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Section 1: Introduction and Overview

“Juvenile justice is local…There are fifty-one (51), non-tribal juvenile justice systems in this country, each with its own history, its own set of laws and policies, its own unique organizational, administrative, and fiscal structures. There are also more than five hundred federally-recognized tribes in the United States, many whom operate their own juvenile courts and which have equal standing to state courts. Even within a single state, mandates developed by the state legislature and governor's office must be interpreted and implemented by a multitude of local officials, under widely varying conditions, and with widely varying effects. Without a thorough understanding of this background complexity, no broad question of juvenile justice practice or policy can be adequately answered, no legal generalization can be meaningful, and no descriptive statistic can be useful.”

Juvenile justice is complicated… Although Michigan’s courts are defined as “one court”, the courts do not reflect the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice’s definition of a unified court. Consolidation and simplification of court structure is defined at the state level in Michigan but funding, management and budgeting are performed on a local level. In addition, delinquency services are provided by the counties, private providers and Michigan’s Department of Human Services.

Michigan’s local juvenile courts administer secure juvenile detention facilities, intake and probation supervision and a variety of treatment programs designed to meet the needs of court-involved youth. Select county governments also administer some juvenile detention facilities. The system is further complicated by the differences in licensing rules for court operated and county operated detention facilities. In addition, the Department of Human Services administers community-based alternative services, a few secure detention resources, three residential facilities and an aftercare, re-entry program for delinquent youth committed to the Department for supervision.

Through legislation in 1998, the Family Division of the Circuit Court was established, which challenged the courts. Thus, the Family Division includes the juvenile court, which handles delinquency and neglect/abuse cases, and the Friend of the Court, which handles domestic relations and child support cases. The Friend of the Court’s title remained the same under this legislation, but the juvenile courts suffered somewhat of an “identity crisis”, not knowing what they were to call themselves based on the legislation. Thus, some “juvenile courts” refer to themselves as “juvenile services;” others call themselves the “family court;” and yet others, retained the title of “juvenile court”. None of these titles are consistent nor are they statutorily correct, which makes the system complicated in a variety of ways. For purposes of this Strategic Plan, the term “juvenile court” reflects the courts that handle delinquency matters.

Juvenile justice is an effective, meaningful approach... to treating court-involved youth and protecting public safety. While it is difficult to prove that “juvenile court” programs directly impact delinquent behavior, the literature suggests the relationships borne from a youth’s involvement with the juvenile court staff and judges, do impact their lives.

Juvenile courts provide services to a population still learning through their mistakes and focuses on holding them accountable. They provide a continuum of services devoted to this population that does not exist elsewhere within the court system and are committed to understanding youth, delinquent behaviors and family system dynamics in order to implement programming that addresses the individual needs of delinquent youth. Juvenile courts ascribe to a collaborative approach which strengthens the ability to offer a variety of services and engage the community.

Juvenile justice is at risk on a national level... Over the past decade, federal resources have been redirected to Homeland Security and other initiatives. Budgets of national organizations, such as the Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency and Prevention, have been drastically reduced. Other organizations and professional associations are under economic hardship and, thus, have established a narrow focus around issues of indigent public defense, prisoner re-entry and disproportionate minority contact. Although these are laudable focus areas, the juvenile courts throughout the nation are experiencing a crisis of a different kind and need support. Such need is revealed in the general lack of mental health resources, community-based restorative programming and gender-specific programs. Family wellness issues abound as do multigenerational issues of substance abuse. Violence and gang activity pose a significant threat to the communities of the nation. As legislation continues with a “one size fits all” approach, the individualized treatment of juvenile offenders is at risk of being lost.

Many leading, national professional justice organizations appear to be focused on the adult trial courts and seldom is there reference to juvenile justice, juvenile courts, and the effective management thereof. Juvenile courts are looking for leadership, knowledge, experience and support that will unify them and value the diversity of each court that reflects the myriad of social mores and values of communities across the land.

Juvenile justice in Michigan is at risk... Michigan’s juvenile courts reflect the national crisis. The poor economy forced thousands of families out of Michigan to seek jobs, and many of those who remain are in great need. The juvenile courts have been flooded with juveniles manifesting increasingly serious mental health issues, co-occurring disorders, substance abuse issues, lack of adult supervision, increased gang influence, etc. while monies for effective programming have dwindled.

---


Many indicators suggest an absence of a juvenile justice agenda in Michigan. In recent years, the Department of Human Services’ Bureau of Juvenile Justice and the State Court Administrative Office have sustained significant staff reductions, leaving reduced capability to address complex juvenile justice issues. Federal discretionary grant funds are minimal and decision-making organizations/committees that oversee the disbursement of these funds are limited in their ability to address emergent needs. As recently as October, 2011, the federal discretionary grant funds were drastically cut, which resulted in many juvenile courts not receiving grant dollars for special programming. Rather than a focus on addressing the issues of juveniles, monies coming into the State are often focusing on adult issues such as prisoner re-entry.\(^6\)

Over the past two decades, Michigan’s juvenile justice system has experienced repeated challenges through legislation that mirrors the adult system. Examples of this legislation include the adult waiver system and the sex offender registry. Such legislation is concerning in that it forces the juvenile court toward an adult-focused approach rather than a child-focused approach.

Increased foster care and other child care costs have been forced upon the local counties which are the courts’ funding agents.\(^7\) In order to financially accommodate this change, the juvenile courts have been forced to eliminate programs, staff and resources, sometimes resulting in less than optimal treatment decisions.

Mandates for reporting juvenile offenses to State agencies are increasing. Police officers, prosecutors, and courts report data regarding juveniles to the Michigan State Police (MSP). Under the purview of the MSP, that data may be viewed by the public and prevent a juvenile from getting a job, housing, scholarships, etc. Often, this creates obstacles for a juvenile to becoming a productive adult.

The depressed economy; state and local budget cuts; the lack of a coordinated and strategic approach to juvenile issues; a lack of research, funding and attention to evidence-based practices; legislative pressures; and a “one-size fits-all” approach have contributed to the dilution of Michigan’s juvenile justice system over the past decade. Michigan needs a comprehensive and progressive juvenile justice agenda and strategic plan that ensures fair, equitable and appropriate justice and addresses the needs of children coming through the juvenile justice system today and in the years ahead.

Juvenile justice professionals are dedicated… Funded by a grant award from the State Justice Institute (SJI), with the support of the Michigan State Court Administrative Office (SCAO), Michigan Department of Human Services (DHS), Grand Valley State University (GVSU) and the 20th Judicial Circuit Court (fiduciary and project management), the Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 project was initiated in August, 2011. The primary purpose of this initiative was to evaluate Michigan’s juvenile justice system and develop a strategic plan. The process resulted in an action agenda and a forum for a collective voice for juvenile justice.


Recognizing time is critical, the Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 initiative has been deliberate in its endeavor. Since the SJI award was received in July, 2011, the following has occurred:

› August/September – Identified and confirmed members of the Planning Committee who were representative of SCAO, GVSU, DHS and the courts. With the leadership and assistance of national consultant, Dr. Brenda Wagenknecht-Ivey of PRAXIS Consulting, Inc., the Planning Committee developed a survey seeking feedback about the juvenile justice system. The survey was disseminated to over 650 juvenile justice professionals, resulting in a 51% return rate. In addition, a trends and an organizational analysis were conducted.

› September/October – Strategic planning sessions were conducted over a 4.5 day period. Broad representation from several juvenile courts, professional associations/organizations and departments within State government – all which work directly within juvenile justice – was solicited and approximately 35 members participated. This group was called the Strategic Planning Oversight Team (SPOT). The strategic planning sessions focused on the establishment of a mission, vision, core values, goals, objectives, strategic focus areas and first year priority projects for each focus area.

› October/November – Resulting from the strategic planning process, a juvenile justice Strategic Plan has been vetted and finalized. Plans for communication and implementation were developed – launching five strategic focus area action teams which will work toward completion of their respective, identified priority projects.

The Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 initiative is a work in progress, and going forward, there is important work to do. Collaboration is critical and improvements are needed to provide the court with the necessary resources to ensure the current and future needs of the courts, the public and the children under the jurisdiction of Michigan’s juvenile justice system, are addressed. The commitment and leadership of involved juvenile justice professionals across the State in Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 has been remarkable; it is a true statement of the recognized need for such an initiative. Throughout the process, an awareness that juvenile courts work to protect public safety while providing an accountable, supportive environment for children, has been and will be ever-present.

Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20’s Strategic Plan is a catalyst for creating a collective vision and voice, and developing a long-term, strategic “roadmap” for the constant improvement of the administration of justice – making juvenile justice and the courts in Michigan stronger, more effective and increasingly responsive to all.

This 2012-2014 Strategic Plan includes the following:
1. The core tenet of the juvenile court, vision of the future, and core values of Michigan’s juvenile justice system;
2. A summary of key trends and effects on the juvenile justice system;
3. An assessment of the juvenile court/juvenile justice system; and
4. Strategic focus areas, long-range goals, objectives, and strategic initiatives.

A glossary of terms is included in Appendix A.
Section 2: Juvenile Court Core Tenet, Vision of the Future, and Core Values

Below are the core tenet of the Juvenile Court, a vision of the future, and core values of Michigan’s juvenile justice system.

Core Tenet of the Juvenile Court

Court-involved youth shall be treated in an appropriate manner within the least restrictive environment that offers effective treatment and ensures public safety.

Vision of the Future – Michigan’s Juvenile Justice System

(October 2011)

Through unified voice and collaboration, Michigan’s juvenile justice system is a leader in the administration of fair and equal justice; individualized, comprehensive and effective treatment that responds to juvenile delinquent behaviors; and accountability that builds safe, resilient communities.

Core Values

(October 2011)

Prevention
Youth and Family Centered
Integrated and Holistic Services
Evidence Based
Outcome Focused
Compassionate
Restorative
Respectful
Proactive
High Performance
Section 3: Trends Summary and Implications

Many trends will affect Michigan’s juvenile justice system in the years ahead. The Strategic Planning Oversight Team (SPOT) reviewed and analyzed several social, economic, policy/political, technological and justice system trends as well as juvenile court caseload trends as part of the planning process. After discussing these trends, SPOT members identified what they believe to be the most significant implications of these trends on the future of Michigan’s juvenile justice system. The analysis revealed the need to be proactive in addressing the effects of the trends on the juvenile justice system and for juvenile justice leaders to actively work to shape a more positive future.

Below is a brief summary of key trends and the projected future implications of these trends on the juvenile justice system. See Appendix B for a comprehensive summary of external trends and the corresponding charts.

Trends Summary

External trends data show the following.

• According to KIDS COUNT: 8
  
  - The percent of teens ages 16-19 not in school and not high school graduates declined between 2000 and 2007, from 10 percent to 5 percent respectively; however, in 2008 and 2009, it increased to 6 percent.

  - The percent of children living in low income families in Michigan continues to rise. The percentage of children living in low income families has increased 12 percentage points in 9 years, from 32 percent in 2000 to 44 percent in 2009.

  - The percent of children living in poverty in Michigan also continues to rise. In 2000, 14 percent of children lived in poverty whereas in 2009, this number jumped to 23 percent.

• A national public opinion poll conducted in 2007 by Belden, Russonello and Stewart on contract with the Center for Children’s Law and Policy showed the following:

  - The public believes generally that youth who commit crimes have the potential for change;

  - There is a strong preference for funding programs for youthful offenders over incarceration (e.g., counseling, education, and job training);

  - Treatment, supervision, and services are seen as very effective ways to rehabilitate youthful offenders; and

---

- The public favors keeping nonviolent juvenile offenders in community-based facilities or under community supervision over incarceration.

- A few of the most significant **policy and political trends** affecting Michigan’s juvenile justice system include:
  - Declining state and local budgets and depleted reserves;
  - Increasing fiscal realignment;
  - Increasing scrutiny on how public tax dollars are spent, moving to performance measurement, and demonstrating accountability;
  - Ongoing tension between increasing expectations for government solutions and the call for less government involvement in personal lives; and
  - Increase in legislation for identified, specific crimes (e.g. sex offender) and unfunded mandates.  

- Several key **technological trends** are:
  - Continuing wireless revolution and rapidly developing telecommunications and information technology;
  - Increasing expectations and demands for access to information and ability to do business with all types of organizations from remote locations and 24 hours a day (e.g., using the Internet to file, pay fines and fees, get case information); and
  - Increasing need to share appropriate information with justice system partners but continuing system integration challenges including privacy and confidentiality issues.

- Several important **justice system trends** include:
  - Increasing numbers, and changing composition, of court users (e.g., more non-English speaking and self-represented);
  - Declining budgets at the state and local levels;
  - Increasing numbers of litigants with mental health and/or addiction problems;
  - Increasing consolidation of courts and court services;
  - Increasing need/demand for the use of technology to enhance access and allow for doing business electronically;
  - Declining court infrastructure (e.g., facilities, technology, equipment, security);
  - Growing tension between creating and maintaining specialty courts (to achieve better outcomes and resolve cases expeditiously) and inability to fund them; and
  - An older than average workforce leading to a loss of institutional knowledge when Baby Boomers retire.

---


10 Ibid, pp. 135-139.

11 Ibid, pp. 135-139.
Internal juvenile court caseload trends and performance on time standards, per the Michigan State Court Administrative Office, show the following.

- **Juvenile delinquency filings** declined 31 percent from 2002 to 2010 and 28 percent since 2006. **Designated proceeding filings** declined 36 percent from 2002 to 2010. They increased 30 percent from 2007 to 2008 and dropped 25 percent from 2008 to 2009. Designated proceedings are those where juveniles are tried as adults in the Family Division of Circuit Court.

  Note: these statistics are to be interpreted, cautiously. Although filings have dropped, the case dynamics are much more complex, requiring significantly more time to process and address the needs of youth being referred to court. In addition, the number of law enforcement officers has declined in recent years, which may account in part for fewer arrests.

- **Felony juvenile (waiver) filings** increased 25 percent between 2002 and 2008, and 17 percent from 2008 to 2009. They declined 29 percent from 2009 to 2010.

- The number of **juveniles supervised by the courts** declined 42 percent from 2002 to 2010, and 18 percent in the last 5 years. The number of delinquent juveniles supervised by **Michigan DHS** declined 70 percent from 2002 to 2010. Finally, the total number of juveniles supervised in Michigan declined 40 percent from 2002 to 2010.

  Note: The decline in supervised youth is misleading. Although the number of delinquent juveniles supervised by the courts throughout the State has significantly declined since 2002, the cases being referred to the courts are more complex, requiring more supervision and manpower. For example, the courts have been flooded with youth who are on multiple psychotropic medications for multiple, diagnosed mental health disorders. Such types of conditions are difficult to manage. To address the individual needs of youth, more rigorous treatment approaches are needed. Residential placement options for these youth are limited and cost-prohibitive. In addition, as a result of the Settlement Agreement between Children’s Rights and DHS, the courts’ budgets have been stretched to the point where residential treatment is seldom an option. Thus, managing these cases in the community requires significantly more time to obtain positive outcomes and protect public safety.
Performance on the juvenile court time standards is as follows:

- Juvenile courts across Michigan are continuing to improve in meeting the initial and maximum time standards for adjudicating and disposing of delinquency matters when a minor is detained or held in custody.

- Juvenile courts also are exceeding the initial time standard and close to meeting the interim and maximum time standards for minors NOT detained or held in custody.

- For designated proceedings (i.e., those where juveniles are tried as adults in the Family Division of the Circuit Court), juvenile courts are very close to achieving these time standards.

- The timeliness for juveniles waived into adult court has declined over the past five years.

Projected Implications of Trends on Michigan’s Juvenile Justice System

All trends are occurring simultaneously, interacting in a myriad of ways. The impact of the trends on the Michigan’s juvenile justice system will likely be great in the years ahead. SPOT members analyzed the trends and believe the following are the most significant effects of the trends on the juvenile justice system. The potential implications are as follows:

1. More instability in families due to economic stress (e.g. low income, poverty levels).

2. A decline in funding for the courts and juvenile services due to a depressed economy, declining caseloads, etc. There will be less funding for prevention. Courts may be able to provide only mandated services. The caseload and workload data may be misinterpreted and lead to false assumptions and conclusions.

3. Continued uncertain, fragmented and unequal funding for the juvenile justice system across the state.

4. A reduction in the number of staff and treatment services means fewer services will be available for juveniles, families, and communities. The well-being of children involved in the court system will be at risk. Services for low-risk juveniles will not be available. Courts will struggle to adequately supervise juveniles and keep communities safe.

5. There is mixed support and concern about the potential impact of a reduction in the number of juvenile judges. Based on judges’ workloads, a reduction in the number of judges may be a very cost-efficient, proactive approach, making the workloads more equitable. There is also some concern this approach may result in an increase in delay, less specialization and expertise in handling complex juvenile matters, potentially negatively impacting outcomes for juvenile and communities.
6. A growing need for a comprehensive continuum of juvenile services to achieve effective outcomes. New types of rehabilitation and treatment approaches may be embraced.

7. A growing need for specialized juvenile services (e.g., gender specific services, treatment for mental illness, substance abuse, and sex offenders, etc.)

8. A decline in the availability of local and community-based placements.

9. More opportunities to collaborate with community partners. Community-based programs may increase (e.g., prevention, diversion, faith-based, etc.).

10. An increasing need to demonstrate results and achieve effective, measurable outcomes. The courts will need good data to make effective programming decisions and will need to use best and evidence-based practices to help juveniles and families succeed and reduce recidivism.

11. A need for juvenile courts and other organizations to critically review their workloads, services, and use of existing resources. Juvenile courts and other organizations may need to provide services differently (e.g. repurpose detention centers, consolidate services, provide regional services) in the future.

12. A need to train, educate, and develop staff (e.g. equip them with the knowledge, skills, and abilities to succeed in the future).

13. A need to keep pace with technology and modify court rules and procedures accordingly. Also, a growing need for more technology funding and statewide efforts to improve technology (e.g. case management system, system integration, etc.).

14. A need for succession planning/talent management programs to prepare for the retirements of many juvenile justice leaders across the state.
Section 4: Assessment of Juvenile Justice System

The Strategic Planning Oversight Team (SPOT) reviewed the results of the strategic planning survey, which was conducted in August and September 2011 and completed by over 350 juvenile justice professionals across Michigan. A summary of the results follows (see Appendix D for more detailed survey results). Also provided is a summary of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats as identified by SPOT.

Survey Overview and Results

The characteristics of survey respondents are shown in Exhibit 1 below.¹²

¹² Note: Juvenile registers are professionals within the juvenile courts who ensure substantive and procedural compliance with all Michigan Court Rules, State Court Administrative Office Rules and Regulations, Michigan Juvenile Justice Benchbook and other statutory requirements governing the non-judicial operations of the Family Division.
The first part of the survey asked respondents to assess the effectiveness of various aspects of Michigan’s juvenile justice system. The survey questions were grouped into five categories. Exhibit 2 below shows how survey respondents rated each category. The results are presented from highest to lowest based on the mean score of each category, which was computed by averaging all of the questions in that category (i.e., grand mean).
The five highest and five lowest rated survey questions and the corresponding categories are provided in the tables below.

### Table 1: Five Highest Rated Survey Questions
(Based on a 10 point rating scale where 10 = Strongly Agreed and 1 = Strongly Disagreed; 5.5 is the midpoint of the scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Our court operates from the core tenet that all youth within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court have the right to be rehabilitated in the least restrictive environment within their community (n=315) (Category: Juvenile Court Philosophy, Programming, Treatment)</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Our court individualizes treatment approaches for juveniles. (n=311) (Category: Juvenile Court Operations)</td>
<td>8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Our court provides juvenile services in a timely manner. (n=311) (Category: Juvenile Court Operations)</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Our juvenile court collaborates with partners to enhance our continuum of service. (n=312) (Category: Collaboration with Partners and Public)</td>
<td>7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Our juvenile court facilities are easily accessible to juveniles and families (e.g., accessible location, parking, ADA accessible). (n=313) (Category: Juvenile Court Operations)</td>
<td>7.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Five Lowest Rated Survey Questions
(Based on a 10 point rating scale where 10 = Strongly Agreed and 1 = Strongly Disagreed; 5.5 is the midpoint of the scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. The funding our juvenile court receives from the State and County is adequate to meet current needs. (n=302) (Category: Funding)</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Collectively, juvenile justice leaders across the state are actively involved in shaping juvenile justice legislation. (n=337) (Category: Legislation and Public Policy)</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Our juvenile court is actively developing staff to replace experienced staff when they retire or leave. (n=299) (Category: Juvenile Court Operations)</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Our juvenile court has the resources to implement programs that meet the complex needs of juveniles. (n=312) (Category: Funding)</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Our court educates the community about the juvenile court (e.g., needs, accomplishments, outcomes). (n=313) (Category: Collaboration with Partners and Public)</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey respondents were asked to help establish future priorities for Michigan’s juvenile justice system. Exhibit 3 shows the priorities ranked from highest to lowest based on average rating.
Exhibit 4 shows the most wanted changes/improvements in the next 2 years according to survey respondents.

Exhibit 4
Michigan Juvenile Justice – Vision 20/20 – 2011 Strategic Planning Survey
Most Wanted Changes/Improvements in the Next 2 Years – All Respondents
September 2011
(n=477; By Percent of Responses)³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevention, Intervention, &amp; Treatment Programs</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation/ Public Policy</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration Among All Partners</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Training/Education</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation/Research</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities, Technology, Equipment, &amp; Staff</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³This was a multiple response question. The percentages are computed based on the total number of responses, not respondents. Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding. See the complete Survey Report for the verbatim responses of all respondents.
Examples of comments in each survey category are as follows:

- **Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment Programs** (36%). Includes more prevention and intervention programs; focus on truancy; increase mental health, substance abuse, and sex offender services; add alternative programs/education; use evidence-based practices; enhance treatment for parents/caregivers; expand community-based programs/services; add specialized services for specific populations (e.g., females); need more and affordable placement options.

- **Legislation/Public Policy** (21%). Includes improving/fixing sex offender registry; alternate dispositions; juvenile competency issues; 17 vs. 18 year old issues; broaden powers of/increase flexibility for the juvenile court; fix public records; waivers; diversion; and continue consent calendars (give kids the same rights as adults).

- **Funding** (13%). Includes increasing funding for prevention in juvenile justice and child protection, early intervention, mental health and substance abuse, court-appointed attorneys, juvenile counseling, assessment and treatment; increase state reimbursement; increase IV-E funds; increase funding for DHS Community Justice Centers.

- **Collaboration among all Partners** (6%). Includes improving collaboration with all partners (e.g., DHS, CMH, schools, community partners); communicating/sharing information more effectively; working together to solve joint problems (e.g., truancy); communicating more effectively across courts/counties.

- **Staff Training/Education** (5%). Includes sponsoring statewide conferences; sharing of best practices; educating on evidence-based practices; succession planning; more training/networking opportunities; mandatory educational levels.

- **Evaluation/Research** (5%). Includes better/more evaluation of programs and service providers; better performance measures; better use of statistics/data; more juvenile justice research; assess cost benefit of long-term mental health facilities.

- **Facilities, Technology, Equipment, and Staff** (3%). Includes improving facilities and IT/JIS/case management systems; providing needed equipment (fingerprinting, LEIN); having adequate staff; user-friendly statewide data base.

- **Miscellaneous** (11%). Includes disproportionate number of minorities in the juvenile justice system; stronger juvenile justice advocacy/consistent voice needed; need specialized Juvenile Court judges; need more consistency/standardization across courts/statewide; reevaluate Family Court concept; do more public education.
Finally, SPOT members completed a SWOT analysis (i.e., summarized strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) of Michigan’s juvenile justice system. Considering all of the information above and members’ collective experiences, SPOT summarized the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats as follows.

**Summary of Strengths**

1. Juvenile justice administrators across the state are fiscally prudent and conservative; they use their limited resources efficiently and effectively.
2. Juvenile court and juvenile justice personnel are dedicated, enthusiastic, innovative, etc.
3. Juvenile court directors and personnel across the state share ideas and innovative practices; there is considerable camaraderie among juvenile justice professionals across the state.
4. The Child Care Fund, which provides in-home care funding, provides much needed funding.
5. Juvenile court services are child and family-centered; staff are responsive.
6. Judges, court administrators/juvenile services administrators, and staff demonstrate leadership in communities across the state.
7. Juvenile courts and community and justice system partners collaborate effectively.
8. Juvenile courts across the state try to rehabilitate youth in the least restrictive environment within their community.
9. Juvenile courts attempt to individualize treatment approaches for juveniles.
10. Juvenile courts resolve juvenile matters and provide juvenile services in a timely manner.
11. Juvenile courts collaborate with partners to enhance the continuum of service.
12. Juvenile court facilities are accessible to juveniles and families.

**Summary of Weaknesses**

1. The juvenile justice system is underfunded; it does not have enough resources to provide needed programs and services to juvenile offenders.
2. Future funding is uncertain.
3. Legislative support is uncertain.
4. Data are not compiled, analyzed, or used consistently to make decisions; some data are not available at all or are difficult to get.
5. The courts are not developing the next generation of leaders; there will be a loss of institutional knowledge when Baby Boomers retire.
6. Policies and procedures are inconsistent within and across counties (e.g., what constitutes a consent case, definitions of recidivism).
7. The juvenile justice system is largely invisible; it doesn’t incite passion to help troubled youth in others outside the system; it isn’t perceived to affect many individual’s daily lives.
8. Critics are vocal and powerful; juvenile justice professionals do not adequately promote accomplishments to the public.
9. There is no proactive approach to shaping the public’s views or educating the public about the juvenile courts.
10. Collectively, juvenile justice leaders do not influence juvenile justice legislation.
11. The juvenile justice system lacks a collective voice.
Opportunities

1. The juvenile justice system must be more resourceful, efficient, and effective; it must design and pursue innovative and stable funding and innovative and effective treatment strategies.
2. Juvenile courts and community and justice system partners can leverage collaboration to improve services.
3. Juvenile justice leaders can develop a collective voice, direction, and priorities, and work together to make changes and improvements.
4. Juvenile justice leaders can actively shape policy and legislation.
5. Juvenile court personnel must work to continually improve services, implement best practices, and use evidence-based practices.
6. The juvenile justice system must improve the availability and use of data to influence public policy and legislation; it must focus on outcomes and measure/demonstrate performance.
7. The juvenile justice system can collaborate with educational institutions to provide needed juvenile justice research including evidence based practices, program evaluation, etc.
8. Juvenile courts can proactively educate the public about their purpose and functions, effectiveness, and results.
9. Reshape the role of DHS through this initiative; redefine how the state can help support the juvenile justice system.

Threats

1. Reduced and eliminated funding is threatening the ability of the juvenile justice system to provide needed services and programs.
2. The juvenile justice system could potentially be absorbed by the adult system.
3. Impending retirements in the juvenile courts will result in a loss of institutional knowledge.
4. Privatization, outsourcing, and consolidation may harm juvenile services.
5. Restrictive legislation and public policy adversely affects the performance and outcomes of the juvenile justice system.
6. Failing to use individualized treatment approaches with juveniles will adversely affect outcomes.
7. The juvenile justice system could become even more invisible and irrelevant.
8. Apathy and lack of experience among some juvenile justice personnel and partners adversely affect the quality of services provided.
9. The lack of an agenda leaves juvenile justice vulnerable; others determine what is best and needed for the system.
Section 5: Strategic Focus Areas, Goals, Objectives, & Strategic Initiatives

The Strategic Planning Oversight Team (SPOT) identified five strategic focus areas for Michigan’s juvenile justice system. **Strategic focus areas** are internal or external issues that are fundamentally important to the system over the long-term. Because of their magnitude, strategic focus areas must be addressed in order for the juvenile justice system to stay true to the core tenet of juvenile courts, strive toward the vision of the future, and continue to improve services to juveniles and families. In sum, they are what Michigan’s juvenile justice leaders agree must be addressed over the long-term to make needed improvements.

**Strategies** are comprehensive responses to strategic focus areas. They include long-range **goals**, which are broad statements that define the desired end, targets that the system will strive to achieve and several objectives for each of the goals. **Objectives** are general statements that describe the manner in which the end result – or goal – will be achieved. **Strategic projects or initiatives** are the shorter-term (e.g., 1 year) priorities of the system. As they are completed, the juvenile justice system will be making progress on accomplishing the long-range goals and responding effectively to the strategic focus areas.

### Michigan Juvenile Justice – Vision 20/20

**Strategic Focus Areas**

(October 2011)

1. Unique Purpose of the Juvenile Court
2. Effective Outcomes for Juveniles, Families, and Communities
3. Juvenile Court Operational Performance
4. Adequate and Sustainable Funding
5. Strong Juvenile Justice Workforce

This section includes descriptions of the strategic focus areas, long-range goals, and objectives. Also included are the 2012 strategic initiatives, which set forth first year priorities.
STRATEGIC FOCUS AREA #1: UNIQUE PURPOSE OF THE JUVENILE COURT

Description: Founded in 1899, juvenile courts have a unique purpose and function. The core tenet of juvenile courts recognizes youth are different than adults and should be treated so; once involved in the juvenile court system, juvenile offenders should receive appropriate and effective treatment in the least restrictive environment within their community and in a manner that ensures public safety.

Preserving and advancing the unique purpose and functions of the juvenile court is a high priority for Michigan’s juvenile justice leaders. Both are needed in the future to ensure Michigan’s juvenile justice system is able to provide rehabilitative and restorative services to help juveniles succeed while holding them accountable and protecting the public.

A collective identity and voice around agreed upon priorities are necessary among juvenile justice leaders and juvenile justice organizations to make future, needed improvements to the juvenile justice system. Also needed are informed champions for juvenile justice in the legislature and communities across the state as well as an educated public. Active involvement in shaping juvenile justice legislation and public policy also is essential in the future to ensure the laws and policy support and are consistent with the core tenet of juvenile courts. Finally, it is important for juvenile courts across the state to promote the same message and have consistent approaches to implementing juvenile justice policy and legislation.

Failure to preserve and advance the unique purpose and functions of the juvenile court will render it obsolete, irrelevant, and ineffective in the future. Michigan’s youth and communities will not be well-served by the system. Finally, the ability of the juvenile justice system to administer fair and equal justice, provide individualized, comprehensive, and effective programs for delinquent youth, and ensure accountability that builds safe, resilient communities is dependent on a juvenile justice system built on sound, foundational principles.

Goals and Objectives

Goal 1: Policy makers in all branches of government and the public understand and support the purpose and functions of the juvenile court system.

Objective 1: Develop a well-defined juvenile court system identity, built around the unique purpose, functions, and core tenet of the juvenile court.

Objective 2: Educate all stakeholders on the history, purpose, principles and functions of the juvenile court system.

Objective 3: Create visibility and build support for the juvenile justice system at the local state, tribal, and national levels.
Goal 2: Juvenile justice leaders are actively shaping juvenile justice legislation and public policy.

Objective 1: Establish and build support for a collective identity and voice.

Objective 2: Advocate for juvenile justice priorities.

Objective 3: Educate and build support for juvenile justice matters among legislators, public policy makers, justice system and community partners, and the public.

Objective 4: Implement public policy and legislation within and across juvenile courts consistently.

**Strategic Focus Area #1: Unique Purpose of the Juvenile Court**

**2011-2012 Strategic Initiatives/Projects**

1. Identify juvenile justice advocates and work with legislators to pass needed legislation.

2. Develop a Juvenile Justice Institute to facilitate plan efforts (Grand Valley State University is interested).

3. Further define, educate, and build support for the unique purpose, functions, and core tenets of juvenile courts.
STRATEGIC FOCUS AREA #2: EFFECTIVE OUTCOMES FOR JUVENILES, FAMILIES, AND COMMUNITIES

Description: Juvenile courts across the state are committed to achieving effective outcomes for juveniles, families, and communities. Achieving effective outcomes, in part, is the ultimate quality measure of juvenile services.

Achieving effective outcomes is dependent on many factors. They include:

1. Having a continuum of services available to meet the complex needs of juveniles and families.
2. Using a holistic and individualized approach to assessing and treating juveniles and families.
3. Involving families and caretakers.
4. Assessing risks and using other tools to make decisions and hold juveniles accountable.
5. Using evidence-based practices and other research findings to treat juveniles.
6. Collecting and analyzing data and measuring outcomes.
7. Collaborating effectively with other justice system and community partners.

Goals and Objectives

Goal 1: Youth and families receive the most appropriate services to meet their needs and protect the public.

Objective 1: Use appropriate and effective assessment tools.

Objective 2: Develop a complete continuum of care.

Objective 3: Use evidence-based practices and juvenile justice research findings to treat juvenile offenders and keep the public safe.

Objective 4: Collaborate with partners to provide needed and appropriate treatment and services.

Goal 2: Program decisions are based on quality data and research.

Objective 1: Standardize data collection, terms and variables statewide to improve analysis and comparisons across counties.

Objective 2: Develop consistent methods for assessing and evaluating juvenile programs.

Objective 3: Share and implement best practices.
Strategic Focus Area #2: Effective Outcomes for Juveniles, Families, and Communities

2011-2012 Strategic Initiatives/Projects

1. Suggest a statewide risk/needs assessment tool(s) that meets the needs of juvenile courts.

2. Identify areas of needed research and partner with universities to conduct juvenile justice research.

3. Develop a model continuum of care.
STRATEGIC FOCUS AREA #3: JUVENILE COURT OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Description: Juvenile courts across the state are committed to continually improving performance. This includes: (1) being more accessible; (2) managing cases, court operations, and juvenile services effectively; (3) resolving matters and providing juvenile services in a timely manner; (4) administering justice in a fair and equal manner; and (5) being more efficient and effective with resources.

The juvenile justice system also will be strengthened if juvenile courts speak with one voice about needs and priorities, increase consistency and uniformity across courts and counties, collect and use operational data to improve performance and effectiveness, and demonstrate the prudent use of resources and outcomes achieved. Technological improvements, more systems coordination, and more community collaboration also are needed to enhance performance.

Goals and Objectives

Goal 1: Juvenile courts provide fair and equitable treatment.

Objective 1: Treat all juvenile offenders equitably and in accordance with the law.

Objective 2: Measure public trust and confidence in the juvenile justice system.

Objective 3: Educate and inform the public about the juvenile justice system.

Goal 2: Juvenile courts, including services offered, are user-friendly and accessible.

Objective 1: Provide helpful and understandable resources to court users.

Objective 2: Use technology to increase access and customer services.

Objective 3: Increase information sharing and collaboration with all justice system and community partners.

Objective 4: Ensure physical facilities are safe and efficient.

Goal 3: Juvenile courts are timely, efficient, and effective.

Objective 1: Resolve juvenile matters in accordance with time standards.

Objective 2: Streamline processes and procedures.

Objective 3: Use assessment methods to collect and analyze data for decision making.

Objective 4: Use performance measures to coordinate and collaborate with all juvenile justice stakeholders.
Strategic Focus Area #3: Juvenile Court Operational Performance

2011-2012 Strategic Initiatives/Projects

1. Improve state and local data collection.
2. Design and implement standardized performance measures for the Juvenile Courts.
STRATEGIC FOCUS AREA #4: ADEQUATE AND SUSTAINABLE FUNDING

**Description:** Michigan’s juvenile justice system needs adequate and sustainable funding to perform effectively in the future. In addition, the juvenile justice system must maximize the use of available and allowable funds. It must continue to be more efficient and effective and implement cost saving measures where possible.

Recent budget cutbacks and the uncertainty in funding have posed challenges for juvenile justice organizations. Staffing levels, the availability of juvenile services and programs across the state, and the adequacy of representation have been affected.

Indeed, funding of the juvenile justice system in Michigan is complex. There are multiple funding streams (e.g., federal, state, and private) and the current funding methods and formulas are complicated. Funding across counties also varies greatly, which affects the services provided to juvenile offenders.

The juvenile justice system needs adequate and sustainable funding and resources to be able to administer fair and equal justice, provide individualized, comprehensive, and effective programs for delinquent youth, and ensure accountability that builds safe, resilient communities. Assuring the efficient and effective use of resources, implementing cost saving measures, and securing adequate and sustainable funding are a high priority in the future. Juvenile justice leaders are committed to developing innovative and effective ways to better use existing funds and securing future funding to provide needed services, ultimately strengthening the juvenile justice system throughout the state.

**Goals and Objectives**

**Goal 1:** Michigan’s juvenile justice system has the funding and resources needed to protect communities, administer fair and equal justice, and help youth and families succeed.

Objective 1: Implement a standardized approach to measuring results, demonstrating outcomes, and taking corrective action as necessary.

Objective 2: Implement and share innovative methods of using existing resources more efficiently and effectively (e.g., consolidating services).

Objective 3: Pursue new, creative ways to fund and support Michigan’s juvenile justice system.

Objective 4: Use technology to save resources and be more efficient and effective.

Objective 5: Educate stakeholders about the needs, priorities and accomplishments of the juvenile justice system.
Goal 2: Juvenile justice funding is predictable and sustainable.

  Objective 1: Build support among stakeholders to assure adequate and sustainable funding for the juvenile justice system.

  Objective 2: Increase systemic knowledge and use of available funding resources and requirements.

Goal 3: Juvenile justice funding and resources are equitably distributed across the state.

  Objective 1: Improve and simplify the funding structure including funding methods and formulas.

  Objective 2: Develop a funding structure that allows equitable funding for non mandated and mandated services.

---

**Strategic Focus Area #4: Adequate and Sustainable Funding**

**2011-2012 Strategic Initiatives/Projects**

1. Advocate for the 75/25 Child Care Fund split.

2. Identify and educate advocates and stakeholders in the funding process about the needs of Michigan’s juvenile justice system.

3. Develop and share innovative funding strategies.
STRATEGIC FOCUS AREA #5: STRONG JUVENILE JUSTICE WORKFORCE

Description: The success of Michigan’s juvenile justice system is dependent in part on the strength of its workforce and the quality of the work environment. A competent, motivated, and satisfied workforce and supportive work environment are essential for ensuring excellent court performance and achieving effective outcomes. Thus, strengthening the workforce and work environment are a high priority.

This area is critically important for the following reasons.

1. More sustainable and personalized training is needed at all levels; continuous training is needed to equip employees with the knowledge, skills, and abilities to perform well in the future.
2. A core training curriculum for juvenile justice professionals, e.g. probation officers, is lacking or out-of-date.
3. Leadership and juvenile court management training is lacking.
4. There is a lack of talent development/talent management programs to ensure deep bench strength when vacancies occur.
5. Professional development, career paths and opportunities are lacking.
6. There is high turnover in some juvenile justice jobs/positions.
7. More cultural competence and diversity in staff and the workplace are needed at all levels and in all positions.
8. There are opportunities to form new partnerships with universities and academicians to enhance education, job readiness, and juvenile justice research.
9. Juvenile organizations must be more nimble in the future and employees must embrace (rather than resist) change.
10. Equal opportunities are needed in all size counties across the state.
11. Employee satisfaction and a positive work environment will help recruit and retain competent staff and improve organizational performance.

Goals and Objectives

Goal 1: Juvenile court staff possess the knowledge and skills to perform their jobs.

Objective 1: Provide employees across the state with consistent, comprehensive, and accessible training and educational opportunities.

Objective 2: Provide opportunities for employees to develop individual talents and strengths (i.e. skill building, management opportunities.).

Objective 3: Develop and sustain partnerships to enhance opportunities for knowledge and skill development.

Objective 4: Create and maintain a culturally competent and diverse workforce.

Objective 5: Develop and transfer knowledge and skill to the next generation of leaders, managers, and employees.
Goal 2: The juvenile court work environment is supportive and motivating.

Objective 1: Ensure competent and effective leaders and managers at all levels.

Objective 2: Compensate employees competitively and fairly.

Objective 3: Provide employees with opportunities for professional development and career advancement.

Objective 4: Reward and recognize employees who exceed expectations.

Objective 5: Provide employees with the requisite space, technology, and resources to do their work well.

Objective 6: Provide employees with well-being opportunities (i.e., free gym, grief counseling, work/family life balance).

---

**Strategic Focus Area #5: Strong Juvenile Justice Workforce**

**2011-2012 Strategic Initiatives/Projects**

1. Develop role-specific, juvenile justice training curriculum.

2. Provide cost-effective training across the state.
Section 6: Conclusion

The Michigan Juvenile Justice Vision 2020 Strategic Plan is an action agenda representing a collective voice for juvenile justice. It is exciting, ambitious and needed. It provides a blueprint for upholding and advancing the unique principles and features of juvenile courts as well as strengthening Michigan’s juvenile justice system in the years ahead.

With the Plan developed, efforts now turn to implementation, communicating and garnering support for the Plan, monitoring progress, and evaluating changes and improvements. Strategic Action Teams have been formed around each of the strategic focus areas to move the Plan forward. Juvenile justice leaders from across the state, including many from the initiative’s original Strategic Planning Oversight Team, have volunteered to participate on these action teams, which will work on completing their respective strategic initiatives in the months ahead. Full implementation will be underway following a late November meeting.

Also, efforts are planned to communicate and disseminate the Strategic Plan to Michigan’s juvenile justice community. Announcements, presentations to the courts, juvenile justice associations and other interested organizations, outreach to juvenile justice leaders and partners and publication of updates and progress are among the methods that will be used to distribute information and build support for the Plan.

Progress and accomplishments on the strategic initiatives will be monitored, documented, and evaluated through regular meetings and communications with team leaders and action team members. Coordinating the work of the Action Teams and regularly assessing progress will be a high priority.

Finally, at the end of each year, action team members and others involved in this strategic planning effort will collectively re-evaluate and establish new strategic initiatives. Doing so will help to further advance the work on this Strategic Plan, ultimately strengthening Michigan’s juvenile courts and juvenile justice system.
Appendix A: Glossary

Core Tenet – Core belief(s) generally accepted.

Goal – A statement that reflects an anticipated outcome or result.

Holistic – The theory that whole entities, as fundamental components of reality, have an existence other than as the mere sum of their parts.

Juvenile Court – A court having legal jurisdiction over youths, generally of less than 18 years of age.

Juvenile Justice System – The portion of the justice system that provides services and legal oversight of minors under court jurisdiction and their parent(s), guardians and other stakeholders.

Mission Statement – Expresses the fundamental purpose of an organization.

Objective – General statements that describe the manner in which the end result – or goal – will be achieved.

Priority Project – These are the shorter-term (1-2 years) strategic and operational priorities of the organization.

Stakeholders – People or organizations that have a stake in the services provided or outcomes achieved (e.g. legislators, counties, Supreme Court, the public).

Strategic Focus Areas – Internal or external, underlying issues that are fundamentally important to the organization over the long-term.

Strategic Focus Area Action Team – Each Action Team represents one of the five Strategic Focus areas. Action teams lead the facilitation of change and improvement efforts identified in their respective strategic focus areas. The Teams, which are comprised of SPOT members, staff from courts across the state, and members of juvenile justice related organizations, are responsible for completing priority projects, communicating progress and encouraging others to get involved.

Strategic Planning Oversight Team (SPOT) – The Strategic Planning Oversight Team consists of members who want to be actively involved in the implementation process and oversee the Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 Strategic Plan. They are charged with regular reviews of implementation, problem-solving challenges, maintaining focus, supporting the Action Teams, building support, sharing information and celebrating/acknowledging goal completion or success.

Vision Statement – Defines a preferred future of an organization. It describes what the organization desire to become or do in the future: what it should be at its best.
Appendix B:
External Juvenile Justice Trends Data – Summary, Graphs, and Charts

Summary of External Trends

Research on juvenile delinquency shows there are a variety of individual, family, and community risk factors. Examples of individual risk factors include: (1) learning disorders; (2) history of early aggressive behavior; (3) involvement with drugs, alcohol, or tobacco; (4) emotional problems or distress; and (5) exposure to violence or conflict in the family. Family risk factors are: (1) harsh, lax, or inconsistent disciplinary practices; (2) low parental involvement; (3) low parental education and income; (4) parental substance abuse or criminality; and (5) poor family functioning and poor supervision of children. Community risk factors include: (1) diminished economic opportunities; (2) high concentrations of poor residents; (3) high level of family disruption; (4) low levels of community participation; and (5) socially disorganized neighborhoods.

According to KIDS COUNT:13

1. The percent of children in single parent families in Michigan has increased from 30 percent in 2002 to 34 percent in 2009. While the divorce rate and/or out of wedlock births contribute in part to this increase, other social trends may also be contributing to this increase. For example, more women are choosing to have and raise children without a partner, in a single parent home.

2. The teen birth rate in Michigan has declined from 59 births per 1000 teens in 1990 to 33 births per 1000 teens in 2008. The teen birth rate has remained steady since 2003 (between 32-34 births per 1000 teens).

3. The teen death rate in Michigan declined steadily between 1990 and 2003 (from 92 teens per 100,000 to 55 teens per 1000 respectively). Since 2004, the teen death rate has begun to increase rising to 59 teens per 100,000 in 2007.

There also are a variety of peer and school risk factors, according to research findings. They include: (1) association with delinquent peers; (2) involvement in gangs; (3) social rejection by peers; (4) lack of involvement in conventional activities; (5) poor academic performance; and (6) low commitment to school and school failure.

4. The percent of teens ages 16-19 not in school and not high school graduates declined between 2000 and 2007, from 10 percent to 5 percent respectively. In 2008 and 2009, the percent increased to 6 percent.14

In addition to families and education, it is important to consider the economic framework affecting delinquency. For example, adverse economic conditions place strain on many families and economic status is related to delinquency.

5. The percent of children living in low income families in Michigan continues to rise. The percentage of children living in low income families has increased 12 percentage points in 9 years, from 32 percent in 2000 to 44 percent in 2009.\textsuperscript{15}

6. The percent of children living in poverty in Michigan also continues to rise. In 2000, 14 percent of children lived in poverty whereas in 2009, the percent jumped to 23 percent.\textsuperscript{16}

Below is a summary of a national public opinion poll conducted on juvenile justice issues by Act 4 Juvenile Justice available at \url{http://www.act4jj.org/media/factsheets/factsheet_54.pdf}.

7. Nearly 9 out of 10 people polled agreed that “almost all youth who commit crimes have the potential for change.”

8. More than seven out of 10 agreed that “incarcerating youthful offenders without rehabilitation is the same as giving up on them.”

9. Eight out of 10 favor reallocating money from incarceration to programs (e.g., counseling, education, and job training) for youthful offenders.

10. Treatment, supervision, and services were seen as very effective ways to rehabilitate youthful offenders. Less than 15 percent thought locking them up was very effective.

11. More than 8 out of 10 people said that providing community-based services is a somewhat or very effective way to rehabilitate youth.

12. The public favors keeping nonviolent juvenile offenders in community-based facilities or under community supervision.

13. A majority of respondents (slightly more than 60 percent) favor community supervision over incarceration for nonviolent juvenile offenders.

14. Nearly two-thirds (65 percent) of respondents said that youth from poor households who get arrested receive worse treatment by the justice system than youth from middle-income households arrested for the same offense.


### Delinquency Risk Factors

#### I. Individual Risk Factors
- History of violent victimization or involvement
- Attention deficits, hyperactivity, or learning disorders
- History of early aggressive behavior
- Involvement with drugs, alcohol, or tobacco
- Low IQ
- Poor behavioral control
- Deficits in social cognitive or information-processing abilities
- High emotional distress
- History of treatment for emotional problems
- Antisocial beliefs and attitudes
- Exposure to violence and conflict in the family

#### II. Family Risk Factors
- Authoritarian childrearing attitudes
- Harsh, lax, or inconsistent disciplinary practices
- Low parental involvement
- Low emotional attachment to parents or caregivers
- Low parental education and income
- Parental substance abuse or criminality
- Poor family functioning
- Poor monitoring and supervision of children
Community Risk Factors

- Diminished economic opportunities
- High concentrations of poor residents
- High level of transiency
- High level of family disruption
- Low levels of community participation
- Socially disorganized neighborhoods

Worksheet 1: Children in Single-Parent Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Worksheet 2: Teen Birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate per 1,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Worksheet 3: Teen Death

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Teen Death Rate (per 100,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer/School Risk Factors

- Association with delinquent peers
- Involvement in gangs
- Social rejection by peers
- Lack of involvement in conventional activities
- Poor academic performance
- Low commitment to school and school failure

Worksheet 4: Drop-out Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to families and education, it is important to look at the economic framework revolving around delinquency:

- Economic resources of family you were born into plays critical role in determining future economic status
- Adverse economic conditions place strain on many families
- Economic status is related to delinquency
- Economic arrangements influence families, schools, communities, and peer groups that are related to delinquency

### Worksheet 5: Low-Income Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Children in Low-Income Families (200% below)
Worksheet 6: Children in Poverty

Problems That Will Continue to Influence America’s Youths, Families, Communities, and Juvenile Courts

- Family disorder resulting in separation
- Exposure to violence, domestic conflict, and poor parenting practices
- Unmet educational, psychological, and emotional needs
- Drug use
- Mental health problems
- Teen pregnancy
- School failure
- Poverty and social disorganization
- Gangs and gang violence
- Societal support for juvenile rehabilitation
- A shift toward a more professional Juvenile Justice system
- Delinquency will increasingly be seen as a community problem that requires a more coordinated response
- More emphasis will be placed on program development and evaluation in the future
### The Social Context of Juvenile Justice

- The influence of the political economy on the practice of juvenile justice:
  - Political and economic resources impacts youth behavior and social institutions
  - Economic resources available to law enforcement agencies, juvenile courts, and correctional agencies affect staffing, programs, and support
  - Funding allocation decisions are a result of a political process at state, local, and agency levels

### Juvenile Justice Reforms

- **Legal Issues**
  - Development of the *family court* and changes in process, procedure, and attitude
  - *Therapeutic jurisprudence* and *restorative justice*
  - Lack of access to justice
- **Public attitudes**
1. The Public recognizes the potential of young people to change.

1a. The public recognizes the potential of young people to change.
2. The public supports redirecting government funds from incarceration to counseling, education and job training for youth offenders.

Eight out of 10 favor reallocating money from incarceration to programs for youthful offenders.

**Favor**
- Strongly 60%
- Somewhat 24%
- Somewhat 6%

**Oppose**
- Strongly 9%

“Do you favor or oppose taking away some of the money your state government spends on incarcerating youth offenders and spending it instead on programs for counseling, education and job training for youth offenders. Is that strongly or somewhat favor/oppose?”

3. The public views the provision of treatment, services and community supervision as more effective ways of rehabilitating youth than incarceration.

Treatment, supervision and services were seen as "very effective" ways to rehabilitate youthful offenders. Less than 15 percent thought that "locking them up" was "very effective."

- Helping Youth get a High School Education: 72%
- Vocational Training and Job Skills: 66%
- Aftercare Services: 63%
- Mental Health Treatment: 60%
- Family Counseling: 57%
- Mentoring by an Adult: 55%
- Community Service: 51%
- Counseling by a Social Worker: 41%
- Juvenile Facilities: 13%
- Adult Facilities: 9%

“I am going to read you a list of things the juvenile justice system can do to help rehabilitate youth who commit crimes. In your opinion, please tell me how effective each of the following is in rehabilitating youth offenders: very effective, somewhat effective, not very effective, or not at all effective way to rehabilitate youth who commit crimes?”
4. The public favors keeping nonviolent juveniles in small, residential facilities in their own communities rather than in large distant institutions.
5. The public believes the juvenile justice system treats low-income youth, African American youth and Hispanic youth unfairly.
**State Trends: Legislative Changes from 2005 to 2010**

**Removing Youth from the Adult Criminal Justice System**

**Trend 1:** Four states (Colorado, Maine, Virginia and Pennsylvania) have passed laws limiting the ability to house youth in adult jails and prisons.

**Trend 2:** Three states (Connecticut, Illinois, and Mississippi) have expanded their juvenile court jurisdiction so that older youth who previously would be automatically tried as adults are not prosecuted in adult criminal court.

**Trend 3:** Ten states (Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Nevada, Utah, Virginia and Washington) have changed their transfer laws making it more likely that youth will stay in the juvenile justice system.

**Trend 4:** Four states (Colorado, Georgia, Texas and Washington) have all changed their mandatory minimum sentencing laws to take into account the developmental differences between youth and adults.

---

**State Trends Continued…**

- 2007 Rhode Island experiment with moving 17yr olds to the adult correctional system finds it more costly to house youths in adult facilities.
- 13 states set juvenile court jurisdiction to end at ages 16 and 17:
  - (Age 16) New York and North Carolina
  - (Age 17) Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois (felonies only), Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Hampshire, South Carolina, Texas, and Wisconsin
- More than 2 million 16-17 year olds will be prosecuted in the adult system as a direct result of these laws.
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Overview:
2011 Strategic Planning Survey

- The planning survey was conducted in August and September 2011.
- Purpose: to inform the planning process & help shape the future direction and priorities of Michigan’s juvenile court system.
- The Project Planning Committee developed the survey.
- Dr. Brenda J. Wagenknecht-Ivey of PRAXIS Consulting, Inc. (project consultant) administered the survey and summarized results.
Overview:
2011 Strategic Planning Survey

- Juvenile Justice Professionals Surveyed:
  - Family and Juvenile Court Judges
  - Circuit Court and Family/Juvenile Division Administrators
  - Juvenile Court Referees
  - Juvenile Registers
  - Juvenile Court Probation Officers/Treatment Caseworkers
  - SCAO and DHS Representatives

NOTE: email addresses were provided by SCAO.

Overview:
2011 Strategic Planning Survey

- The survey was originally sent to 750 people across Michigan

- Final Count: n=687 (after deleting some people due to inaccurate email addresses or people advising they were not involved in juvenile matters)

- Response Rate: 51% (n=353)
3 Types of Survey Questions:

1. Scaled questions assessing various aspects of the juvenile justice system
2. Scaled questions identifying future priorities
3. Two narrative questions
   - Most wanted changes/improvements in the next 2 years (list up to 3)
   - Additional comments for consideration in the strategic planning process

Interpreting the Data:

- Two rating scales were used in this survey:
  - Agreement Scale: 10 = strongly agree; 1 = strongly disagree
  - Importance Scale: 10 = most important; 1 = least important

- Higher average ratings reflect stronger agreement/(more favorable ratings) and higher importance.

- 5.5 is the mid-point of a 10 point rating scale.

- “N” sizes show the number of people in a survey group and/or that answered each question.
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The Family and Child Development

- The family plays a key role in child development and socialization
- Family’s placement in political and economic structure determines family’s access to other institutions/resources
- Family shapes child’s values, personality and behavior
- Relationship quality between parent and child/children most important
- Ways in which child is taught cultural roles and normal adult responsibilities is significant
Family Structure and Delinquency

- Family Construction:
  - Changed due to women’s participation in work force
  - Increase in single parent homes
- Impact of Single-Parent Home on Delinquency:
  - More likely to live in single-parent households
  - Can influence the likelihood of delinquent behavior although relationship between living in a single-parent home and delinquency is weak

Family Relations and Delinquency

- Family Socialization and Delinquency
  - One aspect of socialization is concerned with the social control of children:
    - Bonds between family members
    - Family conflict, hostility, and a lack of warmth and affection → increase delinquency
  - Family crises and change have also been found to be related to delinquency
Family Relations and Delinquency

- Family Socialization and Delinquency, cont.
  - Discipline is also used to exert social control
    - When discipline is lax, inconsistent, or abusive, delinquency is more likely
  - Child abuse and neglect influences delinquency and criminal behavior
  - Conflict between parents, domestic violence and child abuse, and sexual abuse influence a child’s belief about what is acceptable behavior

Family Relations and Delinquency

- Child abuse/neglect continued:
  - According to a 2010 study, 772,000 children were abused in 2008
  - In 2008, the Bureau reported 1,740 children died from their abusers
  - 80% of abusers were parents (9 out of 10 being biological parents)

Schools and Delinquency

- Schools have a profound influence on children
  - Children are spending more time in school
  - Schools teach youths skills which are needed for participation in social and economic life
  - Schools are important when determining one’s economic and social status
  - However, many youths do not experience success in school

School Failure and Delinquency

- Students who fail in school are at risk of delinquency
- Factors related to school failure:
  - Lack of commitment/attachment to school
  - Student alienation
  - Those of lower SES may lack prerequisite skills for academic success
  - Higher rates of failure in nonacademic or vocational tracks
  - Fail to see relevance of school curricula → more problems in school
**School Dropouts and Delinquency**

- **Negative consequences:**
  - Diminished job prospects and difficulty meeting income needs
  - Psychological and social consequences
  - Personal dissatisfaction and regret
  - Lower occupational aspirations
  - Lower educational aspirations for their children

**School Dropouts and Delinquency**

- **Dropouts tend to be:**
  - From low SES groups
  - Members of minority groups
  - From homes with fewer study aids
  - From single-parent homes or from homes with less parental supervision
  - More likely to receive poor grades and low scores on achievement tests
  - Less likely to be involved in extracurricular activities
  - More likely to have discipline problems
School Dropouts and Delinquency

- Research on dropping out and delinquency has produced mixed results:
  - Some research indicates delinquent behavior decreases after youths drop out
  - Other research indicates that youths’ criminal activities increases after dropping out
  - Focus of school policy should be to reduce dropout rate by improving the ability to meet the needs of all students

Substance Use in Juveniles

- A majority of court-involved adolescents have recently used illegal substances; more serious and chronic adolescent offenders have used more substances and are more likely to qualify for a diagnosis of a substance use disorder
- Strong association between reported serious offending and substance use
- Researchers who follow adolescent offenders over time find that substance use at one age is one of the most consistent indicators of continued serious offending at a later age
- Early substance use predicts subsequent criminal behavior in adolescents
Substance Use in Juveniles

- Substance Use and juvenile may be a reciprocal relationship:
  - Substance use may initiate/heighten the risk of offending either independently or in conjunction with other risk factors (i.e. environmental factors, mental disorders, witnessing violent behavior/crimes etc.)
  - “Being high” can lower inhibitions against involvement in criminal acts (a psychopharmacological explanation), and/or committing crime might be a way to obtain funds to support substance use

Problems That Will Continue to Influence America’s Youths, Families, Communities, and Juvenile Courts

- Family disorder resulting in separation
- Exposure to violence, domestic conflict, and poor parenting practices
- Unmet educational, psychological, and emotional needs
- Drug use
- Mental health problems
- Teen pregnancy
- School failure
- Poverty and social disorganization
- Gangs and gang violence
- Societal support for juvenile rehabilitation
- A shift toward a more professional Juvenile Justice system
- Delinquency will increasingly be seen as a community problem that requires a more coordinated response
- More emphasis will be placed on program development and evaluation in the future
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Illinois Juvenile Justice Reforms since 1998

  - Adopting balanced and restorative justice (BARJ) which operates behind 3 main goals:
    - 1. Accountability
    - 2. Community safety
    - 3. Competency development
- Illinois Juvenile Justice Reforms 2010
  - January 1, 2010: youth 17 years charged with misdemeanor offenses occurring on or after January 1, 2010, are considered juveniles
  - Youth 17 years and charged with felonies remain under the jurisdiction of adult criminal court
Michigan Juvenile Justice Reform

The vision of the Bureau of Juvenile Justice is to promote safe communities by:
- Providing comprehensive treatment and services for juvenile offenders through which they will develop competencies to assist in achieving independence and responsibility.
- Holding juvenile offenders accountable for their behavior and working towards repairing harm done to the victim and the community.
- Providing leadership within the juvenile justice community by promoting best practices and comprehensive treatment and services for juvenile offenders in Michigan.
- Providing targeted high-need communities with the necessary resources or information to create purposeful and collaborative juvenile delinquency prevention programs.

Michigan Youth Programs

- The Department of Human Services has maintained a commitment to the positive development of young people through collaborative and coordinated efforts by Juvenile Justice, Foster Care, Protective Services, DHS county office staff, providers and community partners throughout the state. Services are provided through a variety of diverse and innovative programs designed to meet a wide range of individual needs and circumstances of youth.
- Projects range from:
  - College tuition assistance
  - Teen Parenting
  - Vocational and employment training
  - Crisis assistance to runaway and homeless
  - Independent living for youth with disabilities
  - Unique leadership training for youth with disabilities
MDFT

Multidimensional Family Therapy
- (MDFT) a family-based, comprehensive treatment system for adolescent drug abuse and related behavioral/emotional problems
- Theory driven, combining aspects of family systems theory, developmental psychology, and the risk and protective model of adolescent substance abuse
- Incorporates key elements of effective adolescent drug treatment
  - Comprehensive assessment (an integrated treatment approach)
  - Family involvement
  - Developmentally appropriate interventions
- Conducted 1 to 3 times per week over 3 to 6 mo.
- Therapists work in home and at the clinic treating the adolescent, parent, family and extrafamilial in three stages:
  - 1. Building a foundation for change
  - 2. Facilitating individual and family change
  - 3. Solidify changes and launch

MDFT Successes

- In a study comparing MDFT treatment to “conditions as usual” treatment (or ESAU):
  - MDFT retained 87% of participants compared to 13% of ESAU within 3 months
  - In a previous MDFT study, when interacting with offenders 2x per week over 4 months, 96% of participants were retained
  - MDFT participants were more satisfied with their treatment than those receiving ESAU
  - Discharged youth were associated with improvement in adolescent outcome, specifically; decreases in substance use, marginally greater decreases in delinquency, and the number of times participants reported having unprotected sex in the previous 90 days
Balanced and Restorative Justice

- BARJ Model: The foundation of restorative juvenile justice practice is a coherent set of values and principles, a guiding vision, and an action-oriented mission
- BARJ components:
  - Crime is injury.
  - Crime hurts individual victims, communities, and juvenile offenders and creates an obligation to make things right.
  - All parties should be a part of response to crime, including victim if he or she wishes, the community, and the juvenile offender.
  - The victim's perspective is central to deciding how to repair the harm caused by the crime.
  - Accountability for the juvenile offender means accepting responsibility and acting to repair the harm done.
  - The community is responsible for the well-being of all its members, including both victim and offender.
  - All human beings have dignity and worth.
  - Restoration -- repairing the harm and rebuilding relationships in the community -- is the primary goal of restorative juvenile justice.
  - Results are measured by how much repair was done rather than by how much punishment was inflicted.
  - Crime control cannot be achieved without active involvement of the community.
  - The juvenile justice process is respectful of age, abilities, sexual orientation, family status, and diverse cultures and backgrounds -- whether racial, ethnic, geographic, religious, economic, or other -- and all are given equal protection and due process.

BARJ Vision

The Restorative Justice Vision

- Support from the community, opportunity to define the harm experienced, and participation in decision making about steps for repair result in increased victim recovery from the trauma of crime.
- Community involvement in preventing and controlling juvenile crime, improving neighborhoods, and strengthening the bonds among community members results in community protection.
- Through understanding the human impact of their behavior, accepting responsibility, expressing remorse, taking action to repair the damage, and developing their own capacities, juvenile offenders become fully integrated, respected members of the community.
- Juvenile justice professionals, as community justice facilitators, organize and support processes in which individual crime victims, other community members, and juvenile offenders are involved in finding constructive resolutions to delinquency.
What works?

- Weekly home visits by preschool teachers appear to reduce the probability of arrest through age 15
- Family therapy and parental training
- School organizational strategies which enforce rules and reward positive behavior
- Some school-wide initiatives (e.g. antibullying campaigns) can also reduce crime and substance abuse
- School home visits and preschool involvement
- School organizational strategies that address the "whole child" including emotional, environmental, and familial factors
What's Promising?

- Gang monitoring programs with teams made up of probation and police officers can sometimes reduce gang violence.
- After school recreation programs may reduce juvenile crime in the immediate areas.
- Specialized school programs that place youth into smaller, more flexible instructional units might reduce drug abuse and delinquency.
- At least one Big Brother/Big Sister mentoring program reduced drug abuse.
- Schools with the capacity to implement and maintain innovative programs and improve classroom management may reduce alcohol use and delinquency.
- Intensive supervision of first time, minor juvenile offenders (especially status offenders) reduced recidivism among youth in one study. Another intensive supervision study also yielded positive results among serious juvenile offenders.
- The residential program known as "Job Corps" reduced felony arrests among at-risk youth for at least four years after program completion.
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