



MICHIGAN JUVENILE JUSTICE VISION 20/20

2015-2018 Strategic Plan

“The Path Forward”



JUVENILE JUSTICE
VISION 20/20

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 Executive Team	iii
Section 1: Introduction and Overview	1
Section 2: Juvenile Court Core Tenet, Vision, and Core Values	4
Section 3: Trends Summary and Implications on Juvenile Justice	5
Section 4: Juvenile Justice System Assessment: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats	7
Section 5: Strategic Focus Areas (SFAs), Goals, and Objectives.....	9
SFA 1: Unique Purpose of the Juvenile Court	10
SFA 2: Effective Outcomes – Juveniles, Families and Communities	12
SFA 3: Juvenile Court Operational Performance.....	13
SFA 4: Adequate and Stable Funding	15
SFA 5: Strong Juvenile Justice Workforce	17
Section 6: Conclusion	19
Appendices.....	21
Trends Data	21
Bibliography	30

Acknowledgements

This Strategic Plan represents the current aspirations of Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 (JJV 20/20), an innovative grassroots organization dedicated to the improvement of juvenile justice in Michigan. The process of obtaining the content for this Plan reflects a collaborative effort by many committed, juvenile justice professionals representing various state departments, juvenile courts, private agencies, law enforcement, education, technology, professional organizations and other interested stakeholders. Those who participated in this strategic planning process and who have worked on various priority projects over the past four years are sincerely acknowledged for their willingness to give of their time, talent and expertise toward an improved juvenile justice system in Michigan.

Special recognition is extended to the members of the JJV 20/20 Executive Team:

- Sandi Metcalf – President (20th Circuit – Ottawa & the Michigan Association for Family Court Administration)
- Bob Nida – Vice President (Barry County Trial Courts - retired)
- Dr. Kathy Bailey – Treasurer (Grand Valley State University, School of Criminal Justice)
- Heather Blodgett – Secretary (20th Circuit - Ottawa)
- Linda Edwards-Brown (Washtenaw County Trial Courts & the Michigan Association for Family Court Administration)
- Kevin J. Bowling (20th Circuit - Ottawa)
- John Evans (44th Circuit - Livingston)
- Pat Sussex (Dept. of Health and Human Services)
- Dr. Herman McCall (Dept. of Health and Human Services)
- Derek Hitchcock (Highfields, Inc. and the Michigan Federation of Children and Families)
- Nicole Faulds (16th Circuit – Macomb)
- Carla Grezeszak (23rd Circuit – Iosco & the Northern Michigan Juvenile Officers Association)
- Beverly Grant (Grand Valley State University, Johnson Center for Philanthropy) – Position currently vacant
- Andrea Reenders (20th Circuit – Ottawa; Administrative Support)
-

Their commitment and leadership make certain the JJV 20/20 organization remains strong and protects the interests of youth and families served within the juvenile justice system.

State Court Administrative Office liaisons, Jennifer Warner and Noah Bradow, are acknowledged for their contributions and support.

The 20th Circuit and the Ottawa County Probate Courts, with the support of chief judges, Hon. Ed Post and Hon. Mark Feyen, are acknowledged for their belief in the value of JJV 20/20. Sincere gratitude is extended to the 20th Circuit Court administration, as it functions as the fiduciary of several grants.

The Bureau of Justice Assistance is acknowledged for providing grant funding for the development and implementation of the Multi-Jurisdictional Juvenile Justice Data Sharing Project.

The National Center for State Courts (Dr. Tom Clarke & Jim Cabral), SEARCH, The National Consortium of Justice Information and Statistics (Scott Came & Andrew Owen), the Michigan Dept. of Technology, Management and Budget (Jim Hogan and Gideon Francis), the State Court Administrative Office (Marcus Dobek), Bizstream (Mark Schmidt, Cory Vanden Bout) and the five pilot juvenile court administrators –

Monte Starkweather (8th Circuit - Ionia), Andy Thalhammer (17th Circuit - Kent), Sue Darling (9th Circuit - Kalamazoo), Elvin Gonzalez (2nd Circuit - Berrien) and Sandi Metcalf (20th Circuit - Ottawa) are acknowledged for their leadership and their expertise in the implementation of the Multi-Jurisdictional Juvenile Justice Data Sharing Project. Grand Valley State University leaders (Dr. George Grant, Dr. Kathy Bailey, Dr. William Crawley, Dr. Jodi Petersen, Dr. Jerry Johnson & Beverly Grant) are acknowledged for their commitment and support.

Dr. Brenda J. Wagenknecht-Ivey, CEO of PRAXIS Consulting, Inc., is gratefully acknowledged for her facilitation of the strategic planning process. Her knowledge of Michigan's court system and expertise in strategic planning processes greatly benefitted this process.



This document was developed under grant number SJI-13-T-086. The points of view expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the State Justice Institute.

2015-2018 Strategic Plan

Section 1: Introduction and Overview

The first Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 Strategic Plan was completed in November, 2011. The overarching goal of the strategic planning process was to increase awareness of juvenile justice through the establishment of a statewide action agenda for juvenile justice improvement in Michigan.

The initial strategic planning process was collaborative and inclusive of anyone who was invested in the improvement of the juvenile justice system in Michigan. From this effort, five strategic focus areas emerged: 1) The Unique Purpose of the Juvenile Courts; 2) Effective Outcomes for Youth, Families and Communities; 3) Juvenile Court Operational Performance; 4) Adequate and Sustainable Funding; and 5) A Strong Juvenile Justice Workforce.

Over the past three years, Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 members have successfully led multiple efforts toward juvenile justice system reformation and improvements. Finally, juvenile justice is becoming part of the discussion among legislators and government at the state and local levels.

The following are highlights of a few major accomplishments of Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20:

- 1) Unique Purpose of the Juvenile Courts – Developed a Juvenile Court Core Tenets Briefing Book which identifies the statutory and policy citations that are foundational to the juvenile courts in Michigan. Monitored juvenile justice legislation, and met with various legislators offering subject matter expertise and education, as needed.
- 2) Effective Outcomes – Conducted a comprehensive review of Risk/Needs Assessments used by juvenile courts throughout the state and included recommendations. This project culminated in a robust Juvenile Justice Risk Assessment Report which has been used nationally by the Global Advisory Committee and other states/organizations as they have examined the efficacy of risk assessments use within the criminal justice and juvenile justice systems.
- 3) Juvenile Court Operational Performance (Data) – The Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 organization identified juvenile justice data as a very high priority in the strategic planning process. Thus, within the first year of operation, a survey of those submitting and sharing juvenile justice data was conducted to determine what data was being collected; who was collecting the data; to whom the data was being submitted; and with whom the data was being shared. A “Datapalooza” gathering of all those who participated in the survey and other stakeholders was hosted at the Ottawa County Administration Building and a Datapalooza Report resulted from continued discussion, emphasizing the need for juvenile justice data in Michigan.
- 4) Adequate and Sustainable Funding – Developed a Funding Briefing Book which assists stakeholders in understanding how the juvenile justice system and accompanying treatment programs are funded in Michigan.
- 5) Strong Juvenile Justice Workforce – Conducted a survey of juvenile justice professionals to determine training needs within the state. This survey has informed the training agendas for statewide juvenile justice trainings which have been hosted at Grand Valley State University in Grand Rapids, MI.

- 6) Data continued – In October, 2013, Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 received a grant award from the Bureau of Justice Assistance. In response, the Executive Team and Action Team members, along with several juvenile justice stakeholders, designed and developed a statewide Juvenile Justice Data Sharing Model which is in the process of being implemented in five pilot juvenile courts. This project represents a comprehensive approach to develop a sustainable, data collection and sharing juvenile justice system in Michigan. With the assistance of BJA grant funding, JJV 20/20 has developed a Juvenile Justice Data Dictionary and completed the Service Specification Package for technologists to use for consistent implementation across the state. Interestingly, the Data Dictionary is the first, collective approach toward common data definitions and a common language among the Michigan juvenile courts.

This has been a rigorous and ambitious project for a volunteer organization with limited resources, made possible in large part due to and has included close partnerships with case management vendors, pilot juvenile court administrators/judges, local and state technologists, the Michigan Department of Technology, Management and Budget (DTMB), the State Court Administrative Office, Grand Valley State University/Community Resource Institute, and the Department of Human Services. An additional four pilot juvenile courts will be implemented following March 31, 2015 with a targeted completion date of October 1, 2015, through a small grant from the Michigan Committee on Juvenile Justice. The 20th Circuit Court functions as the fiduciary for all the grants and has provided project management along with the support from DTMB. This project is also of interest to other states who are struggling with juvenile justice data collection and data sharing.

These are just a few of the accomplishments Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 has achieved in a brief period of time with the ultimate goal of improving Michigan's juvenile justice system. Unmentioned are countless hours of volunteer time to co-lead SFA Action Teams, write and review documents, prepare and monitor grant applications, and advocate for juvenile justice funding, policy and laws which support the basic tenets of the system. Many of the documents cited above can be found on the Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 website hosted by Grand Valley State University at:

<http://www.gvsu.edu/juvenilejusticevision2020>

This Strategic Plan represents “The Path Forward”. Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 is over four years strong and represents hundreds of juvenile justice professionals who continue to seek improvements for youth, families and communities through effective juvenile justice. As reflected, some needs and aspirations stay the same, while many change with time. Quality and reliable data continues to be an absolute necessity to sustain a viable, quality juvenile justice system within Michigan. Demands for varied, flexible and/or increased funding are at the heart of the system in order to address the needs of youth and families.

Over the past four years, however, the need for consistent types and levels of services across jurisdictional lines as well as seamless services across agencies, has arisen. Concern about the numbers of Baby Boomers retiring and leaving an institutional knowledge void in juvenile justice is significant, and the lack of funding for prevention services is identified as detrimental to an effective juvenile justice system. Education of legislators and the public about the judicial branch of government and the juvenile justice system – including the juvenile courts – is paramount as delinquency is a community issue, not just a juvenile court issue. Effective and devoted champions for juvenile justice are critically needed.

As the implementation of this Plan assists in continuing to address previously identified issues relevant today and tackles the emerging issues, it is important to remain focused on the ultimate goal – to administer justice and restore wholeness to those who enter the juvenile courts and stakeholder organizations through an improved, salient, meaningful juvenile justice system. This effort takes unmitigated commitment of everyone involved, and together, the quality of life in all communities will be improved and preserved.

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

(October 2011)

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

Understanding juvenile justice trends is critical to the improvement of the overall system. During the strategic planning process, a trends analysis was conducted through extensive discussion which covered a variety of areas identified below. A literature review was also conducted in delinquency, incarceration and waiver rates, and areas of legal, procedural, psychological, gender, interventions, and reform trends.

The following are some trends identified and discussed during the strategic planning process:

Over all rates and caseloads of delinquent youth in the juvenile courts are down. However, it appears the complexity of cases has increased.

Lack of parent engagement raises more challenges in the efforts of case management. Many suffer from personal mental health and substance abuse disorders, and they simply do not know how to engage in the treatment process with their child. For those parents who do engage, the challenges are tough in that social media and technology have exposed their children to age inappropriate information and choices that are hard to resist during a time when the teen's brain is still developing.

Increased referrals of children and youth who manifest mental health disorders and cognitive deficits coupled with delinquent behavior. These youth are entering the juvenile courts accompanied by their respective psychotropic cocktails that often include "uppers" and "downers" at a rapid rate. Such medications require increased services and understanding of their impact and influence on youths' behavior and can make it more challenging to help a youth in mood self-regulation, behavior control, etc.

Criminalizing youth in order for them to receive services is common across the state. Access to mental health services on a community level are limited, thus forcing law enforcement to charge a youth with a law violation in order for them to obtain mental health and other services through the juvenile court. The unintended consequence is twofold: 1) The juvenile courts are not mental health clinics, nor is it their original purpose so services may or may not meet the need of these youth, and 2) Once the youth has been charged with a legal violation, the charge may follow them into adulthood and negatively impact their chances for a job, housing and a host of other opportunities due to biases associated with those who break the law.

Education is a significant issue for delinquent youth due to the interpretation of the zero tolerance laws across the state. Some juvenile courts have court operated schools used to educate those youth who are severely struggling or who have been expelled or long term suspended from school. The alternative is to have youth home or on the street unsupervised because they cannot be in school and their parent(s) work.

An increase in community based programming has occurred across the state and is considered to be a best practice to use community based programs rather than residentially place youth. Some rural jurisdictions struggle more than others to develop an array of services in the community, but overall, the outcomes are better when the youth can participate in treatment, locally.

Increased understanding and use of criminogenic risk/needs assessments is helping juvenile courts better identify and address the specific needs of youth. Such assessments also provide a mechanism by

which progress can be measured and adjustments to the dosage and type of treatment can be monitored and modified. Although several juvenile courts use such instruments, the practice needs to be expanded.

Raising the age of culpability efforts are gaining muster. This effort would extend the jurisdiction of the juvenile court to eighteen in order to treat seventeen year olds as minors rather than adults. The intended result is to acknowledge the brain science which notes the adolescent brain continues to develop until the age of twenty-six and in some cases, beyond. Thus, providing age appropriate treatment and intervention services to those youth within the juvenile courts aligns with the brain science. Although this effort may be valid, the lack of data to support this is of concern. Further, without the data analysis, it is difficult to anticipate the potential costs on a local level and the unintended consequence may be that other programs and staffing levels suffer.

Funding challenges and the perceived lack of a voice in decision making at the state level have raised concerns about how effective collaborations will be impacted. Trust among the courts, counties and state agencies must be based on quality communication and partnership. A trend toward less communication and more state control while pushing costs down to the county level has the potential to negatively impact long standing, trusting relationships. This can potentially erode the positive change experienced through the development of evidence based programs within the community, leveraging the Child Care Fund.

For more specific trends which are reflective of national, state and local research, please see the Trends document located in the Appendix.

Section 4: Juvenile Justice System Assessment: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats

Juvenile justice professionals that attended the spring and fall 2014 Bi-Annual Planning meetings assisted the Executive Team in completing a juvenile justice system assessment. Specifically, attendees helped identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Juvenile Justice System in Michigan at this time as well as the opportunities and threats facing the system in the next three years. Below is a summary of the assessment.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The Child Care Fund provides effective and targeted funding for juvenile justice services.2. JJV20/20 is making a difference in Michigan. Strong passionate leaders are advocating for and implementing changes. JJV20/20 provides a collective, grassroots voice and strategic agenda/priorities.3. Additional resources/grants have been secured to advance change and improvements.4. Juvenile justice policy makers appear to be more aware, informed, and enthusiastic about juvenile justice issues and needs.5. There is increased collaboration among juvenile justice agencies and leaders.6. Data improvements are underway.7. There are many committed, dedicated professionals in the juvenile justice system.8. More judges and attorneys see the need for, and value of, investing in youth and helping youth and families succeed.9. Innovative programs and practices are being tested and implemented statewide. Use of evidence-based and individualized treatment programs for youth is on the rise.10. Juvenile justice professionals are trying to take a more holistic approach to treating and helping youth and families succeed.11. Many new hires have more education and new skill sets.12. JJV20/20 is providing needed training for juvenile justice professionals.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Funding is insufficient, unstable, inconsistent, and inflexible.2. A full array of services to help youth and families succeed is not available. The courts/agencies are not able to provide needed, specialized and intensive services to youth.3. There is no statewide juvenile justice agenda – (e.g., agreement at all levels and across agencies/court system); state level leadership is needed4. There is resistance to change; not all courts/agencies/partners are willing to collaborate.5. Inconsistencies persist throughout the state (e.g., among juvenile justice agencies/partners, in available services/ programs, in operational practices and processes, etc.)6. Juvenile justice services are fragmented; they are not seamless and integrated across courts, agencies, and partners.7. Quality data is not yet available to guide decision making (although progress is being made).8. More juvenile justice advocates are needed; there are too few judges, policy makers, others who are committed to improving the juvenile justice system.9. Politics can interfere with what is in the best interests of youth and families.

Opportunities	Threats
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. JJV20/20 should continue being a strong, visible, grassroots leader and voice for juvenile justice reform and improvements in Michigan. 2. Continue to advocate for sound, helpful juvenile justice policy. 3. Continue collaborating with, and educating, state and local leaders and policy makers to strengthen the juvenile justice system. 4. Work to secure adequate, stable, and sustainable funding for the juvenile justice system. 5. Enhance the use of technology to improve efficiency and effectiveness. 6. Continue improving and sharing appropriate data and use accurate aggregate and individual data to drive policy and operational decision making. 7. Provide a complete continuum/array of effective services and treatment programs to help youth and families succeed. 8. Work with partners to expand and strengthen prevention and early intervention services and programs. 9. Form new partnerships to enhance the juvenile justice system (e.g., with academic institutions, community partners, schools, etc.). 10. Develop an integrated, seamless system of juvenile justice services across agencies. 11. Invest in and develop the juvenile justice workforce and next generation of leaders and advocates. 12. Stay abreast of, participate in, and implement innovative programs and practices to increase efficiency and achieve effective outcomes. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deterioration of societal/community/social values; continued racism, sexism, classism, etc. 2. Apathy in society; negative attitudes about the future of youth. 3. Public policy that adversely affects the juvenile justice system. 4. Competing voices and priorities; lack of agreement on priorities, needs, plan of action. 5. Resistance/refusal to change/make needed improvements. 6. Turf issues, silos, and/or lack of collaboration among juvenile justice agencies and leaders. 7. Inadequate and unstable funding of the juvenile justice system. 8. Failure to have a full continuum/array of services and programs to help youth and families succeed. 9. Lack of quality of data and/or inability to use good data to drive decision making. 10. Inability to recruit and retain a workforce passionate about juvenile justice and helping youth and families. 11. Failure to invest in the workforce of the future; having an unprepared, unequipped, and/or untrained workforce. 12. Apathy among juvenile justice leaders and professionals.

Section 5: Strategic Focus Areas, Long-Range Goals, and Objectives

The JJV 20/20 Executive Team revised the strategic focus areas (SFAs), long-range goals, and objectives in early January 2015 based on the planning sessions held in April and October 2014. The revised strategic focus areas, goals, and objectives reflect the current state of affairs of juvenile justice in Michigan as well as progress and accomplishments over the last four years.

A brief description of each SFA is provided below. Also included are the goals and objectives, which will serve as a roadmap for continuing to improve and reform Michigan’s juvenile justice system. The annual strategic priorities of JJV 20/20 are presented in a separate companion document – “Annual Strategic Priorities.” The companion document – “Annual Strategic Priorities” – will be updated annually to reflect JJV 20/20’s strategic projects for the year.

Michigan Juvenile Justice – Vision 20/20
Strategic Focus Areas
(Revised January 2015)

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

STRATEGIC FOCUS AREA #1: ADVANCE THE 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.

Building a collective identity, building consensus around a statewide juvenile justice agenda, and promoting a common voice are high priorities for JJV 20/20. All are necessary to continue making system improvements and bringing about comprehensive juvenile justice reform in Michigan. To that end, JJV 20/20 is committed to developing and promoting informed champions for juvenile justice in the legislature and communities across the state as well as an educated public. Additionally, JJV 20/20 is committed to collaborating with all agencies, partners, and committees on juvenile justice reform initiatives to establish and advance a statewide juvenile justice agenda and make needed improvements. Finally, JJV 20/20 will continue to actively shape juvenile justice legislation and public policy ensuring the laws and policy support and are consistent with the core tenet of juvenile courts.

Great strides have been made over the past four years to preserve and educate about the unique purpose of the juvenile court and advance a statewide reform agenda. JJV 20/20 recognizes more work is needed, however. JJV 20/20 looks forward to continuing its work to ensure Michigan's juvenile justice system is able to administer fair and equal justice, provide individualized, comprehensive, and effective programs for delinquent youth, and ensure accountability that builds safe, resilient communities.

Goals and Objectives

Goal 1: Juvenile justice leaders 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 stakeholders, partners, and the public 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 reform in Michigan is driven by legislation and public policy that supports the core tenet of the Juvenile Court.

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

Objective 2: Advocate for juvenile justice priorities.

Objective 3: Collaborate with others to implement changes and reform initiatives.

Objective 4: Educate and build support for juvenile justice matters among legislators, public policy makers, justice system and community partners, and the public.

Objective 5: Implement public policy and legislation within and across juvenile courts consistently.

Priority Projects:

- Educate the public and other interested parties by creating a website that will describe the juvenile court.
- Create a video or public service announcement relating to juvenile courts and/or JJV 20/20.
- Collaborate with stakeholders to develop positive public policy legislation.

STRATEGIC FOCUS AREA #2: ACHIEVE 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 that includes more prevention and early intervention programs 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 and build support for a complete continuum of care including prevention and early intervention programs.

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

Objective 4: Implement a complete continuum of care consistently across all areas of the state using innovative and cost effective methods.

Objective 5: Collaborate with partners to provide and expand needed and appropriate treatment and services.

Objective 6: Provide seamless services across all juvenile justice service agencies and providers.

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

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

Objective 2: Provide juvenile justice services staff with the tools and resources needed to produce quality data.

Objective 3: Develop and enhance juvenile IT/case management system data sharing across the state.

Objective 4: Develop consistent methods for assessing and evaluating juvenile programs.

Objective 5: Share and implement best practices.

Priority Projects:

- Develop a standardized method by which Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 disseminates important information.
- Complete and analyze the results of the risk and needs assessment survey.
- Complete and analyze the results of a compendium of services in communities.

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.

Priority Projects:

- Increase juvenile justice collaboration at the community and state level.
- Expand the Juvenile Justice Data Sharing project.

STRATEGIC FOCUS AREA #4: SECURE ADEQUATE AND SUSTAINABLE FUNDING

Description: Michigan's juvenile justice system needs adequate and sustainable funding to perform effectively. 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, possible changes to the Child Care Fund, and the uncertainty in funding continue to pose challenges for juvenile justice organizations. Staffing levels, the availability of juvenile services and programs across the state, and the adequacy of representation are 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. Consequently, the services provided to juvenile offenders are not consistent across all areas of the state.

In sum, 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 in all areas of the state, 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 high priorities for 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 and consistent 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) and providing consistent, cost effective services statewide (e.g., using shared services agreements).

Objective 3: Advocate for continuing current funding streams that help juvenile justice agencies provide important services.

Objective 4: Pursue new, creative ways to fund and support Michigan's juvenile justice system.

Objective 5: Use technology to save resources and be more efficient and effective.

Objective 6: Educate stakeholders about the needs, priorities and accomplishments of the juvenile justice system.

Goal 2: Juvenile justice funding is understandable, 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.

Objective 3: Improve and simplify the funding structure including funding methods and formulas.

Goal 3: Juvenile courts have the resources/funding to provide a full range of effective services that meet the unique needs of delinquent youth and families.

Objective 1: Develop a funding structure that allows equitable funding for non-mandated and mandated services.

Objective 2: Advocate for a fair distribution of funding and resources across the state.

Objective 3: Use innovative and cost effective methods to ensure a full range of services and programs in all areas of the state (e.g., shared service agreements).

Priority Projects:

- Establish meaningful conversations with partners to impact the lives of youth and families with funding that is understood, predictable and sustainable.
- Advocate for stable and consistent funding policies.
- Increase Child Care Fund funding in areas of prevention, rural program development, etc., and all expanded forms of direct services to youth and families.

STRATEGIC FOCUS AREA #5: DEVELOP A STRONG JUVENILE JUSTICE WORKFORCE

Description: The success of Michigan’s juvenile justice system is dependent in part on the strength of its workforce and developing a workforce committed to a career in juvenile justice. A competent, motivated, and satisfied workforce committed to a career in juvenile justice will help ensure excellent court performance and effective outcomes. Thus, both are a high priority for the long-term viability of juvenile justice in Michigan.

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. Succession planning and leadership development are needed to ensure deep bench strength when vacancies occur.
5. Juvenile justice needs both judicial and administrative champions in the future. The next generation of leaders is needed to fill the void that will occur when current leaders retire.
6. Many juvenile justice professionals do not see juvenile justice as a career. More work is needed to make juvenile justice a sought after career.
7. Professional development, career paths and opportunities are lacking.
8. There is high turnover in some juvenile justice jobs/positions.
9. More cultural competence and diversity in staff and the workplace are needed at all levels and in all positions.
10. There are opportunities to form new partnerships with universities and academicians to enhance education, job readiness, and juvenile justice research.
11. Juvenile organizations must be more nimble in the future and employees must embrace (rather than resist) change.
12. Equal opportunities are needed in all size counties across the state.

13. Employee satisfaction and a positive work environment will help recruit and retain competent staff and improve organizational performance.

Goals and Objectives

Goal 1: Juvenile justice professionals possess the knowledge and skills to perform their jobs.

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

Objective 2: Provide opportunities for juvenile justice professionals 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 juvenile justice workforce.

Objective 5: Develop and transfer knowledge and skills to the next generation of leaders, managers, and employees.

Goal 2: Juvenile justice is a viable and sought after career in Michigan.

Objective 1: Promote juvenile justice as a career to high school and college students across the state.

Objective 2: Actively recruit and mentor people dedicated to working with youth and helping them succeed.

Objective 3: Create a career path and advancement opportunities for juvenile justice professionals committed to a career in juvenile justice.

Objective 4: Advocate for competitive pay, benefits, and other perks will attract professionals to a career in juvenile justice.

Priority Projects:

- Explore the development of an emerging leaders program with students.
- Develop, plan and host specialized trainings, i.e. mental health, trauma, Autism, EBP, psychotropic medications, community partner collaboration, for juvenile justice professionals, stakeholders, and students.

Section 6: Conclusion

Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 is pleased to present this revised 2015-2017 Strategic Plan, which represents a collective voice and agenda for continuing to reform and improve Michigan's juvenile justice system. It is exciting, ambitious and necessary. As with the first Strategic Plan, this updated Plan 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 updated, the Executive and Action Teams, consisting of volunteers from across the state, will implement the Plan by working on the Strategic Priority Projects identified. Additionally, the Executive Team will communicate and garner support for the Plan, monitor progress, and evaluate changes and improvements.

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.

The Executive Team, 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

JUVENILE JUSTICE TRENDS

Introduction

Juvenile Justice Vision 20/20 is deeply committed to understanding the trends that effect youth involved in the juvenile justice system. The following trends represented what appear to be the most current delinquency, incarceration, and waiver rates, legal issues, physiological advancements, interventions and reform trends:

I. TRENDS IN DELINQUENCY, INCARCERATION, AND WAIVER RATES

A. Juvenile Arrests

- In 2013, the state of Michigan arrested approximately 4,705 youth under the age of 18.
- African American youth continue to be disproportionally represented in arrest data while females make up a much smaller percentage of offenders.

B. Offenses

- The most juvenile arrests made in Michigan in 2013 were for retail fraud/theft (2,271 arrests), non-aggravated assault (2,239 arrests), violation of a controlled substance (1,223 arrests), liquor violations (854 arrests), larceny (797 arrests), and juvenile runaway (719 arrests).

C. Incarceration

- The efforts of the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative greatly reduced unnecessary and inappropriate use of detention in 2013 by decreasing the number of juveniles detained in JDAI sites on a given day by 44 percent.
- According to the Feb 24, 2010 Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP), approximately 71,000 juvenile delinquents were held in residential placement facilities. This rate has decreased and is at its lowest level since the first CJRP in 1997, which found that approximately 117,000 juveniles were in residential placement facilities.

D. Waivers

- In accordance with the trend of increasing the age of juvenile jurisdiction, in 2013 Nevada increased the age of jurisdiction to 16 and only allows juveniles who committed a specific felony and committed a felony in the past to be transferred to adult court.
- In 2013 Missouri changed their “once an adult, always an adult” provision so that juveniles who were found not guilty in criminal court could return to juvenile court for any subsequent offenses.
- Both Illinois and Massachusetts increased the age of juvenile jurisdiction to 18 in 2013.

II. LEGAL TRENDS

A. Landmark Juvenile Life Without Parole Decision

- The Supreme Court ruled in *Miller v. Alabama* (2012) that mandatory life sentences for juveniles violate the Eighth Amendment.
- The Supreme Court determined that proportionality—punishment be appropriate to the crime committed—must take into account “the mitigating qualities of youth.” The Court’s rationale extended from previous cases (*Roper v. Simmons* and *Graham v.*

Florida) explaining how juveniles differ from adults and how this makes them less culpable for their crimes, even when egregious.

- In the past decade, juvenile competency in court proceedings has come to the attention of policy makers as research on adolescent development and psychological maturity has been conducted and published.

B. Due Process and Procedural Issues

- *Increased Due Process Protection*
 - In the past decade, state legislatures have provided increased due process protection for juvenile offenders. Such measures have included providing legal services to juveniles who are facing proceedings and addressing the needs of indigent juvenile offenders.
- *Legal Counsel and Other Procedural Issues*
 - Many states have addressed a juvenile's constitutional right to quality defense counsel during proceedings. In the past decade, at least nine states enacted laws that require qualified counsel be provided to juveniles at various stages of youth court proceedings. Between 2004 and 2005, Illinois, Louisiana and Maryland prohibited juveniles from waiving their right to counsel. For juveniles who are appealing their case, Utah created an expedited process for appeals from juvenile court orders.
- *Indigent Defense*
 - The issue of indigent defense has received attention in recent years in the states. In at least one state — Michigan — the juvenile court must appoint an attorney to represent a youth, regardless of his or her indigence status. Most states appoint counsel to youths only upon determining that they qualify as indigent, and the application process for receiving counsel varies from state to state. Several states — including Florida, Delaware, Georgia, Louisiana and Tennessee—require administrative fees to submit an application. Once a state receives an application for juvenile indigent counsel, decision makers must evaluate either the parents' or the child's finances and other enumerated factors to make their ruling. In Alabama, the presiding judge determines indigence, while Georgia leaves it to the public defender's office or any agency providing the service.
 - Such actions addressing juvenile defense, including indigence, reflect a trend to preserve the constitutional rights of youth who come into in the system.

III. TRENDS IN PYHSIOLOGICAL RESEARCH

A. Distinguishing Juvenile Offenders from Adults

- *Adolescent Developmental Research*
 - A growing body of research on the brain development of children has received national attention. Findings by the Mac-Arthur Foundation's Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice show that adolescent brains are not fully developed until about age 25, and the immature, emotional and impulsive

nature characteristic of adolescents makes them more susceptible to engaging in criminal behavior. Studies also have shown that juveniles who commit crimes or engage in socially deviant behavior are not necessarily destined to be adult criminals. This research has provided the basis for widespread state legislative policy reforms in juvenile justice systems.

- *Federal Standards*

- In *Roper v. Simmons* (2005), the U.S. Supreme Court held the Eighth Amendment's ban against cruel and unusual punishment prohibits juveniles from being sentenced to death for crimes they committed before they reached age 18. The court cited MacArthur Research Network research as evidence that adolescents' brains are not fully developed, which affects mental abilities such as self-control, their ability to understand the consequences of their actions, and their ability to take responsibility for their actions. The Court also held that there was a "consensus" in society that juveniles lack the requisite "culpability" for their crimes, as demonstrated by the fact that 47 percent of state legislatures had already outlawed execution of juveniles in the 1980s and 1990s.
- In 2010, the Court abolished the sentence of life without the possibility parole for youth convicted of non-homicide crimes in *Graham v. Florida*. On June 25, 2012, the Court in *Miller v. Alabama* ruled that imposing mandatory life sentences without the possibility of parole on juveniles also violates the Eighth Amendment.

- *Raising the Age of Juvenile Court Jurisdiction*

- A major trend in juvenile justice policy in the past decade has been to expand the jurisdiction of the juvenile court by increasing the upper age of jurisdiction.
- In 2007, a Connecticut law raised the age of juvenile court jurisdiction from 16 to 18. Connecticut previously had the largest number of inmates under age 18 in its adult system. According to recent data, the proposed change in the age of juvenile jurisdiction moves more than 10,000 new cases a year from the adult criminal justice system to the juvenile justice system.

B. Treating Mental Health Needs of Juvenile Offenders

- Between 65 percent and 70 percent of the 2 million youth arrested each year in the United States have some type of mental health disorder. Mental health needs of court-involved youth challenge juvenile justice system to respond with appropriate and effective evaluations and interventions. During the past decade, state policies have focused on providing proper screening, assessment and treatment services for young offenders who have mental health needs.
- Highlights include a 2005 omnibus state mental health law passed in Washington that expanded mental health services and addressed treatment gaps. In the same year, an Idaho measure also allowed mental health courts to be incorporated into existing state drug courts. A similar Colorado law allowed a 90-day suspended sentence, during which treatment is provided to developmentally disabled or mentally ill juveniles. In 2009, Texas provided that mentally ill youth be eligible to receive continuity of care and treatment while in the juvenile justice system.

C. Implementation of Structured Decision-making Practices and Tools

- Research supports the need to facilitate objective and consistent decision-making practices instead of subjective determinations (including risk/needs assessment instruments).
- Screening and assessment are key to addressing mental health treatment needs of youth in the juvenile justice system. Recent state policies require proper screening and assessment to help determine juvenile risk, placement and treatment. Minnesota and Nevada have established statewide mental health screening for all youth in the juvenile justice system. A 2005 Texas act required juvenile probation departments to have youth complete the MAY-SI-2 screening instrument that identified potential mental health and substance abuse needs. Idaho allowed juvenile courts to order mental health assessment and treatment plans for juveniles. In 2009, acts in North Dakota and Oregon required alcohol and drug education, assessment and treatment for juveniles who commit alcohol violations.

D. Recognizing Bias in Decision Making

- In response to the striking overrepresentation of minority youth in the juvenile justice system, many people have raised the possibility that there is bias in the decision-making process. At one or more of the decision points, minority and/or lower-class youth are more likely than others to be treated harshly than majority youth with similar offenses. Based on research funded by OJJDP, about two-thirds of the studies found harder treatment of racial minorities at some decision-making point; in some cases, race had an influence in just selected jurisdictions of the state, and in others it had an influence because the jurisdictions with larger minority populations responded more harshly to juveniles than did other jurisdictions. Combined with the restorative justice trend, discriminatory treatment can place minority youth at a very high risk for the serious consequences of adult processing.
- There is also an existing bias against female minor offenders. He identified three periods in the development of the Philadelphia Court system; during the phase of conservatism fewer girls are diverted from the formal court process. Diversion programs have tended to draw more female than male minor offenders into the system from those youths who normally would not have been involved at all.
- There is a reverse bias against boys in the area of detention decisions; boys are additionally more likely to be arrested for serious offenses than girls are.

IV. PROCEDURAL TRENDS

A. Handling of Status Offenders

- In some jurisdictions, status offenses are handled through usual juvenile court procedures, but in others the petitions and proceedings are separate for youth designated as Persons or Children in Need of Supervision (PINS or CHINS).
- In 1974, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act specified that states' receipt of federal funds for delinquency programs was dependent on reform in the handling of status offenses; specifically, status offenders were to be removed from institutions.

-
- Opponents of the removal of status offenses from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court claim that such action produces a situation in which no agency would be empowered to detain a runaway child, for instance, against his or her will.
 - The current difficulty of the courts is the unwillingness of the community to provide alternatives to detention for their juvenile offenders.

B. The Police and the Juvenile

- The police are the first major component in the justice system to deal with the juvenile delinquent; current statistics show that a large percentage of arrests, including a significant number of those for serious offenses, involve juveniles.
- In previous times, since police officers lived in their districts and knew local residents, they could work with juveniles in a different manner. Increased urbanization, however, brought increasing caseloads which led to the routinization and impersonalization of police functions. This and other matters led to the formation of the specialized juvenile unit.
- The juvenile unit varies in size depending on the type of police department and the size and nature of the community.
- Although the juvenile officer's responsibilities depend to a great extent on the size of the department, some features of such work are common to most departments.
- The police have a great deal of discretionary power. Police officers arrest approximately 100 out of 1000 of all juveniles they come into contact with; Timothy Crowe argued that the police are more a part of the community rather than the juvenile justice system.
- Many factors determine whether a youth is to be processed or not and whether he or she may eventually end up in the formal juvenile justice system.

C. Detaining and Taking into Custody

- In most states the law of arrest is the same for juveniles and adults, and thus an officer must have probable cause to believe that the suspected juvenile has committed an offense; mere suspicion is not in itself probable cause, but absolute certainty is not required either.
- After the juvenile has been taken into custody, certain procedural rights and safeguards must be considered (e.g., *Escobedo v. Illinois*; *Miranda v. Arizona*).
- In most states, the officer who takes the child into custody is also responsible for notifying the child's parents.
- In *People v. Lara*, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the legal competence of a juvenile to waive her or his rights should be determined by the "totality of the circumstances doctrine."
- In *Fare v. Michael C.* and *California v. Prysock*, the Supreme Court supported the actions of the police in following due process procedures to protect the rights of juveniles.
- After parents have been notified, the juvenile still has the same constitutional right as an adult-the right to contact an attorney or have any one of his or her choosing presenting during an interview.

D. Search and Seizure

- The law governing search and seizure is essentially the same for both adults and juveniles.
- The one area of controversy that pertains to adolescents but not to adults is the right of school officials to search students and their belongings on school property.
- Fingerprinting and photographing juveniles, as well as keeping records, are sources of controversy; the controversy about records revolves around the question of who is to see them and what data should be recorded.
- If a juvenile is requested to appear in a lineup, a counsel is entitled to be present as a result of the decision of *U.S. v. Wade*.
- Many people object to photographing, fingerprint, and keeping records on juveniles because it is too akin to adult criminal proceedings.

E. Disposition of Offenders Taken into Custody

- The decision whether to take a juvenile into custody will be based on the police officer's investigation, which will include the circumstances surrounding the offense, the offense itself, and an assessment of the youngster's family situation.
- The U.S. Supreme Court has not decided many cases relevant to the disposition of offenders taken into custody so it is only state legislation and case law that govern pretrial process.
- One U.S. Supreme Court decision that has bearing on the pretrial release concerns preventive detention; in *Schall v. Martin*, the Court found that it was legal for a child to be detained for the protection of self and others.

F. The Juvenile Court Intake and Processing

- Most juvenile courts are part of the circuit, district, superior, county, common pleas, probate, or municipal courts; the jurisdiction generally includes delinquency, neglect, and dependency cases; however, adoption, appointment of guardians for minors, determination of custody, and termination of parental rights are also included in juvenile court jurisdiction.
- The juvenile court can receive funding from both the state and local jurisdiction.
- There are considerable variations in the philosophy, structure, and procedures of juvenile courts across the country.
- Even though the juvenile court's original intent was to rehabilitate rather than punish, a lack of resources, lack of cooperation, and lack of insight have often turned it into a second-rate agency for processing juveniles.

V. FEMALE DELINQUENCY TRENDS

A. Delinquency Rates

- Juvenile females account for approximately one-third of all juvenile arrests, one-third of arrests for Property Crime Index offenses, and less than one-fifth of arrests for Violent Crime Index offenses. Most juvenile female arrests (76 percent) are for non-index and status offenses.
- According to official crime data, overall juvenile arrest rates are declining, increases in female arrest rates are greatly outpacing the changes in the male arrest rate.

-
- Self-report and victimization data contrast with official arrest statistics, stating that female arrest rates for violent crimes have not increased relative to the male arrest rate.

B. Violent behavior

- Females tend to fight peers in order to gain status, defend their sexual reputation, and in self-defense against sexual harassment
- Females act out violently against family members for reasons including to push back against what they determine to be an overly controlling household and as an expression of anger against a family member from whom they have been emotionally, physically, or sexually abused.
- Fighting in school can be a result of teacher labeling, self-defense, or out of a general sense of hopelessness
- Females residing in disadvantaged neighborhoods are more likely to be violent towards others because of the increased risk of victimization, the inability of parents to protect against negative community influences, and lack of opportunities for success
- There are multiple factors associated with female's involvement in gangs including the likelihood that they come from neighborhoods and families with violent, neglectful, and substance abusing tendencies. Female gang members are more violent than non-gang-involved females, but less violent than male gang members.

VI. INTERVENTIONS TRENDS

A. Best Practices

- Juvenile justice policy makers have recently seen the benefit of adopting evidence-based practices in order to provide the treatment that is most likely to meet needs and improve the overall functioning of the juvenile and his or her family.
- Multi-systemic therapy, family functional therapy and aggression replacement training are evidence-based interventions in place in juvenile justice systems today in at least eight states—Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee and Washington.
- Diversion has recently been viewed as a beneficial method for non-violent juveniles to get their needs met in a community-based program instead of the juvenile or criminal justice systems.

B. Prevention Strategies

- Weekly home visits by preschool teachers appear to reduce the probability of arrest through age 15
- Family therapy and parental training reduce risk factors.
- School organizational strategies that enforce rules and reward positive behavior appear to work. Some school-wide initiatives (e.g. anti-bullying campaigns) can also reduce crime and substance abuse.
- Teaching social skills over long periods of time. Life Skills Training (L.S.T.) was given as an example of a social skills curriculum. Lessons include skills such as stress management,

problem solving, and self-control. Delinquency, substance abuse and inappropriate conduct were reduced by these social skills programs.

- Cognitive development programs wherein high-risk youth are taught specific thinking skills supplemented by behavior modification (i.e. a technique using rewards and punishments to change behavior) reduced substance abuse. Other research suggests these “thinking skills” programs may also reduce delinquency but more research is needed.

C. Promising Policies and Programs

- Increased gang monitoring by teams of police officers and probation officers
- Big Brothers/Big Sisters and similar mentoring programs which have experienced a reduction in drug use
- After-school extra-curricular and recreation programs
- Specialized school programs that place youth into smaller, more flexible instructional units
- Intensive supervision for first-time juvenile offenders in order to reduce the likelihood of another offense

VII. REFORM TRENDS

A. Improving Data Collection

- Efforts have been underway to improve data collection to not only know how many youth are in the juvenile justice system at each decision point of the process, but also to determine treatment, to assess where barriers to equitable treatment exist, and to assess who is impacted by those inequities.

B. Enhancing Cultural and Linguistic Competency

- There has been a promoting of programs that seek “to understand and respect values, attitudes, beliefs, and mores that differ across cultures and to respond appropriately to these differences” in interacting with youth and their families, and in planning and implementing programs for them.

C. Encouraging Family Engagement Opportunities

- A number of initiatives have been developed to find and support ways to better partner with families to develop family engagement at each step of the juvenile justice process.

D. Increasing Diversion and Community-Based Alternatives

- Many states have developed more community-based and diversion programs to reduce confinement and the movement of youth deeper into the juvenile justice system.

E. Developing More Community Collaboration and Engagement

- A number of states have developed comprehensive approaches that bring together both local community members and juvenile justice professionals.

F. Developing Racial Impact Statements for Juvenile Justice Legislation

- A few states are designing impact statements that help ensure policies and practices do not add to the racial and ethnic disparities.

G. Reauthorization and Strengthening of the Federal Juvenile Justice Delinquency and Prevention Act (JJDPA)

- For the last 20 years there has been the a consistent and significant decline in the federal funding of juvenile justice. Efforts are currently underway to advocate for increasing federal funding to enable states to fund programs to improve outcomes, especially as they pertain to funding to reduce racial and ethnic disparities.

H. Blocking the “School-to-Prison” Pipeline

- In the last 30 years, schools have become one the major sources of referrals to the juvenile justice system. A number of states have developed alternative options for youth who have committed minor school disciplinary problems. The goal is to develop more in-school alternatives, rather than referring youth to law enforcement.

I. Gender-Responsive Programming

- Due to female juvenile offenders being the largest growing population in the juvenile justice system, lawmakers have begun passing legislation that requires gender-specific programming in order to meet their treatment and rehabilitation needs.

J. Disproportionate Minority Contact

- The United States juvenile justice system processes minority youth at a disproportionately higher rate than their white counterparts. Police practices, high crime rates in urban communities, and jurisdictional issues have all been identified as potential explanations. Legislative requirements such as the “minority impact statement” and similar efforts have been shown as beneficial in states that utilize them.

K. Detention and Corrections Reform

- States have recently begun shortening the length of time a juvenile can be in a detention center through detention reform laws. In addition, risk assessment instruments have been utilized to better determine the risk-level, treatment needs, and length of stay for juvenile offenders.

L. Removing Youth from Adult Jails/Prisons

- Eleven states have passed laws to prevent and limit the state’s ability to incarcerate juveniles in adult jails and prisons in order to ensure the safety of juveniles. The Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 developed national standards for eliminating abuse of juveniles while in adult facilities by limiting the contact between juveniles and adults.

M. Raising the Age of Jurisdiction

- Connecticut, Illinois, Mississippi, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire expanded juvenile court jurisdiction to increase the amount of older youth tried in the juvenile justice system in comparison to the criminal system.

N. Direct File, Waiver, and Transfer Statutes

- Fifteen States have begun transfer reform so that youth are more likely to stay in the juvenile justice system instead of the adult system. Transfer to adult court is only for the most serious crimes and offenders.

O. Sentencing

- Twelve states have altered their minimum sentencing laws to account for recent research on the developmental differences between adults and youth. Additionally, these states have reviewed how they sentence juveniles to the criminal system as well as hold post-sentence reviews for juveniles already sentenced to life without parole.

P. Reentry/Aftercare

- Recently, state lawmakers are giving more attention to the use of aftercare services in order to improve post-release supervision, provide services to support the safety of juveniles, and create successful transitions back into the home.

Q. Expungement

- State legislators have begun enacting expungement measures in order to protect the confidentiality of juvenile records for purposes of education, employment, and successful transitions into adulthood.

Bibliography

California Endowment, "Promising Practices from the Healthy Returns Initiative: Building Connections to Health, Mental Health, and Family Support Services in Juvenile Justice" (Los Angeles, CA: California Endowment, May 2010), <http://bit.ly/1oSONgy>.

Campaign for Youth Justice: State Trends: Updates from the 2013-2014 Legislative ...
campaignforyouthjustice.org/research/cfyj-reports/ Retrieved December 23, 2015

Colwell, B; Villarreal, S.F; & Espinosa, E.M. (2012), "Preliminary Outcomes of a Pre-Adjudication Diversion Initiative for Juvenile Justice Involved Youth with Mental Health Needs in Texas," Criminal Justice and Behavior 39, no. 4 at <http://cjb.sagepub.com/content/39/4/447>.

Juvenile Justice Information Exchange <http://jjie.org/hub/mental-health-and-substance-abuse/reform-trends/> retrieved December 23, 2014

Lipsey, M (2010) "Improving the Effectiveness of Juvenile Justice Programs" (Washington, DC: Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, December 3, 2014), 14, at <http://bit.ly/1kEv1VU>.

"MAYSI," Texas Juvenile Justice Department, accessed December 24, 2014, <http://bit.ly/1mWZi03>.

McKay, M & Bannon, Jr, W. (2004) "Engaging Families in Child Mental Health Services," *Child Adolescent Psychiatric Clinical N Am* 13: 905–921.

Michigan Incident Crime Reporting. 2013 state total: Arrests by age, sex, race, and crime type. Retrieved from http://www.michigan.gov/msp/0,4643,7-123-1645_3501_4621-332107--,00.html

Models for Change, "Improving and Coordinating Access to Mental Health Services for Youth in Pennsylvania's Juvenile Justice System" (Chicago, IL: John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, April 2007), <http://bit.ly/YIqPeA>;

Models for Change Mental Health/Juvenile Justice Action Network, "School-Based Diversion" (Delmar, NY: National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice, September 2012), 4, at <http://bit.ly/1mevf2p>.

National Juvenile Justice Network, "Competency to Stand Trial in Juvenile Court: Recommendations for Policymakers" (Washington, DC: November 2012), at <http://bit.ly/1j2hnai>. Retrieved December 29, 2014.

Puzzanchera, C (2013) U.S. Department of Justice (2013) Juvenile Arrests
<http://www.ojjdp.gov/pubs/244476.pdf>

Rosado, L.M. & Shah, R.S (2007) "Protecting Youth from Self-Incrimination when Undergoing Screening, Assessment and Treatment within the Juvenile Justice System," Juvenile Law Center

The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2014). Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative 2013 annual result report. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/resources/juvenile-detention-alternatives-initiative-2013-annual-results-report/>

"The Reclaiming Futures Model: Our Proven Six- Step Model," Reclaiming Futures, accessed December 7, 2014, <http://www.reclaimingfutures.org/model>;

Tiegan, A. (2014). 2013 juvenile justice state legislation. *National Conference of State Legislatures*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncsl.org/research/civil-and-criminal-justice/2013-juvenile-justice-state-legislation.aspx>

"What is Multisystemic Therapy?" Multisystemic Therapy, accessed December 21, 2014
<http://mstservices.com/>;