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History of Juvenile Diversion

• Juvenile Diversion was established in state statute during the mid-1980s and is funded with state general funds appropriated annually by the state general assembly.

• In 2002 juvenile diversion programming was reverted to the state General Fund. At that time the allocation was $2,483,702.

• In 2006, the legislature re-appropriated funding for juvenile diversion program in the amount of $1,241,851.
Current Funding

- State-funded Juvenile Diversion
  - $1.2 Million
  - Administration
  - Programs ($1,184,531)

- Marijuana Tax Funds for Juvenile Diversion Programs
  - Began SFY 15/16 with $400,000
  - Administration
  - Programs ($340,000)
  - Program Evaluation ($20,000)

- JJDP Council Title II Funds
  - Evaluation of Juvenile Diversion
State-funded Juvenile Diversion Programs - July 2016 through June 2017

• 2,550 youth were served
  • 19 state-funded juvenile diversion programs within 18 JDs
    • 7 programs located within District Attorneys’ Offices
    • 4 county based programs
    • 1 municipal program
    • 7 community-based programs.

• CDAC reports 18 of 22 District Attorney’s Office have formal diversion
Evaluation of State-Funded Juvenile Diversion Programs

• The JJDP Council first began funding the Evaluation of State-Funded Juvenile Diversion in 2010.

• The purpose of the evaluation is to gather data to assist DCJ, the Council and the grantees in making decisions regarding program effectiveness and improvement.

• Two instruments are used to collect demographic, service provision and short-term outcome data; the Intake/Exit Form and the Pre/post survey.
Juveniles Served in State-funded Diversion by Gender, SFY 16/17

- Male: 66%
- Female: 34%
Juveniles Served in State-funded Diversion by Race/Ethnicity, SFY 2016/17

- White (Non-Hispanic): 55%
- Hispanic/Latino: 30%
- Black/African American: 8%
- Multi-Racial: 4%
- American Indian: 2%
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 1%
- Other: 1%
Youth Served SFY 16/17

• Mean age- 15.13
• Health Insurance- 43% Medicaid
• 72% had no prior police contact
Juvenile Justice Status at Referral for Juveniles Served by Diversion, SFY 16/17

- Pre-file: Alternative to Summons/Arrest: 9%
- Pre-file: Alternative to Filing a Petition: 37%
- Pre-adjudication: Deferred Adjudication: 5%
- Pre-adjudication: Informal Adjustment: 5%
- Pre-adjudication: Filed/Dismissed without...: 13%
- Post Adjudication: Deferred Sentences: 20%
- Post Adjudication: On Probation: 1%
- Post Adjudication: On Probation: 10%
Referral Source for Juveniles Served by State-funded Diversion, SFY 16/17

- DA's Office: 74%
- Police/Sheriff: 11%
- District Court Judge/Magistrate: 6%
- District Court Probation: 9%
Level of Crime for Juveniles Served by State-funded Diversion, SFY 16/17

- Petty: 19%
- Misdemeanor: 56%
- Felony: 26%
Type of Crime for Juveniles Served by State-funded Diversion, SFY 16/17

- Person: 27%
- Theft: 24%
- Sexual: 3%
- Property: 21%
- Drug: 22%
- Weapon: 3%
School History

- Suspended: 29%
- Truant: 11%
- Expelled: 5%
- U/K: 12%
- None of Above: 48%
School Setting for Juveniles Served by State-funded Diversion, Matched at Intake and Exit, SFY 16/17

- Actively Enrolled in Traditional...
- Actively Enrolled in non-...
- Drop Out
- Pursuing GED
- Graduate/GED
- Expelled (otherwise not enrolled)
- Unknown

At Intake: 4%
At Exit: 16%

- 69%
- 74%
Exit Status

SFY 2016-17- 1,207 youth exited Diversion

83% Successful
17% Unsuccessful
July 2014- June 2017

• Key Changes during the grant period
  • Programs were required to screen youth for mental health and substance use issues beginning in FY2014-2015
  • Addition of 3 short-term outcomes at the beginning of FY2015-2016: Connection to Adults (Familial Adults and Non-Familial Adults) and Stress
  • Across all 3 years, pre and Post-surveys collected from more than 80% of all youth participating in DCJ Funded juvenile diversion
  • In the Preliminary Dataset, 3 years of pre- and post-surveys and 2 years of recidivism data
    • Only 1 year of recidivism data for youth with data captured on the 3 new outcomes
Changes in Youth Served

• Decrease in referrals from District Court Probation
  • Decrease in post-adjudicated youth
• Increase in referrals from Police/Sheriff
• Increase in petty offense referrals
Youth Background Characteristics
- Gender
- Race/Ethnicity
- Offense History
- Offense Type

Services Received
- Supervision
- Treatment
- Accountability
- Restorative
- Competency

Short-term outcomes
- Connection to Community
- Locus of Control
- Self-Esteem
- Sense of Accountability
- Risky Behavioral Intentions
- Connection to Adults (Family/Non)
- Stress

Recidivism

Supervision Services
- Case Management
- Tracking/Mentoring
- Electronic Monitoring
- Drug/Alcohol Testing

Treatment Services
- Multi-Agency Assessment
- Individual/Group/Family Mental Health Treatment/Counseling
- Substance Use Treatment/Counseling

- Offense Specific Treatment

Accountability
- Community Service
- Restitution
- Teen Court

Restorative
- RJ Circle Planning
- RJ Circle
- VOM
- Victim/Community Impact Panel

- Apology to Victim

Competency
- Education/Tutoring/GED
- Employment/Vocational
- Drug/Alcohol Classes
- Offense Specific Classes
- Victim Empathy Classes
- Pro-Social Activities
- Special Projects
Short-Term Outcomes

• Statistically significant change from pre- to post-survey was observed for all short-term outcomes in the desired direction
  • Connection to Community (Increase)
  • Self-Esteem (Increase)
  • Locus of Control (Increase)
  • Sense of Accountability (Increase)
  • Risky Behavioral Intentions (Decrease)
  • Connection to Family/Non-Family Adults (Increase)
  • Stress (Decrease)
Services Predictive of Recidivism

- Supervision associated with increased recidivism; More supervision services associated with increased recidivism
- Restorative services marginally associated with reduced recidivism
Recidivism Study

• The recidivism data set included individuals who were accepted into the Diversion program, had successfully or unsuccessfully completed a Diversion program during the 2014-2015 fiscal year, and had been exited from the program for at least 1 year as of June 30th, 2016.

• Individuals with missing or ‘neutral’ outcomes (n=14) such as having chosen court, moved to a different area, or been transferred, are not included.

• The total sample size for this subset of youth was 1222 individuals.
Definition of Recidivism for Diversion

• A filing or filings for a new offense (criminal, misdemeanor, or juvenile delinquency) either while the juvenile was in the program or up to one year after they exited the program.

• Differs from the definition used by judicial or DYS which uses adjudication for a new offense instead of filing as the marker.
Recidivism Findings

• Of all youth who had been exited from a Diversion program for at least one year, 15.6 percent of youth had recidivated during their participation in Diversion and/or within the one year after their participation.

• Of those who had exited Diversion successfully, 11.7 percent of youth had recidivated during their participation in Diversion and/or within the one year after their participation.

• Of those who exited Diversion unsuccessfully, 22.2% of youth had recidivated during their participation in Diversion and/or within the one year after their participation.
Marijuana Tax Funds-7 programs funded (started SFY 16/17)

• **Purpose/Overall Goal:**
  • Increase access to substance use screening, assessment and treatment services for youth receiving juvenile diversion programming.
  • Funds can be used for
    • Screening, assessment, and treatment for marijuana and general substance abuse needs;
    • Addressing the practical barriers to treatment;
    • Providing incentives to encourage abstinence from substances;
    • Obtaining training for program staff; and
    • Providing services to caregivers as it relates to substance use and abuse.
  • Travel
MJ Tax Funds

• In Fiscal Year 2017-2018, of youth who were served by the Marijuana Tax Cash Fund grantees and completed programming (n=159), 65% were male, 68% white, 15% Hispanic/Latino ethnicity, 11% black or African American, 3.3% multi-racial. All other race categories were 2% or less.

• The average age of youth was 15.4 years.
Race/Ethnicity of Youth Served

- **White**: 67%
- **Hispanic/Latino**: 20%
- **Black**: 30%
- **Multi-Racial**: 1%
- **Other**: 3%

**MJ funds**

**Diversion funds**
Preliminary Findings MJ Tax Funds

• An examination of the short-term outcomes that have historically been correlated with a reduced level of recidivism indicated that programs receiving the Marijuana Tax Cash Fund are demonstrating a statistically significant increase in connection to community and sense of accountability.
Preliminary Findings MJ Tax Funds

• Overall, the MJ Tax Cash Fund grantees continue to see statistically significant improvement on the connection to community and sense of accountability outcomes with higher pre- and post-scores on these outcomes than in Fiscal Year 2015-2016.

• Additionally, the MJ Tax Cash Fund grantees are serving youth with lower pre-mean scores (higher for risky behavioral intentions) than the other diversion grantees, indicating that the Marijuana Tax Cash Fund grantees may be serving youth with higher risks.

• However, both groups of programs show an equal level of change from pre- to post survey on all outcomes indicating that diversion programs are able to positively impact the youths they serve.
Recidivism- MJ Funds

• Of youths served in Fiscal Year 2015-2016 by the programs who received the Marijuana Tax Cash Fund, 10.7% of youth recidivated during or after juvenile diversion programming.

• The recidivism rate remained relatively unchanged with 10.4% of youths recidivating in the one year after juvenile diversion programming.