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

- Risk and Needs Assessment /Service Matching

- Evidence Based Practices
  - Interventions
  - Probation Practices
  - Family Engagement

- Desistance Research
A goal within reach: Bend the age-crime curve
Developmental Pathways to Serious and Violent Behavior

AGE OF ONSET:
- LATE

% BOYS/GIRLS:
- FEW

OVERT PATHWAY

EARLY

VIOLENCE
- (attack, strong-arm, homicide)

SERIOUS DELINQUENCY
- (auto theft, burglary)

MODERATELY SERIOUS DELINQUENCY
- (fraud, pick-pocketing)

PROPERTY DAMAGE
- (vandalism, fire-setting)

MINOR COVERT BEHAVIOR
- (shoplifting, frequent lying)

COVERT PATHWAY

(before age 15)

MANY

MINOR AGGRESSION
- (bullying, annoying others)

AUTHORITY AVOIDANCE
- (truancy, run away, staying out late)

Defiance/Disobedience

Stubborn Behavior

AUTHORITY CONFLICT PATHWAY

(before age 12)

EARLY

© R. Loeber:
Child delinquents: Onset of delinquency and first felony court contact (Pittsburgh Youth Study)

- Minor Problem Behavior: Age 7.0
- Moderately Serious Problem Behavior: Age 9.5
- Serious Problem Behavior: Age 11.9

First Court Contact for an Index Offense: Age 14.5
Pathways to Desistance Study
Co-Directors: Edward P. Mulvey & Carol A. Schubert

Probation vs. placement
Unadjusted comparison of re-arrest rate

Mean Yearly Rate of Re-Arrest, by Placement Status

Source: OJJDP Coordinating Council presentation, 2012
Pathways to Desistance Study
(Continued)

Treatment effect of placement
*Matched groups*

Mean Yearly Rate of Re-Arrest, by Placement Status after Matching

- **Probation**: 1.06
- **Placement**: 1.20

No significant differences between groups in rate of re-arrest

Source: OJJDP Coordinating Council presentation, 2012
Pathways to Desistance Study (Continued)

Dose-response curve
3 month intervals as doses

Expected Rate of Re-Arrest, by 3 mo. Dose Category

Source: OJJDP Coordinating Council presentation, 2012
Pathways to Desistance Study
(Continued)

Findings

- Overall, *no effect* of placement on rate of re-arrest (if anything, it may increase re-arrest)

- For intermediate lengths of stay (i.e., 3-13 months), there appears to be *little or no marginal benefit* for longer lengths of stay

Source: OJJDP Coordinating Council presentation, 2012
Key Statewide Delinquency Intervention Strategies

- Forestall progression to serious, violent, and chronic (SVC) offender careers

- Adequately assess risk/needs and match interventions

- Promote desistance
Key Policy Reforms

- Building the continuum and effectiveness of community interventions
- Incorporating adolescent brain research and trauma research
- Reducing reliance on residential placements for rehabilitative interventions
The Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project (JJSIP):
An Overview of Delinquency, JJSIP, the Comprehensive Strategy, and Florida’s Disposition Matrix

Mark A. Greenwald
Director of Research and Data Integrity
Florida Department of Juvenile Justice
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: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests (Circuit 4)

FY 2010-11: 5,768
FY 2011-12: 5,357
FY 2012-13: 4,563
FY 2013-14: 4,189
FY 2014-15: 4,217

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests - Clay

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests - Duval

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Delinquency Arrests - Nassau

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Transfer to Adult Court and Residential Commitment Trends
(Statewide) Transfers to Adult Court

Source: Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
(Circuit 4) Transfers to Adult Court

Source: Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
FY 2014-15 Transfer to Adult Rates

Source: Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Statewide Residential Commitments

Source: Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Circuit 4 Residential Commitments

Source: Delinquency Profile. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
FY 2014-15 Commitment Rates

Source: 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 (Florida)

Source: Delinquency Profile Dashboard Report. 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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Statewide</th>
<th>Circuit 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-17 Population</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure Detention</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers to Adult</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

- Residential Placement
  - Redirection
    - Day Treatment
      - Intensive PS
        - Probation
          - Teen Court
            - Diversion
    - C/R Day Treatment
      - Redirection
        - Intensive PS
          - Probation
## 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Donnell et al. (1971)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird et al. (1979)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonta et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.51</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.

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.

Source: Michael T. Baglivio (2013). The Risk Principle. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Bench / Direct Commitments: Implications for Public Safety Outcomes
Direct Commitments
FY 2006 to FY 2015

Statewide Youth (2015)

Hover over map for Direct Commitment data by County. Click for Print view. Click map again to return.

**PACT Risk Level 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Commitments</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>% Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate-High</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select a Year to Filter Dashboard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Commitments</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>% Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>9,018</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8,208</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7,856</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6,985</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5,973</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,731</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,862</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,540</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3,279</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
(Statewide) Direct Commitments
CY 2006 to CY 2015

Source: Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
(Circuit 4) Direct Commitments
CY 2006 to CY 2015

26% Direct Commitments in CY 2006

57% Direct Commitments in CY 2015

Source: Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
# Committed Youth and PACT Risk Levels (CY 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Moderate-High</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statewide</strong></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>1681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circuit 4</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of statewide total</strong></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Commitment

Probation

STUDY COHORT

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

- Direct commitments were 2.25 times more likely to involve youth who were:
  - Low-Risk to Reoffend
  - 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
Statewide Assessment of Recidivism and Direct Commitments

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
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

<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><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.2%</strong></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>
</tbody>
</table>

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>Recidivism Rates</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Association</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
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 January 2015 - December 2015

Source: Monthly Dispositional Matrix Dashboard Report. Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
On-Going Disposition Analyses – by Type

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…

Dr. Ed Latessa, University of Cincinnati, School of Criminal Justice. "Criminogenic Risk and Mental Health: What Works and What Doesn’t in Reducing Recidivism".
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/service-continuum-analysis-2015

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 4, 2016). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Clay County

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

Top Needs Identified
- Skills training/job placement
- Transportation
- Additional providers for mental health, substance abuse, family counseling, and sex-offender treatment.

Additional Needs
- Sex-offender Day Treatment.

Populations with specific needs
- Sex-offenders. Once the youth are court ordered to stay away from other juveniles, they are often restricted from attending school.

Transportation-related comments
- The bus service is only available within Orange Park itself

Duval County

Resources in sufficient supply
- Cognitive-behavioral interventions
- Community planning and circuit board
- Community donations

Top Needs Identified
- Reporting Center for unsupervised youth
- Skills training/job placement
- In-home family counseling

Additional Needs
- Transitional living for young adults and homeless youth
- More independent living beds
- Sex-offender Day Treatment program

Populations with specific needs
- Sex-offenders
- Some youth in secure detention could be released if an evening reporting center were available.

Transportation-related comments
- Families without transportation have a hard time accessing parenting classes and counseling services

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

**Nassau County**

*(Circuit 4)*

**Resources in sufficient supply**
- Cooperation between agencies, the Court, law enforcement, and local non-profits.

**Top Needs Identified**
- More providers
- Transportation
- Independent living for youth

**Additional Needs**
- Sex offender day treatment
- Sex-offender counseling
- Substance abuse services
- Mental health services

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

**Transportation-related comments**
- Many services available to Nassau County are located in Duval County. A local non-profit to provide transportation in Nassau and Duval County would be helpful.

"Youth who transition out of commitment often have been abandoned by their families, especially if they are 17 or older. These youth, who have no options, often return to the street and commit crimes."

Source: 2015 Service Continuum Analysis (Updated January 4, 2016). 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
## SERVICE DOCUMENTATION TEMPLATE

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

### Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP) for Services to Juvenile Offenders

**Recalibrated version, 2012**

![SPEP Template](image)

- **Primary and Supplemental Service Types**
  - Primary Service Type for Program Being Rated
    - Group 1 services (9 points)
    - Group 2 services (10 points)
    - Group 3 services (15 points)
    - Group 4 services (20 points)
  - Supplemental Service Type
    - Optional supplemental service used. Yes (15 points) / No (0 points)

- **Quality of Service Delivery**
  - Rated quality of services delivered:
    - Low (5 points)
    - Medium (10 points)
    - High (15 points)

- **Amount of Service**
  - Duration [Target number of weeks specified for each service type]
    - % of youth who received at least the target weeks of service:
      - 0% (0 points)
      - 20% (2 points)
      - 40% (4 points)
    - Contact Hours [Target number of hours specified for each service type]
      - % of youth who received at least the target hours of service:
        - 0% (0 points)
        - 20% (2 points)
        - 40% (4 points)

- **Risk Level of Youth Served**
  - % of youth with at least the target risk score for the JJ system:
    - 0% (0 points)
    - 20% (2 points)
    - 40% (4 points)

- **Provider’s Total SPEP Score**
  - 100 (Insert Score)
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 Evaluation 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

Residential Commitment Beds

Fiscal Year

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Residential Services
PACT Risk to Reoffend for Youth Disposed to Commitment by Percentage of Youth Committed (FY 2010-11 through 2014-15)\(^1\)

84% of current commitments involve moderate-high or high risk youth.

72% of current commitments involve moderate-high or high risk youth.

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity.
January-December 2015 there were 146 low risk to re-offend youth committed statewide. This represents a 70% decrease from the same time period during 2011.

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Residential Services
There were 215 moderate risk to re-offend youth committed statewide from January – December 2015. This represents a 62% reduction from 2011.

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Residential Services
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