



RESEARCH REPORT

Implementing Evidence-Based Juvenile Justice Reforms

Demonstration Sites in OJJDP's Juvenile Justice Reform and Reinvestment Initiative

Jeanette Hussemann

Akiva Liberman

May 2017



ABOUT THE URBAN INSTITUTE

The nonprofit Urban Institute is dedicated to elevating the debate on social and economic policy. For nearly five decades, Urban scholars have conducted research and offered evidence-based solutions that improve lives and strengthen communities across a rapidly urbanizing world. Their objective research helps expand opportunities for all, reduce hardship among the most vulnerable, and strengthen the effectiveness of the public sector.

Contents

Acknowledgments	v
Introduction	1
OJJDP's Juvenile Justice Reform and Reinvestment Initiative (JJRRI)	2
The Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP™)	2
Dispositional Matrices	4
Risk Assessment	4
Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities	5
Training and Technical Assistance	5
Implementation of JJRRI at Demonstration Sites	7
Implementing JJRRI in Delaware	7
Delaware's Juvenile Justice System	7
JJRRI Implementation	8
The SPEP™ Rating System	9
Program Improvement	10
Dispositional Matrix	10
Sustainability	11
Implementing JJRRI in Iowa	11
Iowa's Juvenile Justice System	11
JJRRI Implementation	13
The SPEP™ Rating System	14
Program Improvement	14
Dispositional Matrix	15
Sustainability	15
Implementing JJRRI in Milwaukee County, Wisconsin	16
Milwaukee County's Juvenile Justice System	16
JJRRI Implementation	17
The SPEP™ Rating System	18
Program Improvement	19
Dispositional Matrix	19
Sustainability	19
Conclusion	21

Appendix A. Draft Dispositional Matrices	24
Delaware Draft Juvenile Justice Disposition Matrix and Decision Tool	26
Iowa Draft Juvenile Justice Disposition Matrix	30
Milwaukee County Draft Juvenile Justice Disposition Matrix	32
References	36
About the Authors	37
Statement of Independence	38

Acknowledgments

This report was funded by Grant No. 2012-PF-F2-K001 awarded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, US Department of Justice. Points of view expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of OJJDP or the US Department of Justice. We are grateful to them and to all our funders, who make it possible for Urban to advance its mission.

The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Funders do not determine research findings or the insights and recommendations of Urban experts. Further information on the Urban Institute's funding principles is available at www.urban.org/support.

Introduction

At the end of 2012, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) launched the Juvenile Justice Reform and Reinvestment Initiative (JJRRI) in three demonstration sites in Delaware, Iowa, and Milwaukee County, Wisconsin. The goal of JJRRI was to bring evidence and best practices to bear on juvenile justice operations. This was done through the use of empirically based risk and needs assessment, the development of dispositional matrices that provide evidence-based recommendations concerning dispositional options, and the implementation of the Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP™) rating system to assess and guide improvements in the programs delivered to juvenile justice youth. Together, these tools were intended to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the use of juvenile justice resources.

Concurrent with the implementation of JJRRI, the Urban Institute conducted a process and outcome evaluation of the initiative. The goals of the evaluation included understanding how the implementation of JJRRI improved the quality and effectiveness of juvenile justice programming at demonstration sites. Two prior reports focused specifically on the implementation and attempt to validate the SPEP™ system for rating program effectiveness, which was a major component of JJRRI (Lieberman and Husseman 2016, 2017). This report provides an overview of JJRRI and implementation components at the three demonstration sites, including progress made, challenges encountered, and the sustainability of reforms.

Findings are based on data collected between 2012 and 2015. Data collection included annual visits to each site with technical assistance (TA) providers, observation of on-site trainings, and in-depth telephone interviews with stakeholders to monitor progress and assess stakeholder perspectives. Interviews were conducted with a diverse set of juvenile justice stakeholders at each site, including administrators, program providers, court workers, contractors, data managers, and JJRRI program managers and support staff. Additional information was collected via a review of written reports and narratives provided by the JJRRI sites, as well as participation in regular calls with the sites, funders, and TA providers.

This report describes the implementation of JJRRI at the three demonstration sites. The first section briefly discusses key components of JJRRI, and the second section discusses how implementation of the components proceeded in the JJRRI demonstration sites. The third section concludes with a discussion of the overall challenges and benefits to the initiative.

OJJDP's Juvenile Justice Reform and Reinvestment Initiative (JJRRI)

The Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP™)

The SPEP™ rating system was the most prominent component of the initiative. The SPEP™ gives local jurisdictions an evidence-based tool to rate services delivered to youth in the juvenile justice system based on their potential to reduce recidivism. Developed by Mark Lipsey of Vanderbilt University's Peabody Research Institute, the SPEP™ is based on a meta-analysis of the characteristics of effective programs from 548 independent study samples (Lipsey 2009; Lipsey et al. 2010). Lipsey identified four basic characteristics of effective juvenile justice services and used them to develop the SPEP™ rating tool. The four basic elements required to produce SPEP™ ratings are the following:

- *The type of service.* Research indicates that some types of services are more effective in reducing recidivism than others. For example, services with a therapeutic orientation (e.g., counseling and skill-building programs) are much more effective at reducing juvenile recidivism than services with a control orientation (e.g., boot camps and “scared-straight” programs). Note that every distinct service provided is rated separately on the SPEP™. That is, if one program provider offers multiple services, each service is rated separately.
- *The quality of the service.* This element focuses on whether programs are structured to promote consistent and reliable delivery of the intended services. This element of the SPEP™ is the least standardized, and SPEP™ developers typically work with sites to develop quality rating systems which take into consideration preexisting quality assurance protocols, as well as the quality assurance protocols required by the funder (Lipsey et al. 2010).
- *Service dosage.* Each type of service has associated dosage targets, based on both the number of contact hours for each youth (e.g., 2.5 hours per week) and the duration in which services are delivered (e.g., 12 weeks). The SPEP™ rates a service on the percentage of its juvenile justice clientele who meet dosage targets. There, dosage data must describe the amount of a service received by each youth.

- *The risk level of youth who receive the service.* The risk level of youth is measured at the individual level and concerns which youth receive a service. Research consistently finds that services reducing recidivism more for youth who are at higher (vs. lower) risk of recidivism (Lipsey 2009). For the SPEP™ assessment to be conducted, each youth's risk of reoffending must be assessed using a validated risk tool within 90 (preferably 60) days before services are delivered.

Taking into consideration these four elements of effective services, the SPEP™ provides local jurisdictions with the ability to rate juvenile justice services in accordance with evidence on what services are shown to effectively reduce juvenile justice recidivism. The data requirements for the SPEP™, and the implementation “drivers” that are needed to assemble those data, are described extensively in our earlier report on SPEP™ implementation at JJRRI sites (Lieberman and Hussemann 2016).

Risk data are critical to SPEP™ ratings, and full SPEP ratings require timely risk data for 80 percent of a service cohort. Because limitations with risk data are commonly encountered, the developers have devised several types of interim ratings to be used in feedback with programs (see Lieberman and Hussemann 2016).¹

The SPEP™ is intended as a vehicle for quality improvement at the level of both individual services and the juvenile justice system, providing input to a continuous quality improvement process. At the program level, the SPEP™ ratings serve as feedback regarding areas of possible improvement and indications for how to make improvements. If quality is indicated as an area of potential improvement, this might include improved training, better quality assurance and monitoring processes, and new processes for correcting drift in fidelity to the service model. In contrast, if there is a need to improve dosage, those improvements might involve revising or renegotiating contracting agreements that specify service hours and/or durations. Moreover, if most programs being used by a jurisdiction are rated on the SPEP™, then an examination of SPEP™ ratings can be used to assess the current array of programs and may show gaps in services.

¹ Timely risk data for at least 80 percent of a cohort of least 10 clients is required to produce a full SPEP™ rating for a service. In JJRRI, if the cohort was smaller than 10 youth, ratings were considered “advisory.” “Preliminary” ratings required timely risk data for at least 60 percent of the cohort. “Provisional” ratings required timely risk data from less than 60 percent, provided that prior offense data confirmed that the youth with and without timely risk data did not differ systematically.

Dispositional Matrices

Dispositional matrices combine information about current case information with risk of recidivism, as assessed by a validated risk assessment tool, to recommend dispositional options. They are an important tool for generating empirically based recommendations concerning the effective use of dispositional decisions and appropriate placement. Much of the work involved in drafting and implementing a dispositional matrix at the sites was modeled after the dispositional matrix developed by the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice. Research on Florida's matrix shows that youth who receive dispositions outside the range of recommended dispositions have higher levels of recidivism than youth who receive dispositions within the recommended range (Boglivio, Greenwald, and Russell 2015).

During JJRRI, the demonstration sites worked with local juvenile justice stakeholders, including the judiciary and probation officers, attorneys, and defenders, to develop local dispositional matrices to inform juvenile justice decisionmaking (see appendix A for site draft dispositional matrices). The Florida Department of Juvenile Justice provided TA to each JJRRI site over the course of the grant period. TA included phone calls and site visits, and participation in webinars and yearly all-site meetings.

Risk Assessment

Valid, reliable, and timely risk assessments are central to JJRRI and, in particular, to the sites' ability to successfully implement the SPEP™ and a dispositional matrix. Thus, an important goal of JJRRI was to promote use of an evidence-based risk assessment tool that had been locally validated. In practice, both dispositional matrices and SPEP™ ratings use categorical levels of risk (e.g., low, medium, or high risk). The risk levels are generally produced from continuous risk scores, and the cutpoints for differentiating levels of risk can vary locally. Thus, one important aspect of local validation of an established risk assessment system involves setting appropriate *local* cutpoints for levels of risk that take into account the distribution of recidivism risk among the local juvenile justice population. Because this work can be time and data intensive, JJRRI provided considerable technical assistance to the demonstration sites to work through risk assessment data issues.

Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities

JJRI also aspired to reduce racial and ethnic disparities via the use of evidence-based tools at disposition (i.e., a dispositional matrix) and for the improvement of services (i.e., the SPEP™). Because risk assessment was so central to JJRI, this also meant that it was important that the risk assessments in use at JJRI sites were valid both within and across racial and ethnic groups (see Baird et al. 2013). Additional training and technical assistance was provided around these issues. JJRI site teams attended the Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Juvenile Justice Certificate Program at Georgetown's Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, which involved a detailed analysis of the state of racial and ethnic disparities in local juvenile justice systems, as well as a broad assessment of racial and ethnic composition for youth at key juvenile justice decision points, including arrest, referral, detention, and adjudication. TA from Vanderbilt helped sites examine disparities related to risk assessment and risk scoring, placement type and length, and SPEP service type and ratings.

Training and Technical Assistance

Effective implementation of JJRI required considerable technical assistance, which was infused throughout JJRI. Considerable TA was needed to buttress stakeholder support for evidence-based juvenile justice reform in general, and for implementation of JJRI's more specific evidence-based tools. This TA included presentations to multiple audiences concerning the evidence base for evidence-based juvenile justice reform, and for the SPEP and tools for dispositional decisionmaking. In addition, considerable TA was devoted to the technical details involved in implementing the SPEP™ and for developing dispositional matrices.

In JJRI, TA was provided by the Georgetown Center for Juvenile Justice Reform and by Vanderbilt University, involving the SPEP's developers. Generally, the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform led the TA to build and buttress support for the reform effort from key stakeholders, while Vanderbilt led the TA around more technical issues. The TA that was involved in implementing the SPEP™ is described in considerable detail in our earlier report on JJRI's implementation of the SPEP™ rating system (Lieberman and Hussemann 2016).

JJRI implementation required the coordinated efforts of many people, which was organized through an implementation team led by each site's JJRI program manager. The team included a subset of juvenile justice stakeholders from both local and state levels who supported the goals of JJRI and facilitated support among juvenile justice administrators and service providers. TA concerning technical

issues was generally delivered to the implementation team as a first matter and to other stakeholders as appropriate.

Implementation of JJRRI at Demonstration Sites

OJJDP funded three diverse demonstration sites to implement JJRRI. We first provide a brief overview of each demonstration site. We then discuss each site's implementation of JJRRI, including progress, implementation challenges that were encountered, and the sustainability of reforms.

Implementing JJRRI in Delaware

Delaware's Juvenile Justice System

Delaware is one of the least populated states in the United States with approximately 900,000 residents, 13 percent of whom are between the ages of 10 and 19. The state of Delaware has a unified court system composed of Sussex, New Castle, and Kent Counties. Local juvenile court services are provided by the Delaware Family Court in New Castle County at Wilmington, Kent County at Dover, and Sussex County at Georgetown. A director of court operations resides within each county and provides oversight on local court operations, including case processing, intake, and diversion services. The administrative office of the Delaware Family Court provides state oversight on fiscal, human resources, training, and specialty courts.

Services including detention, treatment, and probation are provided by the Division of Youth Rehabilitative Services (DYRS). DYRS is responsible for assessing youth needs and coordinating residential and community-based services. DYRS is one of four divisions within the Department of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families.

The Department of Services for Children, Youth and Their Families maintains the Family and Child Tracking System (FACTS), a statewide information system that provides real-time case tracking across DYRS, the Division of Family Services, the Division of Prevention and Behavioral Health, and the Division of Management Support Services. At the launch of JJRRI, the system contained more than 30 categories of datasets, including demographic information, assessments, case planning, legal status, disciplinary, service utilization, and placement authorization. Case-level data for court cases and risk need assessment information were stored in separate databases, which department staff also had access to.

Before the implementation of JJRRI, DYRS undertook a four-year strategic planning process aimed to improve services to youth in secure case facilities, decrease the detention population, improve interventions for sex offenders, and restructure community services.² As a result, in 2011, DYRS implemented a Community Services Restructure Initiative that focused heavily on matching youth with appropriate services and improving the quality of services that youth received. This process resulted in the implementation of an evidence-based risk-need assessment tool. It also resulted in significant contracting changes with community-based service providers and, in several cases, eliminated funding to community programs that were assessed as providing low-quality services. This money was redirected to support new community-based service programs.

At the launch of JJRRI, DYRS provided community supervision to approximately 3,000 preadjudicated and adjudicated youth throughout the state. Due to limited capacity to provide secure residential services, about half those youth who received placement dispositions resided outside the state. DYRS oversaw contracts and provided funding for both residential and nonresidential youth services.

In 2012, Delaware began using the Positive Achievement Change Tool (PACT) as its risk and needs assessment tool. The PACT was administered after disposition to youth who were disposed to community supervision. Risk assessment was not conducted before disposition, and therefore risk assessment data could not inform judicial dispositional decisions, nor was it available to youth in residential settings.

JJRRI Implementation

The JJRRI application was led by DYRS in collaboration with community service providers across the state. Delaware believed that it was in a good position to implement JJRRI following recent reform in the provision of community-based services as a result of the Community Services Restructure Initiative, including the use of a risk need assessment tool and increased collaboration among juvenile justice stakeholders.

Anticipated benefits of JJRRI included increasing Delaware's ability to provide a more responsive continuum of services to youth that relied more heavily on prosocial skill development. As well, JJRRI

² See, generally, John Wilson, Marion Kelly, and James C. Howell, *Juvenile Justice System in Delaware 2012: The Little Engine that Could* (Comprehensive Strategy Group, 2012).

would allow Delaware the opportunity to develop recidivism measures for community-based services, assess new programs, and use data to guide performance-based contracting practices.

Anticipated challenges to the success of JJRRI included the ability to gather data required for the SPEP™, due to staffing and the limitations of FACTS. There was also considerable concern within DYRS in the division's ability to increase buy-in and continually engage stakeholders. Additionally, DYRS was concerned about the feasibility of implementing the PACT risk assessment before adjudication to guide dispositional matrix work.

DYRS, the primary grant recipient for JJRRI, was the coordinator and data collection and reporting agent. Delaware's implementation team comprised state and local juvenile justice representatives, including the newly appointed DYRS director, the chief of community services, and the regional manager of pretrial and low-level juvenile services, as well as representatives from the juvenile court. Several IT and data specialists participated in the team, including the director of the Criminal Justice Council Statistical Analysis Center, to support improved data infrastructure for the collection of SPEP™ data elements.

The SPEP™ Rating System

Delaware implemented the SPEP™ with one community-based provider, VisionQuest, that served youth in all three counties in Delaware. Delaware focused on services that were implemented within the last two years and had not undergone evaluation. Because the PACT was administered only to youth who received community supervision, the SPEP™ was not initially implemented in residential settings.

Two key issues impacted the implementation of SPEP™ in Delaware. First, and early on in the process, Delaware's assessment of the PACT data revealed reliability issues with data entry and found that the cutoff risk scores being used to distinguish levels of risk (as low, moderate, high) were not effectively separating groups with noticeably different reoffending rates. Second, Delaware initiated a process to upgrade the FACTS database to FACTS II to support automated data collection of SPEP™ elements, including quality, dosage, and duration. However, the FACTS II database was not implemented on schedule, and that required staff to collect data for the SPEP™ via paper files and then input the data into a spreadsheet to be merged with the PACT data.

Despite these issues, Delaware produced full ratings for 13 services within the first year. One “advisory” rating was generated for one service that did not have enough clientele during the cohort period. By 2015, an additional rating was added to include MST services. By 2016, a second round of ratings was completed for all 14 services.

Delaware also initially attempted to implement SPEP™ with three additional community service providers but realized early on that program improvement was limited for these services due to their focus on serving low-risk youth. Although SPEP™ ratings were not completed for the three community service providers serving low-risk youth, Delaware continues to track risk, dosage, and recidivism data for these programs.

Program Improvement

SPEP™ reports were provided to VisionQuest for the 14 services included in SPEP™ within the first year. These ratings were shared by DYRS staff, who worked closely with VisionQuest to implement changes. Shortly following receipt of the SPEP™ report, VisionQuest updated youth referral forms to ensure that youth were being referred to the appropriate service matching the youth’s risk and need assessments. VisionQuest also made adjustments to service dosage and duration. DYRS continued to meet with VisionQuest monthly throughout 2015 to discuss program improvement. For the programs that work with low-risk youth only, and were not included in the SPEP™, DYRS provided funding for service providers to attend trainings to ensure that they were providing adequate service for the youth they serve.

Dispositional Matrix

Early in the implementation of JJRRI, Delaware formed a dispositional guidelines committee that comprised stakeholders from Family Court, the Office of the Attorney General, the Office of the Public Defender, the Statistical Analysis Center, and DYRS. This committee met monthly throughout the grant period. By 2015, the committee had drafted a matrix to be used by the Family Court, and had begun to look at a randomly generated sample of cases from 2012–13 to assess the reliability of the matrix as a tool to guide dispositional decisionmaking. The committee did encounter some obstacles associated with the court’s reliance on plea bargaining and buy-in from judiciary. By late 2016, the dispositional

matrix was being used by DYRS to guide decisionmaking for youth reoffending but had not been fully implemented.³ The draft matrix is included in appendix A.

Sustainability

Delaware continues to struggle with several key issues related to the JJRRI work. First, the state has yet to implement a data system that would support full data automation and therefore support efficient collection of the data required for SPEP™ assessment. Also, DYRS encountered initial and ongoing pushback to implementing the PACT as a predisposition assessment tool to guide judicial decisionmaking. In turn, this has delayed the state's ability to rigorously evaluate and finalize a dispositional matrix tool.

Despite these challenges, Delaware has made significant progress in many areas targeted by JJRRI. Perhaps most significantly, Delaware has made strides in the reliable use of the PACT across community-based and residential services. At the beginning of JJRRI, only youth on community supervision were assessed using the PACT, after disposition. Through the course of the grant Delaware also implemented the PACT with youth in residential facilities (albeit after disposition), which will increase Delaware's ability to match youth to appropriate services and expand the use of SPEP™ with youth in residential services. Along the way, Delaware has implemented high-quality and more timely PACT training for probation officers to increase the reliability of PACT scores. Finally, Delaware continues to support rigorous studies of the PACT, including discriminability and validation studies, to ensure the evidence base of the PACT as a local assessment tool.

Implementing JJRRI in Iowa

Iowa's Juvenile Justice System

Iowa is a unified court system composed of eight autonomous judicial districts, which each encompass five or more counties. Each district has one juvenile court that presides over Children in Need of Assistance, adoption, delinquency, and commitment cases for youth between the ages of 10 and 18.

³ These issues are discussed in detail in our previous reports on the SPEP™ data in Iowa (Lieberman and Hussemann 2016, 2017).

Juvenile courts are supervised by a chief juvenile court officer (CJCO) who oversees juvenile court operations, probation, and case management, as well as program development.

The Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning (CJJP), located within the Iowa Department of Human Rights, administers federal and state grants to fund local and state work focused on delinquency and prevention. CJJP carries out research, policy analysis, and program development, and it serves as the state statistical analysis center. CJJP and the Department of Human Services (DHS) fund district juvenile courts, which control local contracts with community-based services. Residential services receive funding directly from DHS.

Iowa's judicial branch maintains the Iowa Court Information System (ICIS), a statewide information system composed of juvenile and criminal justice processing information. ICIS is updated by juvenile court staff and contains juvenile risk information from the Iowa Delinquency Assessment (IDA). ICIS information is housed in the Justice Data Warehouse, maintained by CJJP.

Before the implementation of JJRRI, juvenile justice reform work was locally driven, and focused on the school-to-prison pipeline, cross-over youth, and credit recovery for youth in residential facilities. Iowa is also a Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI) and Results First⁴ site. Over the JJRRI grant period, Iowa received additional external funding to implement a statewide detention screening tool.

At the launch of JJRRI, over half the youth who were arrested were diverted from court by law enforcement and Juvenile Court Services through diversion programs or informal adjustment contracts. As a result, there were approximately 3,000 juvenile petitions filed annually. Youth adjudicated delinquent required a court order to be placed in short- and long-term residential placement. In these cases, the judiciary ordered the level of care and JCOs made referral decisions.

Iowa implemented the IDA, a risk need assessment tool, in 2007. A short-form IDA—which generates the needed quantitative information for risk categorization—is completed with all youth at intake to assess their level of risk and eligibility for diversion. A long-form IDA, which collects information on relationships, family, substance abuse, emotional health, and other social domains, is completed with youth for whom adjudication was being pursued and was used for case planning purposes. Risk information was stored in ICIS and was regularly updated by juvenile court staff.

⁴ The Results First Initiative is a joint project of the Pew Charitable Trusts and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation that works with state governments to enhance evidence-based policymaking by offering innovative tools to conduct comprehensive cost-benefit analysis of social programming in a variety of state-funded contexts.

JJRI Implementation

The JJRI application was led by CJJP in collaboration with CJCOs from the 1st, 3rd, and 6th judicial districts, and with support from the governor's office. Although JJRI was implemented in three Iowa judicial districts, the goal was to subsequently expand the project statewide. An assessment of JJRI requirements (e.g., use of a risk need assessment tool, and data collection and management systems) led Iowa to believe that the state was in a good position to implement the initiative. CJJP built on a strong working relationship with JCOs, support from key decision makers, and interest in cost-efficiency.

Anticipated benefits of JJRI included providing the Iowa juvenile justice system with a uniform means to evaluate services, improve placement and service referrals, and ensure the fidelity and quality of programming. As well, JJRI would allow them the ability to make use of their local data meaningfully, including decreasing costs, and improving efficiency and youth outcomes. Further, perhaps because of the state's involvement in Results First, Iowa was particularly interested in the potential of JJRI to facilitate the integration of cost analysis into the evaluation of juvenile justice services.

Anticipated challenges to the successful implementation of JJRI included the ability to coordinate grant activities (including phone calls, site visits, and data collection) across multiple entities and districts, educating service providers on the initiative to reduce resistance, and the ability to manage staff and resources to support data automation and state expansion. With regard to improving programs after initial SPEP™ ratings were complete, anticipated challenges included navigating the multiple systems engaged in services for juvenile justice youth (i.e., DHS), and ensuring follow-through with the plan as created. Because the JJRI site's coordinating agent was within the executive branch while the CJCOs were in the judicial branch, JJRI implementation required strong collaborating relationships. Achieving the hoped-for statewide expansion was anticipated to require considerable attention to obtaining broad stakeholder buy-in from executive and legislative branches to support work across judicial districts.

CJJP, the primary grant recipient for JJRI, was the coordinator and data collection and reporting agent. The state implementation team consisted of CJJP staff, including the program manager, division director, and statistical and IT specialist, and the CJCOs across the three judicial districts. District implementation teams consisted of JCO staff, the judiciary, defenders, community service providers, DHS agents, and accountants. The state and district implementation teams met at least monthly. Specialized working groups were formed outside the implementation team to focus on data

infrastructure and management, development and implementation of a dispositional matrix, and program improvement work.

The SPEP™ Rating System

Iowa implemented the SPEP™ with statewide residential programs and local community-based services in three judicial districts. CJJP led SPEP™ data collection at state residential programs and facilitated SPEP™ data collection with service providers in the local districts. SPEP™ data collection focused on the programs that serve the greatest number of youth, including urban locations and residential facilities.

Iowa generated full SPEP™ ratings for four community-based services provided through one community program, and 22 services offered in one residential program, by 2014. Additional SPEP™ ratings were compiled for 15 community-based services across three community programs and 30 additional services across three residential providers by 2015. In sum, Iowa had generated ratings for 19 community-based and 52 residential-based services by 2015.

A key issue encountered by Iowa during the collection of SPEP™ data included the timeliness of the risk assessment data (short-form IDA), which was often older than the six-month inclusion criteria for the SPEP™. Although some qualitative data were available from the long-form IDAs, these data could not easily be transformed into the quantitative risk data needed. In response to this limitation, TA providers worked with Iowa to devise proxy risk measures from other data (i.e., from the more qualitative IDA long form and available criminal history information) so programs could receive feedback.

SPEP™ reports were reviewed with the first round of rated programs in early 2015, approximately 19 months after the SPEP™ was launched. By early 2016, a second round of ratings was completed for 26 services, and ratings were under way for an additional 45 services.

Program Improvement

Community-based and residential services received formal SPEP™ rating reports and program improvement plans beginning in March 2014 and ending in early 2015. SPEP™ rating reports and program improvement plans were presented by CJJP to providers during in-person meetings. Rating reports and program improvement plans facilitated conversations focused on the best strategies by which to improve services. In Iowa, program improvement plans focused on improving the quality and availability of risk scores. As well, some programs required adjustments to the service dosage. After

initially talking with programs about their SPEP ratings and areas of improvement, CJJP and CJOs coordinated with service providers via phone calls as needed; however, due to JJRRI staff limitations, primary responsibility for implementing the recommended program improvements rested largely with providers.

Dispositional Matrix

A working group composed of CJJP and JCOs began meeting in 2014 to discuss drafting and piloting a dispositional matrix. By early 2015, a matrix was drafted and initial data analysis had been completed; however, lack of timely risk assessment data limited the ability to populate the matrix with valid youth data. In 2016, Iowa began referring to the matrix as a “decision matrix” (versus a strictly “dispositional matrix”) because the tool would be used for youth with formal court involvement as well as youth diverted from court. By late 2016, the decision matrix had not yet been piloted, in part due to the incorporation of predictive analytics software that allowed for further development of the matrix using a number of additional variables beyond risk level.

Sustainability

The implementation team began to strategically pursue support for JJRRI at the beginning of the grant. Beyond sustaining JJRRI reforms in the three districts already involved, Iowa hoped to expand statewide. This would require support from other judicial districts, as well as state leaders to support the institutionalization of SPEP™, program improvement, and a (dispositional) decision matrix.

By the end of 2016, Iowa had made significant progress toward expansion. In 2016, SPEP™ was expanded to two additional districts, and was expected to be expanded across the remaining three districts in 2017. The (dispositional) decision matrix working group had also been expanded to include representatives from all eight judicial districts. As well, adjustments to how the IDA was administered had improved Iowa’s ability to provide full and reliable SPEP™ ratings. Finally, ongoing consultation with ICIS staff continued to move Iowa closer to the goal of incorporating the collection of SPEP™ rating elements within their current data management system.

However, while JJRRI began with the support of state leaders, interest in sustaining JJRRI work began to languish toward the end of the grant. In particular, the legislature had been reluctant to provide funding for the staff time required to support continual SPEP™ and program improvement

work, and in 2016, the Iowa judicial branch's budget was decreased by nearly \$6 million. The Juvenile Justice Advisory Council (Iowa's State Advisory Group) allocated a small amount of funding to continue JJRRI work, and CJJP successfully pursued some additional discretionary funding to continue the project, but long-term stable funding was unpredictable and, thus, the sustainability of JJRRI reforms remained uncertain.

Implementing JJRRI in Milwaukee County, Wisconsin

Milwaukee County's Juvenile Justice System

Milwaukee County is the largest county in Wisconsin, with a population of approximately 1 million; 25 percent of the population is under the age of 18. One juvenile justice court presides over all cases, with discretion to place youth in more than 200 juvenile justice programs throughout the county.

The Milwaukee County Delinquency and Court Services Division (DCSD) works with youth from the time of referral to court to the end of the dispositional order. DCSD oversees youth intake and probation services, and contracts with and monitors the administration of juvenile services, including the operation of a 120-bed juvenile facility. DCSD works closely with Wraparound Milwaukee, a managed care program operated by the Milwaukee County Behavioral Health Division, to provide community-based mental health services to youth and families.

At the inception of JJRRI, DCSD relied on multiple data systems to track juvenile justice information. Youth case processing information was stored in the Juvenile Information Management System, which tracked juvenile information from referral to the end of court-imposed supervision. Wraparound Milwaukee maintained a web-based client database that tracked referrals, services, care plans, case notes, and invoices for youth receiving services through their network of providers. Risk assessment data was stored in a separate database.

In the 1990s, Milwaukee County was a JDAI site; however concern about limited data storage and capacity resulted in withdrawal of the initiative. Milwaukee County applied to be a JDAI site again in 2010. When JJRRI work began, DCSD was also in the initial planning phases for JDAI work.

At the launch of JJRRI, DCSD received approximately 2,500 referrals annually. Between 45 and 50 percent of referrals were for first-time offenders. Of the youth who were supervised by DCSD, approximately 40 percent received services through Wraparound Milwaukee. Wraparound Milwaukee received funding from DCSD, child welfare, mental health, and Medicaid capitation, and it contracted

with more than 200 agencies to provide services to youth and their families. Notably, all youth referred for services to Wraparound Milwaukee had previously received a DSM-IV diagnosis associated with mental health concerns.

Almost all youth who committed a sexual offense were referred to Wraparound Milwaukee for support. In part because of the population of youth that were referred to Wraparound Milwaukee, the organization's philosophy and focus on a core coordination support model, differed significantly from DCSD. On average, youth enrolled in Wraparound Milwaukee received approximately four different services at one time. Coordinated and individual juvenile justice programming was typically funded through fee-for-service or unit-price contracts.

In 2012, DCSD began using the Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument (YASI) as its risk and needs assessment to inform recommendations and decisionmaking about juvenile supervision and services. The YASI prescreen is used before referral to court to categorize youth into risk levels. If a youth scores in the low-risk category, he or she may be diverted from court; if the youth scores in the medium- or high-risk category, he or she will be assessed by the YASI full screen with the intention to inform disposition. At the time JJRRI was implemented, by policy DCSD human service workers (who have community supervision responsibilities) were to complete risk assessments with all youth, but in practice risk assessments were not being completed systematically. Further, judges did not consistently allow risk assessments to be introduced in juvenile court hearings or used to guide placements. Wraparound Milwaukee was not using the YASI to inform youth service needs.

JJRRI Implementation

The JJRRI application was led by DCSD in collaboration with Wraparound Milwaukee. An assessment of JJRRI requirements led DCSD to believe that the division was in a good position to implement the initiative due to having recently implemented the YASI and the diverse array of services that were available to justice-involved youth in Milwaukee County. As well, DCSD perceived JJRRI as a good vehicle by which to address gaps in the division's ability to provide a comprehensive service delivery model, including appropriate matching of youth to services and assessment of service effectiveness. Similar to Iowa, DCSD approached its participation in JJRRI as the first step toward statewide expansion and acceptance of the use of YASI, SPEP™, and the dispositional matrix tools.

Anticipated benefits of JJRRI included improving DCSD's ability to match youth with appropriate services, engage in ongoing quality assurance and improvement, and promote service program

improvement and evidence-based practices and standards. As well, JJRRI would provide DCSD a foundation by which to implement the full use of YASI across the juvenile justice system and improve the division's capacity to automate data collection and build a comprehensive data system.

Anticipated challenges included obtaining buy-in from the courts, including the judiciary, attorneys, defense bar, and human service workers, to support the use of YASI and a dispositional matrix to guide decisionmaking. Another anticipated challenge was the necessity of DCSD to work collaboratively with Wraparound Milwaukee, as a major service intermediary, on implementing YASI and quality assurance tools, given differing agency missions and philosophies. Reliance on a very limited and disjointed data system, however, was anticipated to pose the most formidable challenge to JJRRI implementation.

Given these challenges, DCSD assembled an implementation team that included county administrators, quality assurance staff, and IT workers from both DCSD and Wraparound Milwaukee. The implementation team also included juvenile judges and human service worker supervisors to promote SPEP™ and YASI buy-in. Similar to other sites, the implementation team met on a regular basis, and additional working groups were formed to focus on data management and infrastructure, the dispositional matrix, and program improvement work.

The SPEP™ Rating System

Milwaukee County implemented the SPEP™ with six community-based services and five residential services. By the end of 2015, only three community-based services had received full SPEP™ ratings, and three others had received interim ratings. Only one residential service received a full rating. Services funded through both DCSD and Wraparound Milwaukee were rated on the SPEP™.

At a very early stage, Milwaukee encountered issues related to the YASI and its data systems that significantly limited its ability to implement SPEP™. First, upon review of YASI scoring, it became clear that the tool was not being used consistently, including both the timing and entering of data. Second, the sites' inability to merge risk data with other juvenile justice data required risk and SPEP™ data to be entered manually. Also, low cohort sized precluded many services from being included in SPEP™.⁵ Due to these complications, only approximately 5 percent of services were included in SPEP™, although more than 200 services were included in classification activities. No additional programs had received SPEP™ ratings by the end of 2016.

⁵ A cohort size of 10 youth is required to produce a full SPEP™ program rating.

Program Improvement

Due to the setbacks encountered during SPEP™ implementation, Milwaukee County had not implemented program improvement plans by the end of 2016; however, programs had been provided with a draft program improvement plan to guide their thinking around improvement goals. For programs that did receive feedback via SPEP™ ratings, program improvement potential relies on the ability of programs to ensure that reliable and timely risk scores are available, and then to use risk data as a consideration in referral to services.

Dispositional Matrix

A working group focused on the implementation of a dispositional matrix began to meet early in the grant period. Unlike other sites, Milwaukee County focused on drafting both a dispositional matrix and an effective response grid. The dispositional matrix guides judicial dispositional decisionmaking; the effective response grid guides human service worker decisionmaking for youth who violate probation terms. By the end of 2016, both tools had been automated within a data system, but they had not yet been piloted due to concern about the lack of data to support the continual development and assessment of the tools.

Sustainability

Despite challenges to successfully implementing JJRRI, Milwaukee County has worked consistently to improve its ability to sustain JJRRI goals. With considerable TA through JJRRI, the site put considerable effort into increasing the reliable use of YASI. In response to a lack of stakeholder support for the use of a risk assessment tool, DCSD implemented trainings to increase familiarity with and understanding of the YASI as a tool to guide decisionmaking. DCSD also implemented training (and boosters) on using the risk assessment (and on motivational interviewing techniques) for human service workers, Wraparound Milwaukee staff, and members of the judiciary. In addition, a policy was implemented requiring the risk assessment to be completed with every new youth referred to DCSD.

Milwaukee County also made a considerable investment of time and resources to transform its management information system so it could easily accommodate the risk and other SPEP™ data for future cycles of SPEP ratings. In 2013, DCSD began working with a business analytic teams to develop and implement a comprehensive data management system, and by mid-2016, the site implemented the

Juvenile Program Management system to automate data collection and management and to increase the ability for systems to communicate with one another. By the end of its JJRRI grant, Milwaukee County was participating in conversations to increase capacity by moving toward a centralized case management system that could be used across all Department of Health and Human Services Divisions in Milwaukee County

At the end of JJRRI funding, Milwaukee County had secured local funding to continue local JJRRI work. Over the course of the grant, DCSD incorporated a quality assurance division to provide ongoing assessment of juvenile justice services. Thus, JJRRI work related to the SPEP™, YASI, and dispositional matrix will continue to be funded by local and state funds for the foreseeable future.

Conclusion

The JJRRI demonstration project aimed to reform juvenile justice systems through the application of research evidence. JJRRI focused on the use of three types of evidence-based tools: risk assessment systems, dispositional matrices, and the SPEP™ system for rating program effectiveness. In combination, use of these tools would improve dispositional decisions, reduce disparities, and drive continuous quality improvement in services. Such structured tools seem to provide an efficient approach for disseminating the research evidence and for drawing out its application to local sites.

This report provides an overview of how JJRRI was implemented at the demonstration sites. In JJRRI, these tools seemed to be effective vehicles for engaging local stakeholders with the promise of evidence-based reforms and providing clear guidelines for how to apply that evidence.

Implementing these tools requires strong stakeholder support and comes with important data requirements. Considerable TA was provided through the demonstration project for the technical aspects of developing and using the tools as well as to support stakeholder understanding of the underlying evidence and to bolster their support for the reforms. Several common challenges were encountered across the sites.

Stakeholder buy-in and support. Although all sites began the initiative with support from key stakeholders, all sites struggled with buy-in for implementation of some key components of the initiative. For implementing the SPEP as a tool for continuous quality improvement, support is needed from a broad range of juvenile justice stakeholders, as discussed in some detail in our earlier report (Lieberman and Husseman 2016). For consistent risk assessment, support at the staff and supervisor levels is also critical, and, in Delaware, judicial support was critical for consistent risk assessment before adjudication. For dispositional matrices, judicial support is critical and was the target of considerable technical assistance.

Access to valid and reliable risk assessment data. Although all sites were using a risk assessment tool when JJRRI began, limitations in consistent use of and validity of the assessment data affected sites' ability to fully implement the SPEP™ and the dispositional matrix.

Access to comprehensive and linked data management systems. Delaware and Milwaukee County, in particular, were required to spend considerable time manually entering data into data systems to produce SPEP™ ratings. All sites worked through the JJRRI period to improve their data systems; Milwaukee in particular had implemented a considerably revamped MIS for juvenile justice.

SPEP™. Implementing the SPEP™ was challenging; its requirements and challenges are the focus of our previous JJRRI reports (Lieberman and Husseman 2016, 2017). Implementation varied across sites. In Delaware, where primary attention was focused on rating a small number of community-based services, the SPEP™ rating process was much faster than in other sites; Iowa was able to rate more services, although most of the Iowa's ratings were interim because of suboptimal risk data (Lieberman and Husseman 2017).

Dispositional matrices. All sites worked diligently to implement a dispositional matrix, received considerable TA support, and conducted frequent meetings with stakeholders. This provided the foundation for developing draft matrices, which are included in appendix A. However the combination of issues associated with risk assessments combined with limited buy-in from the judiciary and other court staff prevented any site from fully implementing a dispositional matrix to guide decisionmaking by the end of the project period.

Sustainability. Each JJRRI site has struggled to maintain support for the initiative's work following the end of the grant period. This is particularly notable because the sites in large states (Iowa, Milwaukee County) had hoped to serve as a launching point for later statewide expansion. Iowa, in particular, has struggled to secure long-term funding to support and expand JJRRI's reforms statewide, but it has nonetheless achieved some interest from additional judicial districts.

Despite these challenges, sites accomplished some notable reforms and improvements through JJRRI:

- Through JJRRI, sites made considerable progress in their consistent implementation of risk assessment. Although all sites had implemented the use of a risk assessment tool before the grant period, when those risk data were brought to bear on the other tools, this exposed limitations to sites' risk data, then drove improvements in the collection and use of those data.
- In all sites, the SPEP™ rating process and the interim reports that it produced were able to guide efforts to improve program effectiveness in several ways. Assessing the types of services available to youth highlighted gaps in the available services. In addition, attempting to rate the quality of service delivery for the SPEP™ helped sites grapple with establishing quality assurance processes to monitor whether evidence-based services are being delivered with training, monitoring and consistency. Finally, SPEP™ ratings focused attention to the critical issue of the dosage of service, highlighting that services will not effectively reduce recidivism if not delivered at sufficient dosage.

- JJRRI helped motivate considerable improvement to juvenile justice data and systems, while providing considerable guidance for how to do so, as a prerequisite for full implementation of the SPEP™ in particular. All sites were in the process of improved their data and management systems, and Milwaukee County was particularly energetic in using JJRRI to improve data systems. Improved systems then provide local decisionmakers with considerably better information to manage juvenile justice system operations.

In the context of JJRRI, these system improvements were also explicitly linked to expected benefits in terms of recidivism reduction. That is, the three decisionmaking tools advanced by JJRRI—risk assessments, SPEP™, and dispositional matrices—are each based on evidence concerning recidivism, so implementation of those tools comes with the promise of public safety benefits, which was an important motivator for improving those systems.

In summary, JJRRI aimed to bring evidence-based tools to bear on improving juvenile justice practice, from dispositional decision making to the contracting and monitoring of programs and services for youth. Through the use of these tools, some partners expected the process of implementing these reforms to be quite rapid, such as the completion of a round of SPEP ratings within six months at all sites, followed by statewide expansion in the larger states. That aspiration for rapid implementation, proved unrealistic largely because of initial overly optimistic assessments of the current state of risk assessment and data systems. Thus, an extended period was needed to improve those systems before the other tools could really be implemented. Despite being a longer process of reform than was anticipated, JJRRI's integrated approach to harnessing evidence through evidence-based tools seems to have considerable potential to harness the research evidence to improve juvenile justice practice and effectiveness, to uncover deficiencies and guide improvements, and to use the evidence to help maintain stakeholder support.

Appendix A. Draft Dispositional Matrices

Delaware Draft Juvenile Justice Disposition Matrix and Decision Tool

Most serious presenting offense	Low Risk to reoffend	Moderate Risk to reoffend	Moderate High Risk to reoffend	High Risk to reoffend
First time misdemeanor First referral to DYRS, with no history of adjudication or participation in diversion programs.	Community Supervision Assignment Decision Tool (CSADT)	CSADT	N/A	N/A
Minor All misdemeanor offenses, including youth who participated in diversion programs.	CSADT	CSADT	Probation Officer with services	Probation Officer with services
Serious Felony offenses that do not include violence.	CSADT or Probation Officer with services	Probation Officer with services	Probation Officer with services or L4 placement	Probation Officer with services or L4 placement
Violent Violent felony offenses	Probation Officer with services	Probation Officer with services or L4 placement	Probation Officer with services or L4 or L5 placement	Probation Officer with services or L4 or L5 placement

Note: this matrix does not apply to youth eligible for a mandatory 6 month, or 12 month, commitment per DE Code

DYRS staff must always begin with the least restrictive setting within a particular disposition category/or the least restrictive that was successful before. Any deviation (up or down) must always be approved by the unit supervisor; recommendations for placements must be approved by the PAC committee.

Youth in need of a residential ISB program will have been evaluated by PBH and recommendation will be made at the time of the hearing.
Youth in need of a residential mental health program will have been evaluated by PBH and recommendation will be made at the time of the hearing.

Community Supervision Assignment Decision Tool – August 2015

To use grid: review risk of re-offense, caregiver involvement, requirements and access to services choosing item in each row that best matches the youth's situation.

The column with the most categories endorsed is the presumptive program assignment.

Risk of Re-Offense (Assessment score)	Low	Moderate	Moderate High to High
Caregiver Involvement & Attitudes	High Caregiver(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand(s) probation conditions and Court-ordered requirements is willing or committed to assisting youth is able to monitor curfew, school attendance, community service requirements, restitution, fines, etc. is able to initiate/coordinate services with referral help is engaged (or willing to engage) as a participant in treatment as appropriate and necessary is concerned for youth's circumstances and is committed to making and supporting changes 	Any level of caregiver involvement, support and attitude toward probation and the requirements is appropriate for supervision and case management with a contracted community-based provider or a DYRS probation officer. This includes factors to the left in the High caregiver involvement section and those below: Caregiver(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> may or may not understand(s) requirements and probation conditions. may feel conditions are the youth's responsibility, may not agree with the requirements or conditions. may offer minimal or limited support in completing conditions, setting up services, participating, etc. may be willing to participate in treatment/services or may not be willing to actively engage. may have fair to good ability to monitor curfew, school attendance, community service requirements, restitution, fines, etc. may have limited or no ability to maintain youth behavior (home/ community). demonstrates concerns for youth's circumstances, but may not know how to proceed and get help. may have limited or no authority over youth and youth's behavior. 	
DYRS History	First time offenders, prior diversion, civil citation or adjudications not resulting probation, prior successful BOT 2 or more years ago. Traffic offense only regardless of history.	First time offenders, prior BOT, prior low-risk provider program probationers can be considered.	Previous PO, particularly if within the last two years, prior aftercare and now has a new misdemeanor or felony adjudication (traffic offenses only may be appropriate for a provider supervision option).
Requirements/ Needs (these can be court-ordered requirements or youth / family needs)	Low: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Costs and Fines Restitution Community Services Hours No Contact order Substance Abuse Evaluation and follow recommendations Family needs help connecting to social services and supports 	Low – Moderate: 1 – 6 on left and <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Curfew monitoring Electronic Monitoring Support to coordinate services and complete conditions Pro-social or vocational skills Family Engagement Family needs help connecting to more intensive or therapeutic services and supports 	Moderate – High: 1 – 12 on left and <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Therapeutic or rehabilitative needs that are not otherwise met or can only be met through contracted service providers Consistent and/or intensive contact needed to promote success Structured compliance plan Adjunct Services are ordered or needed to ensure compliance
Access to Appropriate Resources within the Community	High: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family has insurance or access to resources and/or; Community-based resources (services, programs, supports) that match needs are available in reasonable geographic proximity Youth can access mental and behavioral health resources through PBH which meet needs and satisfy conditions / requirements. Transportation issues are not an barrier 	Moderate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Youth needs skills-based programming not available in community Youth and family require significant assistance/follow-up to ensure connection to services and completion of requirements. Family may or may not have adequate insurance or barriers may exist to accessing treatment Youth and family need assistance to access treatment services 	Low: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family does not have any or adequate insurance There are availability or funding barriers impacting access to needed services or resources in the community Community-based services and programs do not match treatment or other needs
Type of Service	Compliance Monitoring with BACK ON TRACK	Contracted/Community Program for Case Management & Supervision	Appropriate Rehabilitative or Therapeutic Programming with Probation Officer Supervision

Updated: 8/20/2015

Definitions:

BOT = Back on Track, which is the lowest risk to reoffend statewide provider who will offer case management, 4 skills building groups, and a community service project.

Low Risk Provider = Wraparound Delaware (Wrap DE) in New Castle County and **Community Service Resource Connection (CSRC)** in Kent & Sussex counties offer case management, skills building groups, connections to services in the community, community service projects, etc.

Probation Officer = State of Delaware employee (DYRS) who will connect youth to appropriate services to match their top 3 criminogenic needs, as well address any court ordered conditions (restitution, court costs and fines, etc.). Services can include those through DYRS umbrella services, as well as mental health/substance use services via providers throughout the state/contracted via PBH.

Criminogenic needs

Attitudes & Behaviors (Anti-social/Pro-Criminal Attitudes, Values and Beliefs)

Refer to: Aggression Replacement Training (ART) Group [10 weeks, 30 sessions]
 Accountability [60 days]
 Cognitive Behavioral Self-Counseling Skills (Individual or group) [16 weeks, 24 sessions]

Current Relationships (Pro-Criminal Associates and Isolation from anti-Criminal Peers)

Refer to: Street Smart [9 weeks, 10 sessions]
 Accountability [60 days]
 Sanctuary – individual or group [16 weeks, 24 sessions]

Aggression (Temperamental and Personality Factors Conducive to Criminal Activity)

Refer to: Aggression Replacement Training (ART) (Group) [10 weeks, 30 sessions]
 Cognitive Behavioral Self-Counseling Skills (Individual or group) [16 weeks, 24 sessions]

Skills (History of Anti-Social Behavior/Low Self-Esteem)

Refer to: Sanctuary (individual or group) [16 weeks, 24 sessions]
 Casey Life Skills [16 weeks, 24 sessions]
 Girls' Self-esteem (Individual or group) [16 weeks, 24 sessions]

Current Living Arrangements (Current Dysfunctional Family Features)

Refer to: Family Meetings [Maximum of 6]
Functional Family Therapy (FFT) [Average of 12 weeks, 12 sessions]

Current School Status (Low Levels of Education or Vocational Achievement)

Refer to: Cognitive Behavioral Self-Counseling Skills (Individual or group) [16 weeks, 24 sessions]
Casey Life Skills [16 weeks, 24 sessions]

Current Use of Free Time (Low Levels of Involvement in Pro-Social Leisure Activities)

Refer to: Street Smart [9 weeks, 10 sessions]
Community Service [indicate number of hours]
Guided Recreation [indicate number of hours]

Alcohol and Drug Use (Abuse of Alcohol and/or Drugs)

Refer to: Street Smart [9 weeks, 10 sessions]
Functional Family Therapy (FFT) [Average 12 weeks, 12 sessions]

Iowa Draft Juvenile Justice Disposition Matrix

Most Serious Presenting Offense	Iowa Delinquency Assessment Risk Level			
	No Risk Level	Low Risk to Reoffend	Moderate Risk to Reoffend	High Risk to Reoffend
1st Time/Low Level Offense ¹	Level 1	Level 2	Level 2	NA
Minor Offense ²	Level 1	Level 2 or 3a	Level 2 or 3a-b	Level 3a - c or 4
Felony Non-Violent	NA	Level 2 or 3a	Level 2 or 3a-b	Level 3a - c or 4
Felony Violent	NA	Level 2 or 3a-b	Level 3a - c or 4	Level 3a - c, 4 or 5
¹ - Any offense below a simple misdemeanor ² - Misdemeanor offense (simple, serious, aggravated)		Level 1 - Dismissed/No Supervision Level 2 - Diversion/Informal Probation Level 3 (a-b) - Community Supervision Level 4 - Residential Care Level 5 - Secure Facility		

Evaluation services not included as they may occur in multiple areas

Alcohol/Drug Evaluation(AE)

Mental Health Evaluation(MH)

Sex Offender Evaluation (SE)

Other Notes

Detention decisions should be made using the Detention Screening Tool

Youth charged with sex offenses may require further assessment.

DRAFT

Level 1 - Dismissed/No Supervision

Level 2 - Diversion/Informal Probation

Alcohol/Drug Education
Early Intervention
Shoplifting Prevention
Community Service
DOT OWI
Education Service

Level 3 - Community Supervision (info/form)

(3a) - Lifeskills
School Liaison
Tracking and Monitoring
Electronic Monitoring
Mentoring

(3b) - Counseling/Therapy
Family Centered
Individual Skill
Detention Alternative
Outpatient
Anger Management
Drug Court

(3c) - ART
Alcohol/Drug Treatment
Day/Evening
FFT

Level 4 - Residential Care

Group Care
Mental Health/PMIC
Family Foster Care
Independent Living
Shelter
Violators Program
Inpatient MH Care (this is listed as a service not placement code)

Level 5 - Secure Facility

State Training School
Highly Structured
Hospital
State Hospital

Milwaukee County Draft Juvenile Justice Disposition Matrix

Disposition 1: Intervention Levels				
		Overall YASI Risk Level		
		LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
Severity of Offense	D	Level 1	Level 2	Level 2 or 3
	C	Level 2	Level 2 or 3	Level 3
	B	Level 3	Level 3	Level 4
	A	Level 3	Level 3 or 4	Level 4 or 5

Offense Categories			
D	C	B	A
Disorderly Conduct while armed, Possession of a Controlled Substance (non-marijuana), Possession of a Non-Firearm Weapon including on School Grounds, 4th degree sexual assault, Felony theft, Abuse to animals, prostitution, Endangering safety non-use of a weapon, Marijuana Possession/use, Drug Paraphernalia, Criminal Damage to Property, Disorderly Conduct, Retail Theft, Misdemeanor Theft, Misdemeanor battery, Graffiti, Entry into a locked vehicle, Negligent use of burning material, Criminal Trespass, Fraud/Bad Checks and credit card use, Receiving Stolen property, Resisting/obstructing, an officer, OMVWOC passenger	(OMVWOC, Burglary of a garage or shed or any building unoccupied, Arson of property other than a building, Bomb Threat/Scare, 3rd degree sexual, Assault, False Imprisonment)	(1st or 2nd degree Sexual Assault, 1st or 2nd degree Sexual Assault of a child, Physical abuse of a child, Drug Trafficking Intent to Distribute, Intimidation of a victim, Fleeing an officer in a car/high speed chase, Recklessly endangering of safety with the use of a weapon other than a firearm, Battery/special circumstances (Law Enforcement or School official))	1st and 2nd degree Intentional Homicide, 1st degree Reckless Homicide, Felony Murder, Kidnapping, Substantial and Aggravated Battery, Mayhem, Carjacking with a Weapon, Armed Burglary, Arson of a building, Burglary of a residential building occupied, Felony w/Firearm & Robbery with a Dangerous weapon, Armed w/short-barreled rifle or shotgun, Possession of Firearm or Theft of a Firearm, Strong Arm Robbery Endangering safety with a use of a firearm

Disposition 2: Intervention Types				
Level 1: No Further Action*	Level 2: Diversion*	Level 3: Court Involvement*	Level 4: Intensive Services*	Level 5: Most Restrictive*
Community Services	Community Accountability Panels (CAP)	Supervision/Probation	Targeted Monitoring Program	Milwaukee County Accountability Program (MCAP)
Counsel and Close	Community Services (e.g. REACH, FISS, etc.)	Consent Decree (CD)	PIVOT Program	Department of Corrections
No Further Action	Family Initiated Services/Community Services	DCSD Services & Programs		Serious Juvenile Offender
No Process	Deferred Prosecution Agreement (DPA)	Deferred Prosecution Agreement (DPA) Out of Home Placement/Care		Waiver to Adult Court

Note *Wraparound Milwaukee Assessments can be requested at any point of contact with youth.

Disposition 3: Intervention Services

Programs and Services Sorted According to YASI Domains and Risk Level

YASI DOMAINS ==>	Family	School	Community & Peers	AODA	MH	Violence & Aggression	Attitudes	Skills	Employment & Free Time
YASI RISK = LOW	Healthy Relationships	Tutoring	Individual Therapy	GAIN Assessment (and any recommended services)	Competency Restoration	Anger Management	Healthy Relationships	Individual Therapy	Mentoring
	Family Therapy		CSRC	Celebrating Families	Individual Therapy	Individual Therapy	Individual Therapy	Employment Programs	CSRC
	FFT		Mentoring	Family Therapy	Psychiatric Evaluation	SA Group Therapy	Restorative Justice	SA Group Therapy	Employment Programs
	Parent Education			Individual Therapy	SA Group Therapy	SA Individual Therapy	SA Group Therapy	SA Individual Therapy	
					SA Individual Therapy		SA Individual Therapy		
YASI RISK = Moderate	Healthy Relationships	Tutoring	Individual Therapy	GAIN Assessment (and any recommended services)	Competency Restoration	Aggression Replacement Therapy (ART)	Healthy Relationships	Individual Therapy	Mentoring
	(CC)	CC	CC	Celebrating Families	CC	CC	Burglary/Auto Monitoring Program (BMP/AMP)	CC	BMP/AMP
	Family Therapy	JETI	CSRC	Community Connections (CC)	Individual Therapy	FA	CC	Employment Programs	CC
	Female Family Systems Intervention		FA	Family Therapy	Psychiatric Evaluation	Individual Therapy	ERC	ERC	CSRC
	FFT		Mentoring	Group Counseling	SA Group Therapy	SA Group Therapy	FFT	FA	Employment Programs
	Girls Family Connections		SCOP	Individual Therapy	SA Individual Therapy	SA Individual Therapy	Individual Therapy	FFT	ERC
	Parent Education					SCOP	Restorative Justice	SA Group Therapy	Level II/GPS
							SA Group Therapy	SA Individual Therapy	SAS
							SA Individual Therapy	SAS	
							SAS	SCOP	
YASI RISK = HIGH	Healthy Relationships	Tutoring	Individual Therapy	GAIN Assessment (and any recommended services)	Competency Restoration	ART	Healthy Relationships	Individual Therapy	Mentoring
	Family Therapy	JETI	CSRC	Celebrating Families	Individual Therapy	FA	BMP/AMP	Employment Programs	BMP/ AMP

Disposition 3: Intervention Services

Programs and Services Sorted According to YASI Domains and Risk Level

YASI DOMAINS ==>	Family	School	Community & Peers	AODA	MH	Violence & Aggression	Attitudes	Skills	Employment & Free Time
	Female Family Systems Intervention		FA	Family Therapy	MCAP	Individual Therapy	ERC	ERC	CSRC
	FFT		MCAP	Group Counseling	Psychiatric Evaluation	MCAP	FA	FA	Employment Programs
	Girls Family Connections		Mentoring	Individual Therapy	SA Group Therapy	SA Group Therapy	FFT	FFT	ERC
	MCAP		SCOP	MCAP	SA Individual Therapy	SA Individual Therapy	Individual Therapy	MCAP	Level II/GPS
	Parent Education					SCOP	Level II/GPS	SA Group Therapy	MCAP
							MCAP	SA Individual Therapy	SAS
							Restorative Justice	SAS	
							SA Group Therapy	SCOP	
							SA Individual Therapy		
							SAS		
							SEP		

Note *For all services and risk levels, see BITS and Carey Guides for additional resources.

Terms & Definitions

AODA – Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse	CSRC – Community Services & Restitution Coordination	IMP – Intensive Monitoring Program	SEP – Supervision Engagement Program
ARB – Administrative Review Board	DOC – Department of Corrections	JIPS – Juvenile in Need of Protective Services	SJO – Serious Juvenile Offender
ART – Aggression Replacement Therapy	DPA – Deferred Prosecution Agreement	MCAP – Milwaukee County Accountability Program	
BMP/AMP – Burglary/Auto Monitoring Program	ERC – Evening Report Center	LPC-IT – Licensing Professional Counselor - In Training	
CC – Community Connections Program	FA – Fire Arms	SA – Sexual Assault	
C & C – Counsel and Close	FFT – Functional Family Therapy	SAS – Saturday Alternative Sanctions Program	
CCSN – Children Court Services Network	JETI – Juvenile Education Treatment Initiative	SCOP – Serious Chronic Offender Program	

References

- Baird, Chris, Theresa Healy, Kristen Johnson, Andrea Bogie, Erin W. Dankert, and Chris Scharenbroch. 2013. *A Comparison of Risk Assessment Instruments in Juvenile Justice*. Rockville, MD: National Criminal Justice Reference Service.
- Boglivo, Michael T., Mark A. Greenwald, and Mark Russell. 2015. "Assessing the Implications of a Structured Decision-Making Tool for Recidivism in a Statewide Analysis: Disposition Matrix for Court Recommendations Made by Juvenile Probation Officers." *Criminology and Public Policy* 14 (1): 5–49.
- Liberman, Akiva, and Jeanette Hussemann. 2016. *Implementing the Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol™ to Rate Juvenile Justice Programs: Lessons from OJJDP's Juvenile Justice Reform and Reinvestment Initiative*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- . 2017. *Local Validation of SPEP™ Ratings of Juvenile Justice Program Effectiveness: A Case Study*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Lipsey, Mark W. 2009. "The Primary Factors that Characterize Effective Interventions with Juvenile Offenders: A Meta-Analytic Overview." *Victims and Offenders* 4 (2): 124–47.
- Lipsey, Mark W., James C. Howell, Marion R. Kelly, Gabrielle Chapman, and Darin Carver. 2010. *Improving the Effectiveness of Juvenile Programs: A New Perspective on Evidence-Based Practice*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University, Center for Juvenile Justice Reform.

About the Authors



Akiva Liberman is a senior fellow in the Justice Policy Center at the Urban Institute, where he researches and evaluates crime and justice policy, with a focus on juvenile delinquency and juvenile justice. Recent projects include evaluations of juvenile reentry programs supported through the Juvenile Second Chance Act, Restorative Justice in Rhode Island Schools, pay for success initiatives, and Early Access to Medicaid as a Reentry Strategy.



Jeanette Husseman is a research associate in the Justice Policy Center. She is committed to using rigorous social science methods to inform and improve justice systems. Her research portfolio focuses on indigent defense, victimization, and juvenile justice. Husseman directs projects that employ both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies, and she has extensive experience conducting fieldwork in diverse settings.

STATEMENT OF INDEPENDENCE

The Urban Institute strives to meet the highest standards of integrity and quality in its research and analyses and in the evidence-based policy recommendations offered by its researchers and experts. We believe that operating consistent with the values of independence, rigor, and transparency is essential to maintaining those standards. As an organization, the Urban Institute does not take positions on issues, but it does empower and support its experts in sharing their own evidence-based views and policy recommendations that have been shaped by scholarship. Funders do not determine our research findings or the insights and recommendations of our experts. Urban scholars and experts are expected to be objective and follow the evidence wherever it may lead.



2100 M Street NW
Washington, DC 20037

www.urban.org