluation
  - Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)
The Comprehensive Strategy
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

- Diversion
- Teen Court
- Probation
- Intensive PS
- Day Treatment
- Redirection
- Residential Placement
- C/R Day Treatment
- Intensive PS
- Probation

Increasing Sanctions

Decreasing Sanctions
## 5 Principles of Effective Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk:</td>
<td>Target high-risk offenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need:</td>
<td>Treat risk factors associated with offending behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment:</td>
<td>Employ evidence-based and research-proven treatment approaches and interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsivity:</td>
<td>Tailor treatments to meet special needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity:</td>
<td>Monitor implementation quality and treatment fidelity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
Lipsey’s 2009 Meta-analysis

“Interventions applied to high-risk delinquents…produced larger recidivism reductions than when those interventions were applied to low-risk delinquents” (p.23)

“There was no indication that there were juveniles whose risk level was so high that they did not respond to effective interventions” (p.23)

Importance of Matching Youth to the Appropriate Level of Supervision
Need Principle: Why Dynamic Priority Domains?

- Research shows a 38% reduction in recidivism when case plans contained interventions matched to assessed criminogenic needs for high risk youth. (Luong, D., & Wormith, J.S. (2011).

- The absence of interventions to address a domain that was ranked medium risk or higher was associated with an 82% increase in likelihood of recidivism. (Luong, D., & Wormith, J.S. (2011).
## 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>Level of Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Donnell et al. (1971)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird et al. (1979)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonta et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, Direction, Residential, and PCP. Day Treatment, Direction, Residential, and PCP recidivism rates are statistically equivalent.
Recidivism Rate for Low Risk Youth by "Needs" Level by Placement Type

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.
Bench / Direct Commitments: Implications for Public Safety Outcomes
Bench Commitments
FY 2011-12 to FY 2015-16 (Statewide)

Source: Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Bench Commitments
FY 2011-12 to FY 2015-16 (Circuit 4)

Source: Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Statistical Matching Techniques: Propensity Score Matching

See Also: Guo, S. and M. W. Fraser (2015). Propensity score analysis: statistical methods and applications. Los Angeles, SAGE.
Recidivism and Direct Commitment

Recidivism Rates Pre- and Post-Matching

- Full Sample Probation Supervision: 17.4%
- All Direct Commitments: 40.8%
- Matched Probation Supervision: 32.0%
- Matched Direct Commitments: 40.7%

Source: Briefing Report: Direct Commitments. 2014. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Recidivism and Direct Commitment

- Direct commitments were 2.25 times more likely to involve youth who were:
  - Low-Risk
  - Male
  - Black

- Recidivism rates for direct committed youth were 8% higher than the recidivism rates of statistically identical youth placed on probation.

Source: Briefing Report: Direct Commitments. 2014. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
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

Serious = 55%

Violent = 29%

Chronic = 15%

SVC = 8.9%

NOT SVC = 43%

## Serious, Violent & Chronic Youth

### Serious, Violent and Chronic by Fiscal 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 2007-08</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>9.2% (N=7,747)</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008-09</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>9.0% (N=7,253)</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>8.9% (N=6,464)</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>8.7% (N=5,701)</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>8.7% (N=5,203)</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>8.6% (N=4,651)</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>9.2% (N=4,441)</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Mark A. Greenwald, and Michael T. Baglivio (2015). *Analysis of Serious, Violent and Chronic Delinquency in Florida.* Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Bureau of Research and Planning
### SVC Youth (Statewide & Circuit 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Circuit 4</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Average</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Youth</td>
<td>Not S, V, or C</td>
<td>Not SVC</td>
<td>SVC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism Rates</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Association</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td></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
Key Implications

- Most youth enter the system with minor offenses and low recidivism risk. Few are on pathways to serious, violent, or chronic offending.

- Risk assessment instruments (PACT) measure risk accurately enough to guide the allocation of resources.

- Needs assessment (PACT Full) identify criminogenic needs well enough to guide selection of appropriate services.

- To be effective, evidence-based services should address priority criminogenic needs.

- Matching of youth to appropriate levels of service targeted to prioritized needs is critical.
Structured Decision Making:

Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice
Disposition Recommendation Matrix

- Is a structured decision making tool that assists with matching youth to the appropriate level of service/supervision.

- Is based on a matrix of risk to reoffend (PACT) and the presenting offense.

- Consists of graduated sanctions – The intensity of services increases as the risk level and offense severity increases.
Key Points of the Disposition Matrix

- Low-risk offenders remain in the community with minimal supervision
- Moderate-risk offenders typically placed in more structured community programs, with intensive probation supervision for higher risk youth
- Residential placement reserved for the highest risk offenders after community-based alternatives have been exhausted
## Florida Department of Juvenile Justice Disposition Recommendation Matrix

(Staff should begin with the least restrictive setting within a particular disposition category. See Structured Decision-Making guidelines.)

<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. 985.12. 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*
On-Going Disposition Outcomes Analysis

Placements by Circuit February 2016 - January 2017

Source: Monthly Dispositional Matrix Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Disposition Matrix Validation

38,117 youth released in FY10-11.

Below \((n=691)\)
Optimum \((n=27,916)\)
Appropriate \((n=7,322)\)
Above \((n=2,188)\)

Holds true for males, females, across race/ethnicity, and for all risk levels of youth.

Again... Tiers of Evidence

- The lowest form is anecdotal evidence; stories, opinions, testimonials, case studies, etc.
- The highest form is empirical evidence; research, data, results from controlled studies, etc.
- We do not want to norm an entire system on anecdotes or unusual outliers...
Intermission
Continuum of Service Mapping

Paul Hatcher
Assistant Secretary for Probation & Community Intervention
Florida Department of Juvenile Justice
Continuum Mapping

- Identify the available services within each county
- Map the identified available services according to service category within each county
- Identify the target population for each categorized service according to levels of the Disposition Recommendation Matrix

Source: 2015 Service Continuum Analysis (Updated January 4, 2016). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Interactive Reports

http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/reports/research-reports/service-continuum-analysis

Source: 2015 Service Continuum Analysis (Updated January 4, 2016). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
County & Program Level Reports

Source: 2015 Service Continuum Analysis (Updated January 3, 2016). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Circuit 4 Community Service Mapping: Example Results (2016)...

Clay County

Resources in sufficient supply:
- Inter-agency partnerships
- Court, law enforcement, and agency cooperation

Greatest needs identified from survey:
- Skills training
- Job placement
- Transportation

Greatest additional needs:
- Providers for mental health, substance-abuse, family counseling

Populations with specific needs:
- Sex offenders

Transportation issues:
- Available options are minimal for families needing transportation to court, counseling, treatment, Juvenile Assessment Center, etc.

“Once sex-offending youth are court-ordered to stay away from other juveniles, they are often restricted from attending school.”

Duval County

Resources in sufficient supply:
- Cognitive-behavioral interventions
- Community planning/circuit board membership
- Community donations

Greatest needs identified from survey:
- Reporting center for detention-eligible youth
- Transportation
- Sex-offender day-treatment program

Greatest additional needs:
- Transitional housing for post-commitment youth

Populations with specific needs:
- Sex offenders

Transportation issues:
- Available options are minimal for families needing transportation to court, counseling, treatment, Juvenile Assessment Center, etc.
Circuit 4 Community Service Mapping: Example Results (2016)...

Nassau County

(Circuit 4)

Resources in sufficient supply:
- Inter-agency cooperation (courts, law-enforcement, non-profits)

Greatest needs identified from survey:
- Additional providers
- Transportation
- Independent living program

Greatest additional needs:
- Housing options for transient youth

Populations with specific needs:
- Sex offenders
- Youth transitioning out of commitment

Transportation issues:
- Available options are minimal for families needing transportation to court, counseling, treatment, Juvenile Assessment Center, etc.

Source: 2016 Service Continuum Analysis (Updated January 3, 2017). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
On-Going Monitoring Quality & Availability

- Solutions for transportation issues
- Community services come and go…
- Waiting Lists
- Routine updates will be necessary
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)

Laura Moneyham
Assistant Secretary for Residential Services
Florida Department of Juvenile Justice
EBP Mantra

- The right service
- For the right kid
- At the right time
- In the correct dosage
### Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)

#### Provider's Total SPEP Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider's Total SPEP Score</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Risk Levels of Youth Served

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level of Youth Served</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>For the purpose of calculating score for risk level of youth served.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Quality of Service Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Service Delivery</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Tailored service delivery is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Service delivery is provided, but could be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Service delivery is inconsistent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Site of Service Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site of Service Delivery</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Site A is designated for the target group of service recipients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Site B is designated for the target group of service recipients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Primary and Supplemental Services Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary and Supplemental Services Type</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Service Type</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Primary service type is designated for the target group of service recipients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Services Type</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Supplemental services type is designated for the target group of service recipients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Additional Information

- Source: Dr. Mark Lipsey, Peabody Research Institute, Vanderbilt University
Evidence-Based Practices

- Approaches to determine if a program is “evidence-based”
  - Evaluate existing program
  - Model/Brand name program
  - Meta-analysis/synthesis of research on effective programs
What is the SPEP?

- Evaluation tool
- Identifies shortcomings in programs or services
- Determines the strength of programs and services in relation to existing research
- Determines where programs or services fall in terms of effectiveness

Source: Dr. Mark Lipsey, Peabody Research Institute, Vanderbilt University
SPEP Categories

- **Service Type**: “Therapeutic” programs, with some types more effective than others

- **Service Quality**: Treatment protocol; monitoring and staff training

- **Service Quantity/Dosage**: Duration, intensity, and total number of contact hours

- **Juvenile Characteristics**: Risk to re-offend level of youth served
Changes to Residential

Laura Moneyham
Assistant Secretary for Residential Services
Florida Department of Juvenile Justice
Operational Capacity for Residential Services at Onset of Fiscal Year

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Residential Services
84% of current commitments involve moderate-high or high risk youth.

72%
Next Steps

- Monitoring implementation of Disposition Matrix
- On-going mapping Continuum of Services
- Case Studies Follow-Up
• Closing Thoughts
Discussion & Feedback

Please visit the Department’s Website for more information:
www.djj.state.fl.us