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PENNSYLVANIA'S JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT STRATEGY
JJSES Framework
Achieving our Balanced and Restorative Justice Mission

STAGE ONE
Readiness
- Intro to EBP Training
- Organizational Readiness
- Cost-Benefit Analysis
- Stakeholder Engagement

STAGE TWO
Initiation
- Motivational Interviewing
- Structured Decision Making
- Detention Assessment
- MAYS1 Screen
- YLS Risk/Needs Assessment
- Inter-Rater Reliability
- Case Plan Development

STAGE THREE
Behavioral Change
- Skill Building and Tools
- Cognitive Behavioral Interventions
- Responsivity
- Evidence-Based Programming and Interventions
- Service Provider Alignment
  - Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)
  - Graduated Responses

STAGE FOUR
Refinement
- Policy Alignment
- Performance Measures
- EBP Service Contracts

Delinquency Prevention
Diversion

Family Involvement
Data-Driven Decision Making
Training/Technical Assistance
Continuous Quality Improvement
Pennsylvania’s Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy

• We dedicate ourselves to working in partnership to enhance the capacity of Pennsylvania’s juvenile justice system to achieve its balanced and restorative justice by:
  – Employing evidence-based practices, with fidelity, at every stage of the juvenile justice process;
  – Collecting and analyzing the data necessary to measure the results of these efforts; and, with this knowledge,
  – Striving to continuously improve the quality of our decisions, services and programs.
There are essentially two approaches for strategies to reduce delinquency

1. The “back door” approach focuses on recidivism reduction targeting criminogenic needs matched to cognitive behavioral programs that have the right levels of dosage/intensity. (Reactive)

2. The “front door” approach focuses on the initiation of prevention-oriented programs designed to reduce the risk factors that contribute to delinquency. (Proactive)
Between 2007 and 2014, the number of juvenile delinquency dispositions from new allegations decreased 44%, from 45,573 to 25,567.

**JCJC Statistics courtesy of Rick Steele**
PA Juvenile Delinquency Placements
2007-2014
(Includes disposition reviews but excludes placement reviews)
Source: Juvenile Court Judges’ Commission

Between 2007 and 2014, the number of delinquency placements decreased 45%, from 7,525 to 4,136.

**JCJC Statistics courtesy of Rick Steele**
The total number of days of care for delinquency placements decreased from 1,790,194 to 1,155,011, when comparing FY 08-09 to FY 13-14 data, a decrease of 635,183 days of care.

**JCJC Statistics courtesy of Rick Steele**
Total Delinquency Placement Expenditures*:
Fiscal Year 08-09 to Fiscal Year 13-14

Source: Office of Children, Youth, and Families (OCYF) Needs-Based Budget

*Does not include secure detention costs.

- Total delinquency placement expenditures decreased from $321,652,465 to $236,110,115, when comparing FY 08-09 to FY 13-14 costs, a difference of $85,542,350.

**JCJC Statistics courtesy of Rick Steele
Pennsylvania’s Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy (JJSES)

• Monograph’s definition of delinquency prevention:

“An effective juvenile justice system relies on comprehensive approach that includes addressing the influences that lead to delinquent behavior in the first place...

Preventing delinquency through the large-scale, high-quality implementation of evidenced-based prevention programs allows the juvenile justice system to focus its limited resources on those individuals and cases that require a formal response because of the severity of the offense or the risk level of the youth.”
Additionally, the JJSES Monograph states that:

“Pennsylvania has been proactive and has turned away from a purely reactive approach to delinquency in favor of one that supports programs that promote positive youth development in order to prevent delinquency from occurring in the first place. In fact, delinquency prevention may be the most cost-effective component of JJSES. It is important that chief juvenile probation officers and juvenile court judges play an active role in local community prevention planning, whether it is by serving on advisory boards or planning committees or by utilizing the influence of the Court to create and sustain initiatives. [...] Whether dealing with drug and alcohol, mental health, educational, or other issues, it is critical that child-serving agencies work together as part of a broad-based prevention environment in order to intervene as early and as effectively as possible to. . . .

prevent delinquency.”
Evidence-Based delinquency prevention programs, practices and policies are key to closing the “front door” thereby reducing the penetration rate of juvenile offenders.
Blueprints Model Programs

- Blues Program (Cognitive Behavioral Group Depression Prevention)
- Body Project (Dissonance Intervention)
- Brief Alcohol Screening and intervention for College Students (BASICS)
- Functional Family Therapy (FFT)
- LifeSkills Training (LST)
- Multisystemic Therapy- Problem Sexual Behavior (MST-PSB)
- Multisystemic Therapy® (MST®)
- New Beginnings (Intervention for children of divorce)
- Nurse-Family Partnership
- Parent Management Training (Oregon Model)
- Positive Action
- Project Towards No Drug Abuse
- Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS)
- Treatment Foster Care Oregon
Continuum of Programming

- Promotion/Prevention
  - Universal – for a broad, general population (e.g., all 6th grade youth)
  - Selective – for those who may be “at-risk” but who are not exhibiting problem symptoms (e.g., normally functioning children with divorced parents)
  - Indicated – for those who are beginning to show early signs of problems, but they are not at a “clinical” level (e.g., youth beginning to exhibit signs of depression or aggression, but not yet at a problematic level)
Q: Which is better

12% recidivism rate ✔️

35% recidivism rate ✔️

**STATE A**
(System Reform)
9,000 youth in the system
12% recidivism rate

1,080 youth recidivate

**STATE B**
(Prevention)
3,000 youth in the system
35% recidivism rate

1,050 youth recidivate

**STATE C**
3,000 youth in the system
AND a 12% recidivism rate

360 youth recidivate ★★★
Pennsylvania Resources for Prevention and Juvenile Justice

Committees, Coalitions, Dollars, and Data
OJJDP Plan to the Governor: Delinquency Prevention

• Written by Jim Anderson, as Chair of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention Committee
• Includes/references:
  – Pennsylvania’s Youth Survey (PAYS)
  – Communities That Care prevention planning
  – Evidence-based prevention and intervention programs
  – EPISC Center infrastructure for program and practice support
  – Executive order for state agencies to collaboratively coordinate and plan their prevention programming
  – Establish PA violence prevention budget equal to 1% of Dept. of Corrections budget (~$20 million)
PCCD’s Goals:

• Preventing delinquency and youth violence to the greatest degree possible (reducing prevalence)

• Intervening effectively with youth for whom primary prevention is not sufficient (reducing further system involvement)

• Allowing communities the flexibility to select strategies that meet local needs and have been proven effective

• Providing accountability and using scarce resources efficiently and cost-effectively

• Increasing Local Capacity
PCCD’s Delinquency Prevention Efforts

1994
CTC PLANNING BROUGHT TO PA

1995
GOVERNOR’S COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP FOR SAFE CHILDREN ESTABLISHED

1998
PA 1ST STATE TO ADOPT “BLUEPRINTS FOR VIOLENCE PREVENTION”

2001
$20 MILLION STATE BUDGET FOR CTC & EVIDENCE BASED PREV.

STRONG EMPHASIS ON IMPLEMENTATION QUALITY AND FIDELITY, IMPACT ASSESSMENT, AND SUSTAINABILITY PLANNING

NEARLY 200 EBP’S FUNDED SINCE 1998

2011
PCCD STATE BUDGET FOR PREVENTION EFFORTS REDUCED TO A LOW OF $1.9 MILLION

2013
FEDERAL BUDGET FOR JUVENILE JUSTICE & DELINQUENCY PREVENTION REDUCED TO A LOW OF $1.4 MILLION

$2 MILLION REINVESTMENT FROM JJRI
PCCD’s Delinquency Prevention Subcommittee

• Representatives from PCCD’s prevention partners and practitioners including:
  – State agencies, county officials, local CTC Community Mobilizers.
  – Kim Bowman, Human Services Director for Chester County, chairs the subcommittee.

• Purpose is to coordinate prevention efforts across Pennsylvania, striving to avoid duplication of efforts and make the best use of scarce resources.

• Guides the proliferation of high quality and effective delinquency prevention programs by aiding with implementation, ensuring fidelity and promoting sustainability of supported programs.

• Working to increase the quality of outcomes data collected to measure the impact of prevention efforts.

• Serves as a forum for state leaders to hear input from the field as funding and policy decisions are being made.

• Conducts an ongoing review the programs eligible for funding to ensure that they are meeting the needs of Pennsylvania’s children and families.

• Promoting the effort to expand the CTC model throughout the state.

• Works to expand the participation in, and use of, PAYS data.
Communities That Care coalitions: Collaborative prevention planning and the role of JPO

- Form local coalition of key stakeholders
- Collect local data on risk and protective factors
- Use data to identify priorities
- Re-assess risk and protective factors
- Select and implement evidence-based program that targets those factors

Leads to community synergy and focused resource allocation

Creating Fertile Ground for EBPs
5 year Longitudinal Study of PA Youth

- 419 age-grade cohorts over a 5-year period

Youth in CTC communities with EBPs:
- Lower rates of delinquency
- Greater resistance to negative peer influence
- Stronger school engagement
- Better academic achievement

Using PA data for prevention planning

- Pennsylvania Youth Survey (PAYS)
  - Surveys students (grades 6,8,10,12) on risk and protective factors that drive youth problem behaviors
  - Community, school, family, peer, and individual level
  - Diagnostic data for “universal” population of school-attending youth

- Youth Level of Service (YLS)
  - Aggregated YLS data can provide insight into needs for youth who are at-risk

- Both sources can inform upstream prevention planning
Does your coalition have Juvenile Justice representation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How involved is your county’s Juvenile Justice with your coalition’s prevention efforts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does your county's Juvenile Justice system use the PAYS in their prevention efforts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does your county's Juvenile Justice system share the Youth Level of Service (YLS) information with your coalition?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Establishing the Vision
PA Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers
Delinquency Prevention Committee (DPC)

• DPC Mission Statement:

  “Consistent with our balanced and restorative justice mission and recognizing prevention as part of the JJSES, this committee will work to advance and support juvenile probation involvement in Pennsylvania’s delinquency prevention efforts.”
PA Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers
Delinquency Prevention Committee

• Goals:
  1. Provide guidance on how to incorporate delinquency prevention efforts into the operation of Juvenile Probation Departments.
  2. Support the initiatives and recommendations from PCCD’s Juvenile Justice Prevention Subcommittee.
  3. Identify appropriate Evidenced-Based Prevention Programs based on the interpretation of YLS, PAYS, and archival data.
  4. Provide direction in obtaining technical assistance for data collection and program development/implementation. (Roll out strategies based on County size/available resources).
  5. Provide guidance to align and improve inter-agency coordination and participation in systems collaboration.
  6. Provide assistance in developing and/or working with prevention coalitions.
  7. Assist in the acquisition of funding to support prevention initiatives (examples: Needs Based Budget, PCCD Grants, JCJC Juvenile Probation Services Annual Grant)
Chief Juvenile Probation Officers
Delinquency Prevention Survey

• What is the purpose of the survey? (Key Points)
  – Establish a rudimentary informational baseline.
  – Do JPDs have an interest in prevention driven activities?
  – Identify JPDs involved in collaborative prevention initiatives.
  – Identify what prevention initiatives are currently in operation.
  – Identify population served by prevention initiatives.
  – Determine how prevention services are being funded.
  – Identify the names of prevention-oriented coalitions.
Delinquency Prevention
Survey Results
35 Respondent Counties
CJPO – Delinquency Prevention Survey – County Respondents (35)
8/27/15

Legend:
- **First Class (1)**: Population of 1,500.00 or more
- **Second Class (1)**: Population of 800,000 to 1,499,999
- **Second Class A (2-A) (3)**: Population of 500,000 to 799,999
- **Third Class (11)**: Population of 210,000 to 499,999
- **Fourth Class (7)**: Population of 145,000 to 209,999
- **Fifth Class (9)**: Population of 90,000 to 144,999
- **Sixth Class (24)**: Population of 45,000 to 89,999
- **Seventh Class (5)**: Population of 20,000 to 44,999
- **Eighth Class (6)**: Population of less than 20,000
Survey Says!
Delinquency Prevention Survey

Key Findings

- All 35 respondents believe that JPD played a role in delinquency prevention
- 27 of the 35 respondents were involved with local prevention-driven initiatives
- 10 out of 35 plan to develop a Prevention Initiative in their JJSES Implementation Plan
- 24 out of 35 were involved with prevention oriented coalitions
- 30 out of 35 collaborate with their Single County Authority
- 31 out of 35 are familiar with the PA Youth Survey (PAYS)
- 17 out of 35 are participating members of Communities That Care (CTC)
Other Survey Findings

- Confusion between Prevention and Intervention Programs.
- Truancy Intervention and Elimination/After-school Programs.
- Mental Health and Trauma Informed Programming.
- Family-Based Services.
- JPD involvement in Needs Based Budget process (Special Grants/PA Promising Practices).
- JPD involvement in Student Assistance Programs.
- Prevention Initiatives have been funded by the Needs Based Budget, PCCD Grant Funds, County Budgets, Human Service Development Funds, Single County Authority Mini-Grants, JCJC Grant-In-Aid, PLCB Funds, Housing Authority, Cooperatively Funded, SAMHSA and Fee for Service.
YLS/CMI: Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory

• The YLS yields an overall score that indicates a juvenile’s risk to recidivate:
  – Low (0-8)
  – Moderate (9-22)
  – High (23-34)
  – Very High (35-42)
• YLS Data identifies the most predominant criminogenic needs of juvenile offenders in each county.

• YLS identified criminogenic needs have similar characteristics as PAYS Risk Factors.

YLS DOMAINS (Top 4)
• Attitudes/Orientation
• Personality/Behavior
• Peer Relations
• Family Circumstances/Parenting

PAYS RISK FACTOR DOMAINS
• Community
• School
• Peer-Individual
• Family
• This criminogenic need data identifies trends and can be utilized to “reverse program” via delinquency prevention initiatives.

• Reverse programming is similar to “reverse engineering” which is defined as taking apart an object to see how it works in order to duplicate or enhance the object.
Examples of a JPD Prevention Initiatives and Collaborations
• Magisterial District Judge Adjudication Alternative Program
• OCYF/JPD Needs Based Budget
• Student Assistance Program (At-Risk Youth)
• Commonwealth Prevention Alliance – PaSTOP.org
• Truancy Prevention Programs
• PA Academic Career Technical Training Alliance (PACTT)
• Children’s Integrated Service Plan (Block Grants)
• Single County Authority (Drug & Alcohol)
• Cross Systems Mapping (MH/Drug & Alcohol)
• Communities That Care
• Leadership Roundtables
• Systems of Care
• CASSP
• CJAB
• CASA
JJSES Implementation Plans and Needs Based Budget
I. Purpose

II. Permissible Expenditures

III. Completion of JJSES Implementation Plan

The JJSES Implementation Plan consists of three sections:

Part One – Describes the current status of your county’s implementation of activities included in your FY 2014-2015 JJSES Implementation Plan and any impact those activities have had on your department. (Example – How EBP 101 for stakeholders has impacted the level of engagement for service providers and other system partners; how the use of the YLS has diverted low risk juveniles from formal court involvement)

Part Two – Lists the planned JJSES activities to be implemented during FY 2015-2016. These activities should enhance and build upon last year’s activities.
   a. It is only necessary to list the activities being implemented during FY 2015-2016.
   b. Counties are not required to include activities in all stages of the JJSES if the county is not ready to implement activities within those stages or has already implemented activities within those stages.
   c. Counties should use their completed EBP survey, the JJSES monograph and last year’s JJSES Implementation Plan, at minimum, to assist with identifying the proposed activities listed in this section.
   d. Whenever possible include any available data which supports the implementation of the proposed activity.

Funding for evidence-based prevention and intervention programs can be supported through the OCYF Needs-based Plan and Budget process. There is only a 5% match requirement for most evidence-based programs. These programs must use a defined curriculum or set of services that, when implemented with fidelity as a whole, has been validated by some form of scientific evidence. Evidence-based practices and programs may be described as "supported" or "well-supported", depending on the strength of the research design.

Some examples of programs that can be supported include:

1. Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST)
2. Functional Family Therapy (FFT)
3. Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC)
4. Family Group Decision Making (FGDM)
5. Family Development Credentialing (FDC)
6. High-Fidelity Wrap Around (HFWA)
Needs Based Budget
PA Promising Practices

- County may identify one outcome-based dependency program and one outcome-based delinquency program, for a total of two, for special funding consideration.
- County must report on each program’s services and outcomes.
- Information must include a discussion of how many children are expected to be served, and the expected reduction in placements.
- DHS will fund county PaPPs as special grants for two years only. Thereafter the Promising Practice, if producing desired outcomes, becomes part of the county’s operating practices and is fiscally represented in the needs based budget. If the program is not producing the desired outcomes, the county may choose to end the program or fund it through other resources.

Some examples of programs that can be supported include:

1. Strengthening Families 10-14
2. Incredible Years
3. Communities That Care
4. Nurse-Family Partnership
5. Project Towards No Drug Abuse
6. Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS)
# PA Funding Mechanisms for Prevention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Stream</th>
<th>Funder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence Prevention Programs (VPP)</td>
<td>PCCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse and Education Demand Reduction</td>
<td>PCCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Trust Fund</td>
<td>PA Dept. of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Needs-Based Budget</td>
<td>PA Dept. of Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Assistance</td>
<td>PA Dept. of Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single County Authority Services</td>
<td>PA Dept. of Drug &amp; Alcohol Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others?????.......</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Calls to Action!

• Find out if you have a prevention coalition in your community. If so, participate!
• Consider applying for funding through PCCD for training and delivering prevention programs in your county. Funding includes free technical assistance and implementation resources from the EPISC Center!
• Advocate for your local school districts to participate in the PA Youth Survey if they aren’t already.
• If they are participating, collaborate on the data, find out what students are reporting!
• Review your YLS data to identify the most prevalent criminogenic needs of your delinquent population in order to develop upstream prevention initiatives.
• Utilize the Special Grants/PA Promising Practice sections of your Needs Based Budget to implement prevention programs based on your specific criminogenic needs.
• Consider developing a delinquency prevention initiative within your JJSES Implementation Plan.
• Participate in an upcoming prevention survey being developed by the EPISC Center.
• Consider becoming a member of the PA Chief JPO’s Delinquency Prevention Committee.
For More Information:

PA Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers
www.pachiefprobationofficers.org

Pennsylvania Commission on Crime & Delinquency (PCCD)
www.pccd.pa.gov

EPISCenter
www.episcenter.psu.edu

Pennsylvania Youth Survey
http://www.pays.state.pa.us/2015

Commonwealth Prevention Alliance
www.commonwealthpreventionalliance.org

Juvenile Court Judges’ Commission
www.jcjc.pa.gov

Department of Human Services
www.dhs.state.pa.us

The Partnership for a Drug Free America
www.drugfree.org
DDAP (PA Department of Drug and Alcohol Programs)
http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt?open=512&objID=20800&parentname=ObjMgr&parented=os&mode=2

CADCA (Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America)
http://www.cadca.org

Office of National Drug Control Policy
https://www.whitehouse.gov/ondcp

Substance Abuse Mental Health Services Administration
http://www.samhsa.gov/prevention

Tobacco Free Kids
www.tobaccofreekids.org

Stop Opiate Abuse Campaign
www.pastop.org

The EPISCenter represents a collaborative partnership between the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD), and the Bennett Pierce Prevention Research Center, College of Health and Human Development, Penn State University. The EPISCenter is funded by PCCD and the PA Department of Human Services. This resource was developed by the EPISCenter through PCCD grant VP-ST-24368.