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Dramatic Progress But More Work Needed

**National Arrests Per 100,000 Juveniles Ages 10-17 (1980-2011)**

Impact On Recidivism
-51%
Decrease From Peak

**Declines in State Commitment Rates (1997-2011)**

-79%
-68%
-77%
-78%
-72%
-48%

*Easy Access to the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*  
*Juvenile Arrest Rates for All Crimes, 1980-2011, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*
Policymakers want to know the outcomes for youth in contact with the juvenile justice system.

- When youth are under local or state supervision, what are their rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration rates?
- How do youth under system supervision fare in terms of academic, employment, and other important outcomes?
- Do youth transition successfully off of system supervision to a crime-free and productive adulthood?
- What if any supervision and service programs and practices are making a positive difference?
The Case of Texas: Dramatic Decline in Youth Committed to State Incarceration

Total Texas Admissions to State Facilities (FY 2002 – FY 2012)

- **2007 Legislature**: No commitment for misdemeanor offenses; $60 million in new community funding
- **2009 Legislature**: $45 million for Commitment Reduction Program with incentive funding for counties and community supervision
- **2011 Legislature**: Merge former TX Youth Commission and TX Juvenile Probation Commission into Texas Juvenile Justice Department (TJJD)
Reforms Shifted Funding from Incarceration to Community-Based Interventions

2004-2005 Biennial Budget

- Institutions: $260.7 Million (64%)
- Community: $472.1 Million (36%)

Average Daily Population in State Correctional Facilities:
- 4,910

2014-2015 Biennial Budget

- Institutions: $327.2 Million (53%)
- Community: $289.9 Million (47%)

Average Daily Population in State Correctional Facilities:
- 1,066
High statewide recidivism rates raise a key question: What is the impact of reforms on recidivism and other youth outcomes?

Re-Arrest Rate

- One-Year Rate (2011 Group): 36%
- Three-Year Rate (2010 Group): 67%
- Five-Year Rate (2008 Group): 79%

Re-Arrest Rate of Probationers

Re-Arrest Rate For Youth Released From State Facilities
Survey of State Juvenile Correctional Agencies

Purpose: To assess the status of data collection on outcomes for youth in the juvenile justice system, recognizing that in order to improve recidivism rates and other key youth outcomes, jurisdictions must first be able to measure these outcomes.

Who was Surveyed: State Juvenile Correctional Administrators

Focus of Survey Questions: The collection, analysis, reporting and use of recidivism and other performance measures for youth in the juvenile justice system.

Methodology: CJCA administered the survey online to its members from August to September of 2013.

Response: All 50 states and the District of Columbia responded to the survey.

Survey conducted in partnership with:

[Logos of the participating organizations]
Key Recommendations

Measure recidivism for all youth involved with the juvenile justice system, considering the multiple ways they may have subsequent contact with the justice system.

Analyze recidivism data to account for youth’s risk levels, as well as other key youth characteristics and variables.

Develop and maintain the infrastructure necessary to collect, analyze, and report recidivism data.

Make recidivism data available to key constituents and the general public.

Use recidivism data to inform juvenile justice policy, practice, and resource allocation.
Most states track recidivism for youth in their custody, but one in five don’t. Of the 39 states that do, a number of them measure recidivism narrowly.
Measure recidivism for youth involved with the juvenile justice system, considering the multiple ways they may have subsequent contact with the justice system.

**Recommendations**

- Track the distinct ways in which youth can have subsequent contact with the justice system:
  - Rearrest
  - Readjudication/reconviction
  - Recommitment/reincarceration
  - Technical violations/revocations
  - New offenses processed by the adult criminal justice system
  - New offenses that occur after a youth is no longer under system supervision

In Pennsylvania, the Juvenile Court Judges’ Commission collaborated with the Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers and researchers at Temple University to develop a shared set of juvenile justice outcome measures and establish a common recidivism benchmark across Pennsylvania’s 67 counties.
Most states conduct some analysis of their recidivism data but are limited in their ability to answer key questions about the effectiveness of their systems.

How many states track recidivism rates?
- Yes: 39
- No: 11

Of the 39 states, how many track recidivism according to risk?
- By Risk: 21

Of the 39 states, how many analyze recidivism in other key ways?
- By offense: 23
- By locale: 23
- By risk: 20
- By needs: 13
- By length of stay: 12
- By program: 11
Analyze recidivism data to account for youth’s risk levels, as well as other key youth characteristics and variables

Recommendations

- Require recidivism data to account for youth’s assessed risk levels
  - Recidivism rates can and should differ substantially depending upon the risk level of the population of youth served.
  - Requires assessing the risk levels of all youth under supervision effectively using a validated assessment tool, and for this information must be maintained in an electronic record system.

- Analyze recidivism data according to other key youth characteristics and variables
  - Youth demographic groups
  - Placement type, facility, service provider, and length of stay
  - Youth’s service needs and programs

The Utah Division of Juvenile Justice Services partnered with researchers at the University of Utah to evaluate the quality of service providers and to analyze whether providers produce better or worse recidivism rates than expected based on the risk level of the youth they serve.
Almost half of states described their capacity to collect and report recidivism and other performance data as “Average,” “Below Average,” or “Weak”

Key Findings

States' Ratings of Their Capacity to Collect and Report Juvenile Justice Recidivism Data and Other Key Performance Measures

- Very Strong: 16%
- Strong: 30%
- Average: 28%
- Below Average: 14%
- Weak: 12%

Recommendations

Develop and maintain the infrastructure necessary to collect, analyze, and report recidivism data.

- Establish a system-wide electronic case management system
- Develop interagency information-sharing agreements
- Establish policies and procedures to guide data entry and use.

The Oregon Youth Authority (OYA) developed the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) and provides funding and technical support for its continued use by 36 county juvenile justice agencies. The JJIS tracks youth from referral to a juvenile court through secure confinement and reentry and is used by OYA to report on youth outcomes to the state legislature.
The majority of states share recidivism data with at least some key constituents, but significant gaps exist in many states’ reporting practices.

How many states track recidivism rates?

- Yes
- No

Of the 39 states, how many report recidivism to key constituents?

- Public: 29
- The judiciary: 25
- Other state youth-service agencies: 22
- State Advisory Groups: 16
Recommendations

- Require regular reporting of recidivism data
  - At least annual reports that share recidivism trends for youth under system supervision.
  - Formally report these data to all branches of government, court personnel, State Advisory Groups, service providers, other key system stakeholders, and the public.

- Establish methods for sharing data effectively
  - Develop a user-friendly way to report recidivism data that helps decision makers to focus on and understand a limited, priority set of key indicators of system effectiveness, and use data to guide policy and practice.

The Florida Department of Juvenile Justice publishes all of its juvenile justice data—from prevention through reentry—on a public website that allows users to conduct guided analysis of the data to answer their own key questions. They also share user-friendly reports on priority outcome measures with all branches of government.
Most states use recidivism and other performance measures to some degree to inform policy and resource-allocation decisions, but the majority are not harnessing the full potential of this information.

All States' Use of Juvenile Recidivism Data and Other Performance Measures to Guide Policy, Practice, and Resource-Allocation

- Primary: 26%
- Some: 58%
- Little: 10%
- Not at all: 6%

39 States that Collect Recidivism Data Use it for Specific Purposes

- System Monitoring: 83%
- Evaluate Progress: 78%
- State Oversight: 58%
- Facility Evaluation: 56%
- Program Evaluation: 49%
- Reform Evaluation: 48%
- Population Comparison: 40%
- Jurisdiction Comparison: 34%
- Cost-Benefit Analysis: 28%
Use recidivism data to inform juvenile justice policy, practice, and resource allocation

Recommendations

- Establish formal processes for reviewing recidivism data.
  - Legislative processes to evaluate whether performance is improving overall, and impact of specific reform initiatives.
  - Create a performance-based culture where all staff knows the current outcomes for the youth under their supervision.

- Set improvement targets
  - Identify baseline recidivism rates and set annual targets for improvement that are ambitious but achievable.

- Use recidivism data to promote accountability and the efficient use of resources
  - Tie overall agency funding as well as for specific programs and reforms to demonstrated recidivism reductions.
  - Hold agency staff accountable for results and use data to guide staff and agency policy/practice improvements.

The Washington State Institute for Public Policy evaluated and showed the positive impact of evidence-based programs on recidivism and cost savings. As a result, the state legislature invested $48 million to expand evidence-based programs, which was estimated to save approximately $250 million that the state would otherwise have spent on prison construction and operation.
The core principles offer juvenile justice systems a road map for what to do, and how to do, it to improve outcomes for youth. The issue brief offers guidance on how to evaluate the impact of these efforts.

Core Principles for Reducing Recidivism and Improving Other Outcomes for Youth in the Juvenile Justice System
White Paper and Issue Brief in Action

Piloting white paper checklists to help state systems assess and strengthen policies and practices to improve outcomes for youth.

Piloting issue brief recommendations to help state systems track recidivism and use this data to guide system decisions and hold agencies accountable.
The mission of the Division of Youth Services is focused on community protection, accountability, beliefs that foster responsible community living and competency development.
The Indiana Department of Correction (IDOC) defines recidivism as a return to incarceration within three years of the offender’s date of release from a state correctional institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 Juvenile Releases</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recidivists</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivists to Juvenile</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivists to Adult</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reporting Recidivism Data

www.in.gov/idoc/dys/
## Outcomes and Reform Measures Tied to Recidivism Data: Length of Stay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
<th>Number Released</th>
<th>Number of Recidivist</th>
<th>Recidivism Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 3 Months</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 - 6 Months</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 6 - 9 Months</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 9 - 12 Months</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 - 2 Years</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 2 - 3 Years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3 - 4 Years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 4 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,196</strong></td>
<td><strong>365</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Length of Stay**: 262.6 Days
Outcomes and Reform Measures Tied to Recidivism Data: Length of Stay

• Reduced/adjusted lengths of stay based on youth needs and risk levels
• Built relationships with juvenile courts/judges to ensure they had accurate information regarding cases and length of stay
• Created a Projected Program Completion Date (PPCD)
  – Targeted goals for release dates that can be impacted positively and negatively by progress
  – Helped to keep youth focused on goals and improved behavior, which impacted length of stay
• In the three-year period that followed these reforms, the percentage of youth who were reincarcerated fell from 39 percent to 30.5 percent.
Outcomes and Reform Measures Tied to Recidivism Data: Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Recidivism rate within 1 year</th>
<th>Recidivism rate within 2 years</th>
<th>Recidivism rate within 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bienvenido Program to target Hispanic youth

- Trained volunteers to conduct training and mentoring program for Hispanic youth population
- Connected youth with community resources and volunteers to assist them during transition
Outcomes and Reform Measures Tied to Recidivism Data: Family Engagement

Performance-based Standards (PbS) Parent Survey: Percent of youths whose treatment plans included family members as a resource to help meet their treatment plan goals.

- Camp Summit Juvenile Boot Camp: 100%
- Logansport JCF: 100%
- Madison JCF: 100%
- Pendleton JCF: 96%
- Field Average: 95%
Family Engagement

• Empowered families based upon their strengths to have an active role in the youths progress while at the facility

• Impacted youth behavior and created a more positive atmosphere, helping to reduce the length of stay

• Improved transition and re-entry, positively impacting recidivism
Education Outcomes

- A five year study of 6,561 offenders released to five metropolitan counties in Indiana revealed the following:
  - Offenders who had lower education levels were more likely to recidivate
  - The recidivism rate among 306 offenders releases with a college education between 2005-2009 was 31.0%;
  - The recidivism rate among 3,461 offenders released with a GED was 46.2%; and
  - The recidivism rate among 2,321 offenders released with education level below high school was 55.9%
  - Of the entire group released in 2005, the recidivism rate among African American males under the age of 30 with an education below high school was 61.8%

- Results of the study consistently revealed that undereducated offenders, primarily those among the younger offenders was significantly higher
- Our own PBS Outcome data had a clear correlation between improved math and reading scores with lowering recidivism rates
### Outcomes and Reform Measures Tied to Recidivism Data: Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number Released</th>
<th>Number of Recidivist</th>
<th>Recidivism Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,196</strong></td>
<td><strong>365</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes and Reform Measures Tied to Recidivism Data: Education

Percent of youth confined for over six months whose math scores increased between admission and discharge.

- Field Average
- Indiana Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Field Average</th>
<th>Indiana Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2010</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2010</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2011</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2012</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2013</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2013</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes and Reform Measures
Tied to Recidivism Data: Post-Release Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Release</th>
<th>Recidivism rate within 1 year</th>
<th>Recidivism rate within 2 years</th>
<th>Recidivism rate within 3 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Connecting Youth to Community Resources

- Established juvenile parole division to assist in connecting youth with community resources
- Juvenile Reintegration Specialists meet with youth and families after release from facility to assist in providing direction and assistance with reentry efforts including: education, employment, outreach services, counseling, treatment and other needs.
## Outcomes and Reform Measures Tied to Recidivism Data: Offense Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Level</th>
<th>Number Released</th>
<th>Number of Recidivist</th>
<th>Recidivism Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felony A</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony B</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony C</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony D</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdem. A</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdem. B</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdem. C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,196</strong></td>
<td><strong>365</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring high risk youth being housed with low risk youth

• Reduced “contamination effect” of high risk youth on lower risk youth
• Worked with courts and JDAI initiative to place lower risk youth in alternative community-based programs
• Target was to keep lower risk youth out of secure detention prior to adjudication to impact deep-end DOC commitments
Outcomes and Reform Measures Tied to Recidivism Data: JDAI

Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI)

• Statewide expansion initiative ensuring right kids are in the right place with access to the right services

• Helped reduce overall population levels and reduced lower risk kids from being committed to DOC with higher risk youth
Utilizing Strong Research and Data
Florida Department of Juvenile Justice (Quick Facts)

• Centralized Juvenile Justice System

• Centralized Information System (JJIS)

• Dedicated Research Team

www.djj.state.fl.us
Creating a Data Driven System

www.djj.state.fl.us
The Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project (JJSIP)

- Comprehensive Strategy
- Structured Decision Making (SDM)
- Continuous Monitoring

www.djj.state.fl.us
The DJJ Disposition Matrix

<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 MISDEMEANOR¹</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 First time misdemeanor offenders with no history of participation in alternatives to arrest. Under § 985.12, F.S., 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 upon the PACT Risk Level to Re-offend.

² All misdemeanor offenses.

³ Felony offenses that do not include violence.

⁴ Violent felony offenses (do not include misdemeanor assault and battery, which is 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, LifeSkills, etc.)
  (3c) - Day Treatment, MST, FFT, Minimum Risk Commitment
Level 4 - Non Secure Residential Commitment (Low- & Moderate-Risk Programs)
Level 5 - Secure Residential Commitment (High- & Maximum-Risk Programs)

www.djj.state.fl.us
Definitions

Florida Department of Juvenile Justice
Structured Decision-Making and the Dispositional Matrix

I. Purpose of Structured Decision-Making

The mission of the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) is to “increase public safety by reducing juvenile delinquency through effective prevention, intervention and treatment services that strengthen families and turn around the lives of troubled youth.” As the agency responsible for the entire continuum of juvenile justice interventions, we are obligated to concentrate staff and programmatic resources in what we know works: community-based practice and programming. As we work to expand home-based interventions and reduce reliance on expensive residential facilities for youth who can be served safely and effectively in the community, we must also develop data-driven, research-based guidelines to help our staff determine which youth will receive what level of supervision.

As the nation’s largest juvenile justice agency, we are well positioned to be a leader in the field, and employing Structured Decision-Making (SDM) is one important way in which we can become a model for best practice. By examining statewide data and aligning our policies with the best evidence available concerning effective interventions, DJJ has developed a dispositional matrix that will assist probation staff in making informed and consistent dispositional recommendations. SDM has several benefits; it:

- Reflects DJJ’s expertise as to which youth are and are not appropriate for residential placement, intensive alternatives to placement, probation, diversion and civil citation;
- Helps ensure that DJJ’s resources are focused on the youth that need them most;
- Reduces the use of overly intensive interventions for lower risk youth—a practice that has consistently shown to increase recidivism and thereby jeopardize public safety;
- Promotes dispositional decision-making that distinguishes treatment needs from level of restrictiveness; and
- Achieves equity and fairness by ensuring that youth with similar offenses and risk levels will receive similar dispositional recommendations.

By weighing offense severity along with risk to reoffend, the dispositional matrix has been designed as a classification tool to help DJJ staff determine the most appropriate level of supervision for youth. This tool is not meant to replace the expertise and creativity of our staff. Instead, the hope is to capitalize on those traits while also recognizing the need for a consistent, research-based approach that applies across Florida’s 20 judicial circuits and 67 counties.

The Department’s continuing goal is to develop a continuum of care that provides the most effective and most cost-effective interventions in the least restrictive environment. As we expand the scope of community-based services, supervision, and sanctions for youth, strong policy guidelines are essential to ensure that those resources are appropriately targeted and that we are able to prioritize delinquency interventions that work best to protect public safety and outcomes for the youth entrusted to our care and supervision. Accordingly, the dispositional matrix is founded on the premise that whenever possible, attempts to safely supervise and deliver services to youth in their homes and in their communities should be fully exhausted before making a recommendation for residential placement.

www.djj.state.fl.us
State-Level Reports

Placement Levels - Statewide

Click on Counties to Filter Results
Click Again to Clear

Select Heat Map Parameter
- Above Guidelines

Number of Youth Disposed by Gender & Above Guidelines Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Youth Disposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Optimum Placements</td>
<td>23,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Guidelines</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Guidelines</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dispositions</td>
<td>29,033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5% Male
2% Female
Monitoring Adherence

Dispositional Matrix Report

Statewide August 2013 - July 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Disposition</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Moderate-High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Minor Diversion</td>
<td>9,061 (69%)</td>
<td>543 (27%)</td>
<td>136 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>2,613 (20%)</td>
<td>1,191 (59%)</td>
<td>1,019 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day Treatment</td>
<td>135 (10%)</td>
<td>78 (4%)</td>
<td>45 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redirection</td>
<td>21 (0%)</td>
<td>43 (2%)</td>
<td>162 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Secure Commitment</td>
<td>1 (0%)</td>
<td>12 (1%)</td>
<td>34 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Minor Diversion</td>
<td>2,648 (59%)</td>
<td>206 (18%)</td>
<td>55 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>686 (15%)</td>
<td>577 (18%)</td>
<td>583 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day Treatment</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Analytics and Visualizations

www.djj.state.fl.us
Latest Research: Briefing Sheets

http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/fast-facts/delinquency-briefings

• Gang Activity for DJJ Involved Youth
• Domestic Violence Placements
• Obstruction/Resisting Arrest Analysis
• R-Pact Change Score Analysis
• Adhering to the Risk Principle
• General Delinquency Briefings
• Serious, Violent and Chronic Offenders
• And more....

www.djj.state.fl.us
Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Mark A. Greenwald, M.J.P.M
Bureau of Research and Planning
Mark.Greenwald@djj.state.fl.us
(850) 717-2627

www.djj.state.fl.us
Thank You

Join our distribution list to receive CSG Justice Center project updates!

www.csgjusticecenter.org/subscribe

Additional Resources:


Juvenile Reentry and Resources: http://csgjusticecenter.org/youth/juvenile-reentry/


For more information, contact Josh Weber (jweber@csg.org)

The presentation was developed by members of the Council of State Governments Justice Center staff. The statements made reflect the views of the authors, and should not be considered the official position of the Justice Center, the members of the Council of State Governments, or the funding agency supporting the work. Citations available for statistics presented in preceding slides available on CSG Justice Center web site.
100 Wall Street, 20th Floor
New York, NY 10005
Phone: (877) 332-1719
Email:
info@nationalreentryresourcecenter.org

http://csgjusticecenter.org/nrcc