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Major Themes in Juvenile Justice Reform

- Risk and Needs Assessment
- Evidence Based Practices
  - Interventions
  - Probation Practices
- Desistance Research
A goal within reach: Bend the age-crime curve

Age-Crime Curve of Self-Reported Delinquency Before and After Simulated Intervention on High-Risk Participants (Loeber, Farrington, Howell, Hoeve, 2012)
Developmental Pathways to Serious and Violent Behavior

**Authority Conflict Pathway**
- **Before age 12**
- **Early**
- **Many**
- **Stubborn Behavior**
- **Defiance/Disobedience**
- **Authority Conflict Pathway**
- **Before age 12**

**Overt Pathway**
- **Before age 15**
- **Late**
- **Few**
- **Minor Aggression**
- **Physical Fighting**
- **Violence**
- **Serious Delinquency**
- **Moderately Serious Delinquency**
- **Property Damage**
- **Minor Covert Behavior**
- **Covert Pathway**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Problem Behavior</th>
<th>Moderately Serious Problem Behavior</th>
<th>Serious Problem Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age: 7.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First Court Contact for an Index Offense
Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders

Problem Behavior > Noncriminal Misbehavior > Delinquency > Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offending

Prevention
Target Population: At-Risk Youth

- Programs for All Youth
- Programs for Youth at Greatest Risk
- Immediate Intervention

Preventing youth from becoming delinquent by focusing prevention programs on at-risk youth

Intervention & Graduated Sanctions
Target Population: Delinquent Youth

- Intermediate Sanctions
- Community Confinement
- Training Schools
- Aftercare

Improving the juvenile justice system response to delinquent offenders within a continuum of treatment options and system of graduated sanctions

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

![Bar chart showing comparison between probation and placement rates](image)

- Probation: 0.63
- Placement: 1.20

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rate</th>
<th>probation</th>
<th>placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project: Application in Florida
Matching Services...
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

• Comprehensive Strategy
• Evaluation [*Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)*]
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 anecdotal outliers...
Research Basis

• Key features of *juvenile offender careers*
• We understand how offender careers develop
• Early intervention is a top priority for maximum system effectiveness
• 5 Principles of Effective Intervention
• Structured Decision Making Tools
Serious, Violent, Chronic Youth

**SERIOUS** = 55%
**VIOLENT** = 29%
**CHRONIC** = 15%

SVC = 8.9%

NOT SVC = 44%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</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>84,586</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008-09</td>
<td>80,540</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
<td>72,713</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
<td>65,858</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>59,920</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>363,617</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>F Statistic</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVC</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not S, V, or C</td>
<td>75.22</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY=fiscal year; SVC= Serious, Violent, and Chronic; Not S, V, or C are youth that do not meet any of the three categories; For ANOVA, F-statistic reported with p-value in parenthesis.
Broward County SVC Rates Compared to State Average

<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>Broward</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>14.5%*</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Average</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=Highest SVC rate of any county in Florida
### 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

*Note: Data from the FY 09-10 sample.*
A Larger Percentage of Very Young Offenders Have SVC Careers

First Offense 13 or Over

- Serious: 45%
- Violent: 22%
- SVC: 4%
- Chronic: 8%

245,726 “Aged-out” Juvenile Offenders

First Offense 12 or Under

- Serious: 66%
- Violent: 42%
- SVC: 21%
- Chronic: 32%

51,928 “Aged-out” Juvenile Offenders

Florida DJJ Data: 297,654 Juvenile Offenders Who Have Turned 18
THE COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY

The First JJSIP Component
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
What is a Comprehensive Strategy?

• A *continuum* of services from universal prevention through residential and aftercare
• Ensures the appropriate *allocation of resources* to each level of services along the continuum
• Ensures the matching of youth to the level of services based on *assessed* risk and needs (C-PACT, R-PACT, Prevention Assessment Tool)
• Promotes prevention: Targets *at-risk youth*; prevents youth from becoming delinquent by focusing prevention programs on at-risk youth
• Incorporates Interventions and Graduated Sanctions: Target *delinquent youth*; Improve the juvenile justice system’s response to delinquent offenders within a continuum of treatment and service options and a system of graduated sanctions
## Comprehensive Strategy

**Source:** Howell (2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>Graduated Sanctions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Population: At-Risk Youth</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target Population: Delinquent Youth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for All Youth &gt; Programs for Youth at Greatest Risk &gt; Immediate Intervention</td>
<td>Intermediate Sanctions &gt; Community Confinement &gt; Training Schools &gt; Aftercare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Prevention

Preventing youth from becoming delinquent by focusing prevention programs on at-risk youth

### Graduated Sanctions

Improving the juvenile justice system response to delinquent offenders through a system of graduated sanctions and a continuum of treatment alternatives

---

Problem Behavior > Noncriminal Misbehavior > Delinquency > Serious, Violent, and Chronic Offending

---

- **Immediate Intervention**
- **Intermediate Sanctions**
- **Community Confinement**
- **Training Schools**
- **Aftercare**
A Graduated Sanctions Model

Diversion

Teen Court

Probation

Intensive PS

Day Treatment

Redirection

C/R Day Treatment

Intensive PS

Redirection

Probation

Residential Placement

Increasing Sanctions

Decreasing Sanctions
The Comprehensive Strategy

- Research-Based
- Data Driven
- Service Matching
- Outcome-Focused Framework
Two-Tiered Approach

• Prevent youth from becoming delinquent:
  • Focusing prevention programs on at-risk youth
• Improve the response to offenders through a system of graduated sanctions

Both goals can be accomplished with a “seamless” continuum of prevention, early intervention, and treatment options linked with graduated 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>
Risk Principle

1. Treating high-risk youth gives the greatest reduction in re-offending behavior.
3. Matching levels of treatment services—intensity and duration—to the risk level of the offender.
4. Utilize intensive community-based treatment for lower-risk, high-needs youth.
## Targeting High-Risk Offenders
(Andrews & Bonta, 2003)

### Risk Level and Treatment Recidivism Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Level of Treatment</th>
<th></th>
<th></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>Low</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</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>Baird et al. (1979)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews &amp; Kiessling (1980)</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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></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.
Matched Low Risk Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism Pre-matching</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>10.6%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-matching</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>9.8%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 28,681 Low risk probation youth
- 1,726 Residential youth
- Matched on:
  - Age at 1st arrest
  - Current drug/alcohol use
  - Expulsion/drop out
  - Violent felony
  - Felony
  - Antisocial peers/gang association
  - County
  - Race/ethnicity
  - Gender
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)
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
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).
Responsivity Factors

The more you help youths drive down criminogenic needs, the better are their chances of quitting crime.

Extrinsic [Least under youth’s control]

Intrinsic [Most under youth’s control]

Responsivity: Factors within individuals or the environment that do not predict re-offending, but constitute ‘roadblocks’ to treatment.

Source: Justice System Assessment & Training http://www.j-sat.com
Protective Factors:

Factors that decrease the effects of risk factors and increase the likelihood of desistance.

Prochaska & DiClemente (1986)
EBP Mantra

• The right service
• For the right kid
• At the right time
• In the right dosage
The Second JJSIP Component

STANDARDIZED PROGRAM EVALUATION PROTOCOL (SPEP)
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
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
Why Therapeutic Program Types?

Control approaches
- Discipline
- Deterrence
- Surveillance

Therapeutic approaches
- Restorative
- Skill building
- Counseling
- Multiple services
Further Sorting by Intervention Type within, e.g., Counseling Approaches

- Individual
- Mentoring
- Family
- Family crisis
- Group
- Peer
- Mixed
- Mixed w/referrals

% Recidivism Reduction from .50 Baseline
Further Sorting by Intervention Type within, e.g., Skill-building Approaches

- Behavioral
- Cognitive-behavioral
- Social skills
- Challenge
- Academic
- Job related

% Recidivism Reduction from .50 Baseline

0 5 10 15 20 25 30
Meta-Analysis: Dosage

• **Group 5 Service (Score=30)**
  • **Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy**
    • Target Weeks=15; Target Hours=45
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)

• **Group 4 Service (Score=25)**
  • **Group Counseling**
    • Target Weeks=24; Target Hours=40
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  • **Mentoring**
    • Target Weeks=26; Target Hours=78
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: Behavioral Contracting/Management
  • **Behavioral Contracting; Contingency Management**
    • Target Weeks=24; Target Hours=72
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: Mentoring, Mixed Counseling (individual, group, family, and/or vocational), Remedial Academic Program
Dosage (cont.)

• **Group 3 Service (Score=15)**
  • **Family Counseling**
    • Target Weeks=20; Target Hours=30
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  • **Family Crisis Counseling**
    • Target Weeks=4; Target Hours=8
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  • **Mixed Counseling**
    • Target Weeks=25; Target Hours=25
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: Behavioral Contracting/Management
  • **Social Skills Training**
    • Target Weeks=16; Target Hours=24
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  • **Challenge Programs**
    • Target Weeks=4; Target Hours=60
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: Group Counseling
  • **Mediation**
    • Target Weeks=4; Target Hours=8
    • Qualifying Supplemental Services: Restitution/Community Service
Dosage (cont. 2)

• **Group 2 Service (Score=10)**
  - **Restitution; Community Service**
    - Target Weeks=12; Target Hours=60
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  - **Remedial Academic Program**
    - Target Weeks=26; Target Hours=100
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: Job-Related Services (work experience, job preparation, and/or job training)

• **Group 1 Service (Score=5)**
  - **Individual Counseling**
    - Target Weeks=25; Target Hours=30
    - Qualifying Supplemental Services: None (automatic 5 points added to score)
  - **Job-Related Training**
    - Vocational Counseling
      - Target Weeks=20; Target Hours=40
      - Qualifying Supplemental Services: Remedial Academic Services
    - Job Training
      - Target Weeks 25; Target Hours=400
      - Qualifying Supplemental Services: Remedial Academic Services
    - Work Experience
      - Target Weeks=26; Target Hours=520
      - Qualifying Supplemental Services: Remedial Academic Services
Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice

STRUCTURED DECISION MAKING
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 must always begin with the least restrictive setting within a particular disposition category. See SDM guidelines)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Serious Presenting Offense</th>
<th>PACT Risk Level to Re-Offend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-Risk to Re-offend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st TIME MISDEMEANOR&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Level 2 or 3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Level 2 or 3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Level 2 or 3a-b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 - First time misdemeanor offenders with no history of arrest or participation in alternatives to arrest. Under Section 985.12, Florida Statutes, all first time misdemeanants are eligible for civil citation. Youth deemed ineligible for civil citation (based on community standards) should be reviewed under the "Misdemeanor" category based on their PACT Risk Level to Reoffend.

2 - All misdemeanor offenses.

3 - Felony offenses that do not include violence.

4 - Violent felony offenses (does not include misdemeanor assault/battery, which is captured under "minor").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 - Alternatives to Arrest</th>
<th>Level 2 - Diversion &amp; Non-DJJ Probation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 - Community Supervision</td>
<td>Level 4 - Non Secure Residential Commitment (Low &amp; Moderate-Risk Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3a) - Probation supervision</td>
<td>Level 5 - Secure Residential Commitment (High &amp; Maximum-Risk Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3b) - Probation enhancement services (ART, LifeSkills, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3c) - Day Treatment, MST, FFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions about the data should be directed to Mark Greenwald by e-mail at mark.greenwald@dj.state.fl.us.
For more information visit http://www.dj.state.fl.us/
Questions about the data should be directed to Mark Greenwald by e-mail at mark.greenwald@dj.state.fl.us.
For more information visit http://www.dj.state.fl.us/
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.

### All Youth 12 Month Recidivism by Matrix Adherence Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix Adherence Level</th>
<th>Recidivism Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Guidelines</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimum Placement</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Placement</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Guidelines</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Addressing Racial & Ethnic Disparities (RED)

- 10-17 Population: 21%
- Arrests: 48%
- Diversion: 39%
- Probation: 50%
- Secure Detention: 56%
- Commitment: 57%
- Transfers to Adult: 59%
Addressing Racial & Ethnic Disparities (RED)

- 10-17 Population: Statewide 21%, Broward 35%
- Arrests: Statewide 48%, Broward 70%
- Diversion: Statewide 39%, Broward 58%
- Probation: Statewide 50%, Broward 76%
- Secure Detention: Statewide 56%, Broward 79%
- Commitment: Statewide 57%, Broward 76%
- Transfers to Adult: Statewide 59%, Broward 82%

Legend: Statewide, Broward
Remember.... 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 anecdotal outliers...
Delinquency Profile 2012 – 2013

Offenses - Arrests Received Statewide

Hover here for info

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Felonies</th>
<th>Misdemeanors</th>
<th>Other Offenses</th>
<th>Total Offenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>41,108</td>
<td>67,817</td>
<td>27,386</td>
<td>130,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>35,801</td>
<td>59,349</td>
<td>24,798</td>
<td>119,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>31,801</td>
<td>53,547</td>
<td>22,969</td>
<td>108,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>20,350</td>
<td>45,280</td>
<td>20,565</td>
<td>95,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>25,484</td>
<td>39,372</td>
<td>17,638</td>
<td>83,494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Change
-12% -10% -12% -12%

This report was compiled using data from the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS). For more information visit [http://www.dj.state.fl.us](http://www.dj.state.fl.us)
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
## County Service Mapping

### Continuum of Services - At a Glance

**County:** Broward  
**Last Updated:** 7/31/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Services &amp; Structures Categories</th>
<th>Available Program/Services</th>
<th>All Ages</th>
<th>Male/Female</th>
<th>Youth at Greatest Risk</th>
<th>Alternatives to Arrest</th>
<th>Diversions</th>
<th>Probation Supervision</th>
<th>Non-Secure Residential</th>
<th>Secure Residential</th>
<th>Aftercare Services</th>
<th>Capacity /Slots</th>
<th>Waiting List? Y/N</th>
<th>Average Wait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skill Building/Structured Activities</strong></td>
<td>Forelife</td>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remedial Academic Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun Ed</td>
<td>16-21</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mavericks</td>
<td>16-21</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiddon Rodgers</td>
<td>16-21</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderhill H.S, University North, Dolphin Park</td>
<td>16-21</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restorative Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Behavioral</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Counseling/Mentoring/Behavioral Contracting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td>12-18 YOA</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arise</td>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men 2 Boys</td>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Human Services</td>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Counseling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting Place</td>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Mental Health</td>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysalis Center</td>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camflot Community</td>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Home Society</td>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Family Services</td>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>Male/Female</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
Next Steps

• Monitoring implementation of Disposition Matrix

• On-going mapping Continuum of Services and gap analysis

• Bringing It All Together
January-October 2014 there were 85 low risk to re-offend youth committed statewide. This is a 78% decrease from the same time period in 2011.
There were 154 moderate risk to re-offend youth committed statewide from January-October 2014. This is a 68% reduction from 2011.
In 2008-09 Low + Moderate risk to re-offend youth constituted 27% of all commitments. In 2013-14 Low + Moderate made up 16%.

Mod-High + High risk to re-offend youth went from 73% of all commitments in 2008-09 to 84% in 2013-14.
Non-secure:
Low+ Moderate risk youth
- 2008-09 = 27%
- 2013-14 = 16%
Mod-high + High
- 2008-09 = 73%
- 2013-14 = 84%

Secure:
Low+ Moderate risk youth
- 2008-09 = 15%
- 2013-14 = 16%
Mod-high + High
- 2008-09 = 85%
- 2013-14 = 84%
Snapshot of youth in residential program types on June 30, 2014 by PACT risk to re-offend.
Low + moderate risk breakdown: Behavioral=17%; DD=6%; SA=15%; Other spec.=8%; Sex Offender=45%
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