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Mission
We develop research-driven strategies to increase public safety and strengthen communities.

Who We Are
We combine the power of a membership association, representing state officials in all three branches of government, with the expertise of a policy and research team focused on assisting others to attain measurable results.
The Second Chance Act

- The Second Chance Act supports state, local, and tribal governments and nonprofit organizations in their work to reduce recidivism and improve outcomes for people leaving incarceration.

- The Second Chance Act has supported over $400 million in reentry investments across the country.

- Passed in 2018, the Second Chance Reauthorization Act builds on and strengthens the initial landmark legislation.
Agenda

01 Introductions
02 Challenges to Improving Outcomes for Youth
03 About the Improving Outcomes for Youth Initiative (IOYouth)
04 IOYouth in Nevada
05 IOYouth in New Mexico
06 IOYouth in Colorado
States’ juvenile incarceration rates have declined dramatically over the past decade from over 75,000 in 1997 to less than 32,000 in 2015.

PERCENT CHANGE IN STATE JUVENILE INCARCERATION RATES (1997-2015)

Source: "Easy Access to the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement."
CSG Justice Center used more than 1.3 million records to analyze recidivism rates for similar groups of youth.

Juvenile Probation and Secure Confinement Data
- 899,101 records
- 452,751 juveniles
- Dispositions and secure releases

Criminal History and Prison Admission Data
- 408,312 records
- 242,541 juveniles
- Arrests and incarcerations

Two Closer-to-Home Study Cohorts
- Pre-reform cohort: 27,131 juveniles
- Post-reform cohort: 31,371 juveniles

“Apples to apples” comparison of youth eligible for incarceration:
- Youth supervised in the community
- Youth released from state-run secure facilities
Youth kept closer to home have better outcomes

**One-Year Probability of Rearrest**

- Released from State-Run Secure Facilities: 41%
- Supervised in the Community: 34%

21% more likely to be rearrested

**First Recidivism Offense a Felony**

- Released from State-Run Secure Facilities: 49%
- Supervised in the Community: 17%

3x more likely to commit a felony when recidivating
Per capita funding for county juvenile probation departments increased significantly after reforms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2005</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita expenditures for local juvenile probation departments</td>
<td>$3,555</td>
<td>$7,023</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures (adjusted for inflation to 2014 dollars)</td>
<td>$4,337</td>
<td>$7,304</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of local juvenile probation expenditures department contributed by county</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rearrest rates for youth on community supervision were comparable regardless of intervention and did not improve after reforms.
A significant percentage of low-risk youth under supervision received supervision and services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% of Low-Risk Youth on Supervision* in Programs</th>
<th>Low-Risk Youth on Supervision* in Programs % High Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubbock</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Low-risk youth in most counties stayed in programs longer than high-risk youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Low-Risk Youth</th>
<th>High-Risk Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubbock</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Youth were not matched with services that addressed their needs and were research-based.

NUMBER OF YOUTH IDENTIFIED AT REFERRAL AS HAVING A SUBSTANCE ABUSE NEED, FY 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>659</th>
<th>497</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,731</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
<td>518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCENT OF THESE YOUTH IN SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT OR INTERVENTION PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2%*</th>
<th>27%</th>
<th>0%*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Texas study has key implications for all states

1. State and local jurisdictions can reduce the number of incarcerated youth without compromising public safety.

2. Youth supervised “closer to home” have lower rearrest rates than similar youth released from state-run secure facilities.

3. Increased resources are not sufficient to reduce recidivism and improve outcomes for youth on community supervision and returning from incarceration.

4. Resources must be used efficiently to match youth with the appropriate level and type of research-based supervision and services based on their assessed risks and needs.
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The IOYouth Initiative can help leaders answer key questions about the juvenile justice system

- What are the recidivism rates and other outcomes for youth under system supervision, and is data collected and used to track, analyze, and improve these outcomes?
- Are resources used efficiently to provide services for youth most at risk of reoffending, and are the services youth receive demonstrated as effective?
- Are youth matched with the appropriate level and length of supervision and is supervision focused on addressing youth’s risks and needs?
The IOYouth Initiative has four key phases of work:

1. **Formation of a taskforce to oversee and guide the initiative**
   - Partnership with a statewide task force consisting of legislators, agency leadership, judicial officials, and other key stakeholders

2. **Analyze data and review policy and practice**
   - Qualitative and quantitative system assessment including analysis of case level data, a review of policies and practices, and focus groups and interviews

3. **Present system-improvement recommendations**
   - Recommendations for system improvement presented to the task force based on assessment findings

4. **Adopt new policies**
   - Development of legislative and appropriations changes
There are several prerequisites that are necessary for the IOYouth initiative to be successful

- **Strong leadership from taskforce members that are committed to the assessment process and championing improvement efforts**

- **Transparency and timely sharing of available juvenile justice system data, and other data related to juvenile justice youth**

- **Commitment across all three branches of government, state and local agencies, and stakeholder groups to potential policy changes resulting from the IOYouth initiative**

- **Collaboration across youth serving systems, branches of government, and state and local entities as applicable**
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Assessment Findings

- **Arrests** for violent and weapons offenses decreased by close to 70%.
- **Detentions** for a gross misdemeanor or felony offense declined 18% between 2011 and 2015. **Probation dispositions declined 22%** between 2011 and 2015.
- **Commitments decreased by 53%** between 2006 and 2015. There was a 41% decline in the average monthly juvenile parole population between 2009 and 2015.
- Nevada spent **more than $95 million** for juvenile justice supervision and services in 2015.
- **No standard definition of recidivism** and no way to consistently measure outcomes.
Juvenile Justice Reform Bill

• Required DFCS and local departments to use state funds on evidence-based practices

• Established a cost-sharing model for evidence-based programs

• Required DFCS submit an annual report on agencies’ compliance with established evidence-based standards

• Allowed the state to withhold money from a juvenile court or agency that does not comply data collection and evidence-based practice regulations

• Required DFCS to analyze information to determine trends, disparities, supervision/services effectiveness, and recidivism rates

• Established the Juvenile Justice Oversight Council to oversee the selection and adoption of a validated risk and needs assessment
**Juvenile Justice Reform Bill**

**Where We Are Today:**

| Risk & Needs Assessment tool selected with pilot implementation to begin by July 1, 2019 | 5 Year Strategic Plan adopted, Commission working on implementation | Facility quality assurance reviews in progress | Foundation for data collection and analysis established |
# Lessons Learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUCCESSES</th>
<th>CHALLENGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislation passed unanimously</td>
<td>Short-term from initial convening to legislative session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy-in from agency leadership and all three branches of government</td>
<td>Legislative drafting process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of information from a variety of sources</td>
<td>Achieving racial diversity on the task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission members invested in the success of reforms</td>
<td>Overcoming suspicion of outsider infiltration/lack of clarity on outsider qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation deadline in bill language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Assessment Findings

- Half of all referrals to the juvenile justice system are for status offenses and petty misdemeanors.

- New Mexico does not use a risk assessment tool to identify youths’ risk of reoffending or to inform disposition, placement or length of stay.

- Probation violations account for the largest proportion of new detentions, probation dispositions and commitments.

- Since 2012, the proportion of time a youth spends in secured facility has increased by 10%, and the use of extensions has increased.

- 1 in 5 youth with informal disposition receive another disposition within a year compared to 1 in 2 youth disposed to probation.
Juvenile Justice Reform Bill

1. Divert lower-level youth to **ensure limited resources are spent on higher-risk youth that are a public safety concern**
   - Require certain offenses to be diverted automatically
   - Establish minimum age of juvenile delinquency

2. **Adopt a risk and needs assessment instrument** to identify high-risk youth and match supervision accordingly
   - Require the use of a risk and needs assessment for every pre-adjudicated youth and use the assessed risk of reoffending to inform disposition, placement, and release decisions

3. **Prioritize limited service resources** on higher risk youth and **increase accountability for service providers**
   - Focus funding for community-based services on moderate and high-risk youth
   - Require quality assurance reviews to improve the quality and delivery of services in correctional facilities
## Lessons Learned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUCCESSES</th>
<th>CHALLENGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive collaboration from diverse stakeholders from different systems and communities</td>
<td>Consistent participation by task force members due to conflicting commitments and schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More consensus than disagreement</td>
<td>Reluctance to reform arising from fears of perceived risk to public safety and public perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerous policy changes identified, agreed upon, and recommended</td>
<td>Hesitation in moving forward because of perceived time constraints in short session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from state leadership to pursue reform changes to improve outcomes and public safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of policy changes that can be implemented without legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Assessment Findings

- Colorado lacks a centralized approach to tracking diversion participation, services, and outcomes.

- More than one-third of youth who screen to a level below secure detention still end up in secure detention.

- Over two-thirds of district court cases resulted in some form of system supervision.

- 62% of DYS sentences are for two years or longer, and in 2017, youth spent an average of 834 days (2.28 years) total in DYS custody.

- Nearly 30% of youth starting probation fail while under probation supervision and 35% of youth completing probation have a subsequent case filed within three years of discharge.
Juvenile Justice Reform Bill

- Expanded accessibility to diversion programs across the state
- Developed clear criteria for detention eligibility
- Targeted CYDC resources more efficiently by focusing resources on youth most at risk of secure detention
- Adopted a validated risk and needs assessment instrument to identify a youth’s risk of reoffending and to inform court decision making and case planning
- Established statewide standards for juvenile probation that are based in research
- Expanded the use of kinship care for youth in detention and commitment and under consideration for out-of-home placement
Key System Improvements from Juvenile Justice Reform Bill

1. **Creation of a committee to select/develop:**
   - Validated risk and needs assessment
   - Mental health screening tool for juveniles
   - Validated risk screening tool to be used in informing a juvenile's eligibility for diversion
   - Research-based detention screening instrument

2. **Statewide graduated responses and incentives**

3. **Established standards for probation**

4. **Implemented length-of-stay matrix**
Juvenile Justice Reform Bill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where are we today?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implements the recommendations for juvenile justice system from our task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes funding for risk assessment tool selection and initial implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.9M set aside to expand juvenile diversion programs statewide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you!

Join our distribution list to receive National Reentry Resource Center updates!

csgjusticecenter.org/subscribe

For more information, contact Shanelle Johnson at sjohnson@csg.org.