

DISPOSITION

- Definition & Rationale
- Required Data & Methodology
- Data Worksheets
- Analysis Questions

DISPOSITION DEFINITION & RATIONALE

Disposition is the phase of the juvenile justice system where youth adjudicated delinquent are ordered by the court to comply with specific sanctions, supervision, and services as a consequence for their delinquent behavior. In New Jersey, the range of dispositions available to the court include but are not limited to restitution/fines, community service, probation, and commitment to the Juvenile Justice Commission. For youth disposed to a term of probation supervision, among the conditions of probation that might be imposed by the court is the completion of a Dispositional Option Program. The structure of these Dispositional Option Programs are varied, but common among these options are intensive supervision programs, day and evening reporting centers, and structured day and residential programs. Given this goal, Disposition programs developed through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing sanctions, supervision, and services that address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

When determining the appropriate disposition in a given case, the court faces the complex task of considering multiple goals, including promoting public safety, ensuring offender accountability, and providing juveniles with opportunities for personal growth and skill development through rehabilitative efforts. By developing and enhancing local Dispositional Option Programs, Counties can facilitate the achievement of these goals by providing the court with the range of options that matches best the supervision and service needs of youth in their communities. Research and experience indicate that well developed community-based Dispositional Option Programs can effectively reduce the likelihood of continued delinquency, improving the lives of the youth they serve, and the quality and safety of the local community and its citizens.

Disposition data describe the number of youth adjudicated delinquent and disposed by the court, as well as the characteristics of these juveniles that reflect the causes and correlates of delinquent activity. By understanding the nature and extent of the juvenile population facing disposition and the factors associated with involvement in delinquency, planners can better identify the content and scope of Dispositional Option Programs needed in their Counties. As such, Counties will be better equipped to make informed decisions regarding the allocation of resources to Dispositional Option Programs, including those resources disseminated by the Juvenile Justice Commission (State/Community Partnership, Family Court Services, Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative – Innovations Funding, and Title IIB). Note, however, that the disposition data collected through this Comprehensive Plan represent only a portion of the data that a County might collect as part of the overall Dispositional Option Programs planning process.

DISPOSITION ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

- When answering questions regarding trends, describe *whether* any change has occurred, the *direction* of any change (e.g., increase/up, decrease/down), and the *size* of any change (e.g., small, moderate, large).
- When answering questions regarding rank orders, draw comparisons between categories (e.g., using terms like least/smallest, most/largest).

NATURE & EXTENT OF THE DISPOSED POPULATION

JUVENILES ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT

1. Looking at Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender (Cell C3) and Table 2: Juvenile Cases Adjudicated Delinquent with Probation & Incarceration Dispositions (Cell B4), describe the overall number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent and the number of cases with probation and incarceration dispositions in 2015.

In 2015, there were a total of 117 (Male 83, Female 34) juveniles adjudicated delinquent by gender including a total of 39 juvenile adjudicated delinquent cases with probation with zero incarceration commitments.

NATURE OF JUVENILES ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT IN 2015

2. Looking at Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender (Columns C and D), describe the number of males and the number of females adjudicated delinquent in 2015.

In 2015, there were a total of 117 (Male 83, Female 34) juveniles adjudicated delinquent by gender.

3. Insert into the chart below Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity (Table 3, Columns C and D), beginning with the group that had the greatest number of adjudications in 2015.

Ranking of Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race for 2015			
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
1	Black	66	56.4%
2	White	39	33.3%
3	Hispanic	9	7.7%

4	Other	3	2.6%
---	-------	---	------

4. Insert into the chart below Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age (Table 5, Columns C and D), beginning with the group that had the greatest number of adjudications in 2015.

Ranking of Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age Group for 2015			
Rank	Age Group	Number	Percent
1	15-16	52	44.4%
2	11-12	4	3.4%
3	13-14	25	21.4%
4	17	36	30.8%
5	6-10	0	0.0%
6	18 And Over	0	0.0%

SUMMARY OF THE NATURE OF JUVENILES ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT IN 2015

5. Looking at your answers to Questions 2 through 4, summarize what this information tells you about the nature of juveniles adjudicated delinquent in 2015.

Overall, Black male juveniles continue to uphold the largest amount of delinquent adjudications with 100.00% of all cases referred directly to probation versus any JJC commitments.

CHANGE IN JUVENILES ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT BETWEEN 2012 and 2015

6. Looking at Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender (Cell E3) and Table 2: Juvenile Cases Adjudicated Delinquent with Probation & Incarceration Dispositions (Cell C4), describe the overall change in juveniles adjudicated delinquent and cases with probation and incarceration dispositions between 2012 and 2015.

2015 data shows decreases in both the male (-46.1%) and female (-2.9%) juvenile populations. This constitutes an overall decrease of -38.1% in juveniles adjudicated delinquent and cases with probation and incarceration dispositions since 2012.

7. Looking at Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender (Column E), describe the change in the number of males and the number of females adjudicated delinquent between 2012 and 2015.

In 2012, there were 154 males (81.5% total population) and 35 females (18.5% total population) adjudicated delinquent. In 2015, there were 83 males (70.9% total population) and 34 females (29.1% total population) adjudicated delinquent. The overall number of adjudicated delinquent juveniles decreased by -38.1%.

➤ For Question 8, use Table 3: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race.

8. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race (Column E), from largest to smallest between 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race Between 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Race	% Change	Number
1	Other	100.00%	3
2	Hispanic	80.00%	9
3	Black	78.4%	66
4	White	44.4%	39

➤ For Question 9, use Table 5: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age.

9. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age (Column E) from largest to smallest between 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age Between 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Age Groups	% Change	Number
1	6-10	-100.00%	0
2	11-12	-66.7%	4
3	13-14	-39.00%	25
4	17	-36.8%	36
5	15-16	-5.5%	52
6	18 and Over	0.00%	0

SUMMARY OF THE CHANGE IN THE NATURE OF JUVENILES ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT BETWEEN 2012 and 2015

10. Using the answers from Questions 6-9, describe how the nature of juveniles adjudicated delinquent changed between 2012 and 2015.

The 6-10 age group shows the largest decrease in juveniles adjudicated delinquent (-100.00%). All other age groups showed no change or a decrease in juveniles adjudicated delinquent from 2012-2015.

Disproportionate Minority Contact And Racial And Ethnic Disparities

11. Using the data in Table 4 (Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity), compare and describe the number of Juvenile Arrests to the number of Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015.

*2012: White juveniles tallied (224) arrests with (27) adjudicated delinquent.
Black juveniles tallied (220) arrests with (37) adjudicated delinquent.
Hispanic juveniles had (33) arrests with (5) adjudicated delinquent.
Juveniles identifying as 'Other' had (0) arrests with (0) adjudicated delinquent.*

*2015: White juveniles tallied (123) arrests with (39) adjudicated delinquent.
Black juveniles tallied (174) arrests with (66) adjudicated delinquent.
Hispanic juveniles had (32) arrests with (9) adjudicated delinquent.
Juveniles identifying as 'Other' had no arrests with (3) adjudicated delinquent.*

Probation Placements

12. Using the data in Table 6 (Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity), describe the overall change in the Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015.

From 2012-2015, those identifying as white juveniles saw the only overall decrease in probation placements (-6.7%). Juveniles identifying as 'Other' showed the largest increase (100.0%). Hispanic juveniles show an increase of probation placements (40.0%). Juveniles identifying as Black showed no increase or decrease (0.0%).

13. Insert into the chart below the number column (Table 6, Column C), Probation Placements by race/ethnicity beginning with the group that had the greatest number of placements in 2015.

Ranking of Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity, 2015		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number
1	Black	38
2	White	28
3	Hispanic	7
4	Other	2

14. Insert into the chart below the % change in Table 6 (Column E), Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest % change between 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	% Change
1	Other	100.0%
2	Hispanic	40.0%
3	White	-6.7%
4	Black	0.0%

15. Using the information in the ranking chart above, what does this information tell you about your county's Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015? How has Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity changed since 2012?

Juveniles identifying as 'Other' showed the largest percentage increase categorically (100.0%). Probation placements in general have increased slightly from 2012-2015 (2.7%).

Disproportionate Minority Contact And Racial And Ethnic Disparities

16. Using the data in Table 7 (Juvenile Probation Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity), compare and describe the number of juvenile adjudications to the number of probation placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015.

The number of juvenile adjudications to the number of probation placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015 showed disproportionate percentages. These differences may have been due to calendar year crossovers or deferred dispositions.

- **For Questions 17-20 use Table 8 (Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity) and Table 9 (Secure Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity)**

Secure Placements

17. Using the data in Table 8 (Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity, Column H), describe the overall change in Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015.

All secure placement statistics have either decreased or not changed from 2012-2015. White (-100.00%), Black, (-85.7%), Hispanic (-100.00%) and 'Hispanic (0.00%)

18. Insert into the chart below the number of Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity beginning with the group that had the greatest number of secure placements in 2015.

Ranking of Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity, 2015		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number
1	Black	1
2	White	0
3	Hispanic	0
4	Other	0

19. Insert into the chart below the % change in Table 8 (Column E) Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest % change between 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity, 2015		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	% Change
1	White	-100.0%
2	Hispanic	-100.0%
3	Black	-85.7%
4	Other	0.0%

20. Using the information in the ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about your county's Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015? How has Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity changed since 2012?

Secure placements have decreased significantly across all categories between the years of 2012-2015. Salem County is using other scopes such as prevention and or diversion to keep adjudicated juveniles out of secure placement facilities.

Disproportionate Minority Contact And Racial And Ethnic Disparities

21. Using the data in Table 9 (Secure Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity), compare and describe the number of Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent to the number of Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015.

*2012: White juveniles adjudicated delinquent totaled (27) with (3) secure placements.
Black juveniles adjudicated delinquent totaled (37) with (7) secure placements.
Hispanic juveniles adjudicated delinquent totaled (5) with (2) secure placements.
'Other' juveniles adjudicated delinquent totaled (0) with (0) secure placements.*

*2015: White juveniles adjudicated delinquent totaled (39) with (0) secure placements.
Black juveniles adjudicated delinquent totaled (66) with (1) secure placement.
Hispanic juveniles adjudicated delinquent totaled (9) with (0) secure placements.*

'Other' juveniles adjudicated delinquent totaled (3) with (0) secure placements.

JUVENILE AUTOMATED MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JAMS)

- **For Questions 22- 31 use Disposition Data Worksheet and the JAMS data from the JAMS packet.**

22. Looking at Data Worksheet Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender (Cells C1 and C2, 2015) and comparing this information to JAMS Table 6: Total Intakes by Gender, 2015, describe any differences or similarities between juveniles adjudicated delinquent and juveniles in dispositional option programs by gender.

JAMS data on gender intakes unavailable.

23. Looking at Data Worksheet Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender (Cells D1 and D2) and comparing this information to JAMS Table 6: Total Intakes by Gender, 2015 (Female and Male for Each Program), describe any differences or similarities between the gender of youth adjudicated delinquent and the gender of youth served in any given dispositional option program.

JAMS data on Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent By Gender is not available.

24. Looking at Data Worksheet Table 3: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity, 2015 (Column C) and comparing this information to JAMS Table 3: Total Intakes by Race/Ethnicity, 2015, describe any differences or similarities between juveniles adjudicated delinquent and juveniles in dispositional option programs by race/ethnicity.

JAMS data on Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent By Race/Ethnicity is not available.

25. Looking at Data Worksheet Table 3: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity (Column D) and comparing this information to JAMS Table 3: Total Intakes by Race/Ethnicity, 2015 (Total for Each Program), describe any differences or similarities between the race of youth adjudicated delinquent and the race/ethnicity of youth served in any given dispositional option program.

JAMS data on Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent By Race/Ethnicity is not available.

26. Looking at Data Worksheet Table 5: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age (Column C) and comparing this information to JAMS Table 4: Average Age of Intake Population, 2015, describe any differences or similarities between juveniles adjudicated delinquent and juveniles in dispositional option programs by age.

JAMS data on Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent By Age of Intake is not available.

27. Looking at Data Worksheet Table 4: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age (Column C) and comparing this information to Table 4: Average Age, 2015, describe any differences or similarities between the age of youth adjudicated delinquent and the age of youth served in any given dispositional option program.

The average age tracked for JAMS for Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent programs by age is 17. In 2015, there were (36) seventeen year-olds that represented 30.8% of the second largest age related population category.

28. Looking at the “Total” column of Table 6: Problem Areas by Program, 2015, the chart below shows the top ten Problem Areas for youth served in dispositional option programs, from largest to smallest.

Ranking of Problem Areas by Program					
2012			2015		
Rank	Problem Areas	Total	Rank	Problem Areas	Total
1	Personality/Behavior	169	1	Personality/Behavior	80
2	Peer Relations	101	2	Peer Relations	31
3	Education	100	3	Education	28
4	Substance Abuse	69	4	Family Circumstances/Parenting	22
5	Other	47	5	Substance Abuse	18
6	Family Circumstances	33	6	Vocational Skills/Employment	6
7	Vocational Skills	30	7	Medical Problems	5
8	Attitudes/Orientation	19	8	Attitudes/Orientation	5
9	Teen Pregnancy	1	9		
10	Medical	0	10		

29. Looking at the “Total” column of Table 7: Service Interventions Provided, 2015, rank the top ten service interventions provided to youth in dispositional option programs, from largest to smallest.

Ranking of Service Interventions Provided					
2012			2015		
Rank	Service Interventions Provided	Total	Rank	Service Interventions Provided	Total
1	Decision Making Skills	46	1	Data Not Available	*
2	Supervision	41	2	Data Not Available	*
3	Anger Management Training	40	3	Data Not Available	*
4	Life Skills Training	37	4	Data Not Available	*
5	Substance Abuse Evaluation	28	5	Data Not Available	*
6	Urine Monitoring	28	6	Data Not Available	*
7	Role Model/Mentor	27	7	Data Not Available	*
8	Counseling/Individual	26	8	Data Not Available	*
9	Interpersonal Skills Training	22	9	Data Not Available	*
10	Transportation	16	10	Data Not Available	*

30. Looking at your answers to Questions 28 and 29, describe the extent to which identified problem areas of juveniles are currently being addressed by service interventions provided in dispositional option programs.

Data for 2015 Service Interventions not available.

31. Looking at the “Total” column of Table 8: Service Intervention Needed, 2015, rank the top ten dispositional option program service areas that were identified, from largest to smallest.

Ranking of Service Interventions Needed					
2012			2015		
Rank	Service Interventions Needed	Total	Rank	Service Interventions Needed	Total
1	Data Not Available	*	1	Decision Making Skills	20
2	Data Not Available	*	2	Urine Monitoring	15
3	Data Not Available	*	3	Counseling/Individual	12
4	Data Not Available	*	4	Anger Management Training	10
5	Data Not Available	*	5	Life Skills Training	9
6	Data Not Available	*	6	Academic Education	8
7	Data Not Available	*	7	Sub. Abuse Treatment/Counseling Intensive	7
8	Data Not Available	*	8	Role Model/Mentor	7
9	Data Not Available	*	9	Interpersonal Skills Training	4
10	Data Not Available	*	10	Substance Abuse Evaluation	3

Data for 2015 Problem Areas and Service Interventions not available.

IMPLICATIONS FOR DISPOSITIONAL OPTIONS PLAN

Extent of Need

32. What does the answer to Question 6, 12 and 17 (overall change in disposed population) tell you about how your County's overall need for dispositional option programs has changed in recent years?

Dispositional populations showed an overall decrease of -38.1% amongst male and female juvenile populations. However, the juveniles in probation placements identifying as 'Other' (100.0%) and Hispanic (40.0%) increased significantly. Despite the overall decline in youth populations, the need for growth in dispositional options has grown.

Nature of Need

33. Based on the answers to Question 5 (nature of disposed population, 2015), Question 10,15 and 20 (change in the nature of the disposed population between 2012 and 2015), Questions 22, 24, and 26 (nature of youth in dispositional option programs as compared to youth adjudicated delinquent by gender, race, and age), and Question 28 (top ten problem areas), what are the characteristics of youth that seem reasonable to address programmatically through your County's dispositional options plan?

Based on available data, dispositional programs should be systematically refined to target juveniles in the age range of 15-16 which serve as the bulk of dispositions.

34. Looking at your answer to Question 11, 16 and 21, what does this information tell you collectively about the status of disproportionate minority contact and racial/ethnic disparities at this point of the juvenile justice continuum within your county?

Juvenile minorities continue the trend of being disproportionately contacted and in the Juvenile Justice System in Salem County.

Other Data Reviewed for Extent and Nature of Need - Disposition

35. Was additional data, not provided by the JJC, used in your county's planning process? (If other data was used submit a copy in Chapter 13.)

What does any other available data tell you about how your County's overall need for dispositional option programs has changed in recent years and what are the characteristics of youth that seem reasonable to address programmatically through your County's dispositional options plan? Are there additional data that relates to Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial And Ethnic Disparities?

No additional data was used in the county process for Disposition or Disproportionate Minority contact or racial disparity.

RECOMMENDATIONS

36. Looking at your answers to Questions 32, 33 and 35, state the need and/or service gap to be addressed. Cite the data that supports the need and/or service gap. List your recommendations for your County's dispositional options plan?

State need and/or service gap to be addressed	Cite the data that indicates the need and/or service gap exists	Recommended service/program activity to address the need and/or service gap
Reduction in disproportionate minority youth adjudicated delinquency.	Black juveniles represented 56.4% of all adjudicated delinquent youth.	Foster improved relationships with law enforcement and minority youth in targeted communities.
Address increasing arrests for weapons.	25% increase in weapons offenses.	Engage parents and schools to attend and continue weapons/violence education seminars. <i>if adjudicated youth</i>
Address need for substance abuse treatment in schools.	33% increase in drug related offenses in schools.	Provide "open door" counseling and cognitive treatment for drug users as well as increased substance abuse awareness.

Comments:

37. Looking at your answers to Questions 34 and 35 what recommendations or strategies would your county make with regards to Dispositional Options policy and practice through the lens of race and ethnicity? What recommendations or strategies would your county consider to ensure similar outcomes for similarly situated youth?

Comments:

Increasing trends in substance use and weapons are both concerning and lethal. Fostering improved "open door" community relationships with parents, law enforcement, and teachers all support a "first-contact" juvenile adjudication reduction model. Cultural and community awareness provides all participants within the continuum a better understanding of the population they serve thus reducing juvenile delinquency.

**Juvenile Statistical Processing
 Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County**

Gender of Juveniles by County

County	Males	Females	Total	Not Indicated	Total Number of Juveniles
Salem	154 81.48	35 18.52	189	0 .00	189
TOTAL	154 81.48	35 18.52	189	0 .00	189

- 1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).
- 2.) Figures were based on the Case Status Dates of Juvenile Delinquency compliants
- 3.) These figures include Violation of Probation offenses
- 4.) These figures include Transferred in Cases

Userid: JUBWOLF
 Run Date: 08/08/17
 Run Time: 12:33:37
 Program: fj_0x

2012

Dis: - ble #1

Disp: Table # 2 2012

PAGE 1.1

RUNDATE...: 08/11/17
PROGRAM...: TABLE3U
REQUESTOR: Keith Vine
REQ. CNTY: MID
(PART B3/Y2K)

Lead Dispositions for
For the period between
Lead Disposit

County	01	02	03	04	06	08	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Atlantic	28	0	16	4	28	16	114	13	8	181	0	17	95	0	0	16
Bergen	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	283	1	29	50	0	5	463
Burlington	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	20	0	274	0	7	9	0	12	163
Camden	104	0	0	3	1	0	0	239	85	655	0	26	42	0	0	399
Cape May	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	59	0	11	11	0	0	45
Cumberland	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	164	0	9	28	0	18	79
Essex	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	313	0	14	7	0	0	511
Gloucester	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	181	0	30	30	0	31	96
Hudson	62	0	0	0	75	0	178	8	0	232	0	22	77	1	2	86
Hunterdon	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	0	5	22	0	0	14
Mercer	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	470	0	14	119	0	0	19
Middlesex	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	4	447	0	26	14	0	10	190
Monmouth	32	0	2	0	7	0	1	1	6	375	2	14	33	0	20	254
Morris	7	0	0	0	0	0	46	0	0	128	0	40	75	0	3	23
Ocean	16	133	0	0	0	0	0	21	15	200	0	17	63	0	7	69
Passaic	42	0	0	0	20	0	36	15	33	484	0	7	7	0	0	215
Salem	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	101	0	14	27	0	1	13
Somerset	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	111	0	5	10	0	0	23
Sussex	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	50	0	8	22	0	12	12
Union	52	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	104	443	0	6	40	0	4	104
Warren	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	0	0	34	0	0	4
TOTAL	550	133	19	7	133	16	382	362	341	5277	3	321	815	1	125	2798

- 1) JJC Incarceration
2) Short-Term Commitment
3) Residential Program JJC
4) DYFS Residential
5) DMH-R/DHS
6) Other Residential
- 7) Non-Res. Program JJC
8) DYFS Non-Residential
9) Div. of Mntl Retard (DMR)
10) Other Remedial Non-Res.
11) DYFS (Unspecified)
12) JJC Incarceration (Susp)
- 13) Probation
14) Probation (Suspended)
15) Restitution
16) Community Service
17) Res/Non-Res (Suspended)
18) Fine
- 19) Formal Continuance
20) Other Conditional
21) Continue with Prior Disposition
22) Other
23) Suspended (Conditional)
* Categories above 23 are NOT considered valid

ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT Cases by County
January 1, 2012 - December 31, 2012
ion Categories (One per Case)

20	21	23	26	32	33	35	41	43	44	50	51	52	60	67	69	70	86
16	9	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	12	6	0	0	0	0	16	4
31	53	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	18	0	2	0	0	0	4
16	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	11	0	0	0	0	4	26
20	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	33	4	0	0	0	0	0	3
9	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	1	10	6	0	0	1	0	1	11
15	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	51	13	0	2	0	0	3	26
48	5	1	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	6	0	0	5	4	32
9	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	17	4	0	0	0	0	0	10
4	26	2	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	14
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
40	32	0	0	10	0	1	0	0	0	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
8	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	6	0	0	0	0	12	46
11	5	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
9	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	2	0	0	0	0	5	19
4	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4
266	131	5	1	80	1	9	5	1	9	216	84	6	4	1	5	53	232

99 Cases

2	605
10	988
0	568
0	1618
0	170
0	441
7	1099
20	450
2	798
0	100
6	722
2	845
5	857
4	349
0	571
0	877
0	188
0	158
0	123
7	808
0	122
65	12457



FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County

Userid: JUVJF10
Run Date: 04/11/17
Run Time: 09.07.43
Program: fj_0x

Dis:
Tables: # 1, 3, 5, 7, 9

Summary of Selections

Report Type: Adjudicated

County/Vicinage: Statewide

Township: All Townships

Statute Group: All Statutes

Dispositions: All Dispositions

Age: WHERE AGE IS-FROM 10 TO 17

Gender: ALL

Race: All

Time Period: Calendar Year 2015

Transfers are set to: exclude

VOP's are set to: exclude

Gender values: M-Male, F-Female, U-Unknown or not indicated

Race values: 1-Caucasian, 2-Black, 3-Hispanic, 4-Asian/Oriental, 5-Amer Indian, 6-Other,
7-Unknown, 8-Alaskan Native, 9-Amer Ind, Eski, Aleu

Use the Page Down/Up buttons to scroll to report sections

FJ Statistical Processing
 Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County

Userid: JUNE10
 Run Date: 04/11/17
 Run Time: 09.07.43
 Program: fj_0x

Gender of Juveniles by County

County	Males	Females	Total	Not Indicated	%	Total Number of Juveniles
Atlantic	192	51	243	0	.00	243
Bergen	467	135	602	0	.00	602
Burlington	317	104	421	0	.00	421
Camden	638	206	844	0	.00	844
Cape May	149	34	183	0	.00	183
Cumberland	202	73	275	0	.00	275
Essex	776	207	983	0	.00	983
Gloucester	196	66	262	0	.00	262
Hudson	322	62	384	0	.00	384
Hunterdon	14	13	27	0	.00	27
Mercer	338	112	450	0	.00	450
Middlesex	397	105	502	0	.00	502
Monmouth	390	162	552	0	.00	552
Morris	144	22	166	0	.00	166
Ocean	197	74	271	0	.00	271
Passaic	518	127	645	0	.00	645
Salem	83	34	117	0	.00	117
Somerset	48	10	58	0	.00	58
Sussex	29	7	36	0	.00	36
Union	253	67	320	0	.00	320
Warren	42	10	52	0	.00	52
TOTAL	5,712	1,681	7393	0	.00	7393

- 1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).
- 2.) Figures were based on the Case Status Dates of Juvenile Delinquency compliants
- 3.) These figures exclude Violation of Probation offenses
- 4.) These figures exclude Transferred in Cases



(PART D)

FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County

Userid: JUJEF10
Run Date: 04/11/17
Run Time: 09.07.43
Program: fj_0x

Race/Ethnicity of Juveniles by County

County	White	% Black	% Hspnc	Asian % PciSl	Amer. % Indn.	% Other	Alskn % Native	% Total	Not Indctd	Grand % Total
Atlantic	58	23.87	133	54.73	46	18.93	3	1.23	0	.00
Bergen	260	43.19	148	24.58	163	27.08	21	3.49	0	.00
Burlington	139	33.02	254	60.33	23	4.75	1	.24	0	.00
Camden	244	28.94	460	54.57	126	14.95	3	.36	1	.12
Cape May	130	71.04	28	15.30	20	10.93	1	.55	0	.00
Cumberland	54	19.64	125	45.45	89	32.36	0	.00	0	.00
Essex	51	5.19	817	83.20	104	10.59	4	.41	1	.10
Gloucester	135	51.53	113	43.13	6	2.29	3	1.15	0	.00
Hudson	25	6.51	189	49.22	152	39.58	16	4.17	0	.00
Hunterdon	22	88.00	2	8.00	0	.00	1	4.00	0	.00
Mercer	87	19.46	308	68.90	44	9.84	2	.45	3	.67
Middlesex	166	33.27	178	35.67	130	26.05	21	4.21	3	.60
Monmouth	227	41.27	251	45.64	64	11.64	5	.91	2	.36
Morris	107	66.05	25	15.43	27	16.67	3	.85	2	.36
Ocean	174	64.44	55	20.37	39	14.44	0	.00	4	2.41
Passaic	161	25.04	225	34.99	247	38.41	3	.47	1	.37
Salem	39	33.62	66	56.90	9	7.76	0	.00	2	.31
Somerset	20	34.48	22	37.93	15	25.86	1	1.72	0	.85
Sussex	28	80.00	5	14.29	2	5.71	0	.00	1	.00
Union	61	19.06	-96	61.25	56	17.50	3	.94	0	.00
Warren	37	72.55	11	21.57	3	5.88	0	.00	1	.00
TOTAL	2225	30.19	3611	48.99	1362	18.48	91	1.23	5	.07
							74	1.00	3	.04
								7371	22	-30
										7393

- 1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).
- 2.) Figures were based on the Case Status Dates of Juvenile Delinquency compliants
- 3.) These figures exclude Violation of Probation offenses
- 4.) These figures exclude Transferred in Cases



FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County

Userid: JUDGE10
Run Date: 04/11/17
Run Time: 09:07.43
Program: fj_0x

(PART C1)

Age of Juveniles by County

County	6 - 10		11 - 12		13 - 14		15 - 16		17 only		Total	5 and under 18 and over		Out of Range		Grand Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	
Atlantic	1	.41	12	4.94	44	18.11	112	46.09	74	30.45	243	0	.00	0	.00	243
Bergen	0	.00	20	3.32	85	14.12	235	39.04	262	43.52	602	0	.00	0	.00	602
Burlington	1	.24	17	4.04	74	17.58	168	39.90	161	38.24	421	0	.00	0	.00	421
Camden	5	.59	53	6.28	132	15.64	366	43.36	288	34.12	844	0	.00	0	.00	844
Cape May	0	.00	3	1.64	35	19.13	89	48.63	56	30.60	183	0	.00	0	.00	183
Cumberland	4	1.45	16	5.82	50	18.18	123	44.73	82	29.82	275	0	.00	0	.00	275
Essex	3	.31	27	2.75	166	16.89	430	43.74	357	36.32	983	0	.00	0	.00	983
Gloucester	3	1.15	18	6.87	53	20.23	113	43.13	75	28.63	262	0	.00	0	.00	262
Hudson	2	.52	13	3.39	57	14.84	179	46.61	133	34.64	384	0	.00	0	.00	384
Hunterdon	0	.00	1	3.70	1	3.70	13	48.15	12	44.44	27	0	.00	0	.00	27
Mercer	3	.67	21	4.67	97	21.56	192	42.67	137	30.44	450	0	.00	0	.00	450
Middlesex	5	1.00	20	3.98	85	16.93	218	43.43	174	34.66	502	0	.00	0	.00	502
Morristown	5	.91	23	4.17	76	13.77	216	39.13	232	42.03	552	0	.00	0	.00	552
Morris	1	.60	1	.60	18	10.84	76	45.78	70	42.17	166	0	.00	0	.00	166
Ocean	0	.00	6	2.21	50	18.45	114	42.07	101	37.27	271	0	.00	0	.00	271
Passaic	3	.47	36	5.58	138	21.40	293	45.43	175	27.13	645	0	.00	0	.00	645
Salem	0	.00	4	3.42	25	21.37	52	44.44	36	30.77	117	0	.00	0	.00	117
Somerset	0	.00	4	6.90	9	15.52	23	39.66	22	37.93	58	0	.00	0	.00	58
Sussex	0	.00	2	5.56	4	11.11	19	52.78	11	30.56	36	0	.00	0	.00	36
Union	0	.00	6	1.88	49	15.31	150	46.88	115	35.94	320	0	.00	0	.00	320
Warren	0	.00	1	1.92	5	9.62	27	51.92	19	36.54	52	0	.00	0	.00	52
TOTAL	36	.49	304	4.11	1253	16.95	3208	43.39	2592	35.06	7393	0	.00	0	.00	7393

- 1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).
- 2.) Figures were based on the Case Status Dates of Juvenile Delinquency complaints
- 3.) These figures exclude Violation of Probation offenses
- 4.) These figures exclude Transferred in Cases

PAGE 1.1

RUNDATE...: 06/20/17
 PROGRAM...: TABLED
 REQUESTOR: Keith Vine
 REQ. CNTY: MID
 (PART B3/Y2K)

Dis: Table #2, 9

Lead Dispositions for ADJUDICATED DELINQ
 For the period between January 1, 2015
 Lead Disposition Categories (on

County	01	02	03	04	06	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	18	19	20	21
Atlantic	21	0	7	0	10	52	58	0	90	0	5	40	0	16	7	1
Bergen	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	225	0	17	35	1	247	2	0
Burlington	7	0	1	0	7	5	0	3	214	0	9	18	7	57	12	1
Camden	72	0	0	4	0	0	131	89	402	0	1	2	0	72	9	5
Cape May	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	75	0	9	0	7	34	19	0
Cumberland	15	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	124	0	9	33	9	51	7	0
Essex	128	0	1	0	0	0	9	0	271	0	24	2	0	353	22	9
Gloucester	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	115	0	17	21	2	72	15	0
Hudson	22	1	0	1	31	45	0	0	199	0	2	6	8	100	18	8
Hunterdon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	17	0	4	0	0
Mercer	29	0	0	0	2	0	0	25	293	0	8	42	0	27	9	4
Middlesex	6	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	392	1	12	1	3	123	20	18
Monmouth	5	0	0	0	2	5	0	1	349	0	3	1	5	151	5	0
Morris	7	0	0	0	5	11	0	7	79	0	8	58	1	17	0	0
Ocean	6	42	0	0	0	0	20	0	170	0	13	47	4	27	2	0
Passaic	28	0	0	0	7	7	48	30	358	0	5	13	2	142	20	0
Salem	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	35	0	7	20	0	27	1	0
Somerset	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	59	0	0	9	0	9	3	0
Sussex	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	29	0	3	2	0	8	1	0
Union	17	0	13	0	52	2	0	0	189	0	2	31	1	31	26	0
Warren	0	0	0	1	5	2	0	0	50	0	5	15	0	1	0	0
TOTAL	384	64	25	6	122	129	277	170	3733	1	159	413	50	1569	198	46

- | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 1) JJC Incarceration | 13) Probation (Suspended) | 19) Formal Continuance |
| 2) Short-Term Commitment | 14) Probation (Suspended) | 20) Other Conditional |
| 3) Residential Program JJC | 15) Restitution | 21) Continue with Prior Disposition |
| 4) Residential | 16) Community Service | 22) Other |
| 5) DMH-H/DHS | 17) Res/Non-Res (Suspended) | 23) Suspended (Conditional) |
| 6) Other Residential | 18) Fine | * Categories above 23 are NOT considered valid |

Disposition: Table 3 (2012 plan)

DISPOSITION ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

- When answering questions regarding trends, describe *whether* any change has occurred, the *direction* of any change (e.g., increase/up, decrease/down), and the *size* of any change (e.g., small, moderate, large).
- When answering questions regarding rank orders, draw comparisons between categories (e.g., using terms like least/smallest, most/largest).

NATURE & EXTENT OF THE DISPOSED POPULATION

JUVENILES ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT

1. Looking at Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender (Cell C3) and Table 2: Juvenile Cases Adjudicated Delinquent with Probation & Incarceration Dispositions (Cell B4), describe the overall number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent and the number of cases with probation and incarceration dispositions in 2012.

There were a total of 69 Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent and 117 cases with probation and Incarceration Dispositions in 2012.

NATURE OF JUVENILES ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT IN 2012

2. Looking at Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender (Columns C and D), describe the number of males and the number of females adjudicated delinquent in 2012.

There were 57 males and 12 females Adjudicated Delinquent in 2012.

3. Insert into the chart below Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity (Table 3, Columns C and D), beginning with the group that had the greatest number of adjudications in 2012.

Ranking of Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race for 2012			
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
1	Black	37	54%
2	White	27	39%
3	Hispanic	5	7%

Other

Table Dis
4

COUNTY ARRESTS BY RACE - 2012

COUNTY	TOTAL ARRESTS BY RACE			
	WHITE	BLACK	AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE	ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER
Atlantic	9,105	5,514	37	198
Bergen	15,171	4,597	66	954
Burlington	11,940	9,531	16	185
Camden	17,160	11,367	22	153
Cape May	7,042	1,198	13	29
Cumberland	6,075	4,615	8	29
Essex	8,573	29,007	39	183
Gloucester	11,866	5,594	21	49
Hudson	11,005	7,948	31	308
Hunterdon	2,736	353	7	30
Mercer	6,120	8,272	11	214
Middlesex	14,133	7,742	48	855
Monmouth	18,581	7,679	39	196
Morris	9,216	1,665	45	170
Ocean	15,059	2,439	17	60
Passaic	10,405	5,641	11	179
Salem	2,676	2,952	1	6
Somerset	5,182	2,831	31	162
Sussex	3,870	279	6	19
Union	7,988	8,959	32	120
Warren	3,455	626	6	27

Table
4 Dis

COUNTY ARRESTS BY RACE - 2012

ADULT ARRESTS BY RACE				JUVENILE ARRESTS BY RACE			
WHITE	BLACK	AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE	ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER	WHITE	BLACK	AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE	ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER
8,462	4,940	35	183	643	574	2	15
13,289	4,242	61	842	1,882	355	5	112
11,105	8,766	12	169	835	765	4	16
15,350	9,363	14	137	1,810	2,004	8	16
6,505	1,105	11	25	537	93	2	4
5,642	4,112	8	27	433	503	-	2
8,011	26,873	30	167	562	2,134	9	16
11,227	5,226	20	47	639	368	1	2
9,949	7,445	28	291	1,056	503	3	17
2,461	321	7	28	275	32	-	2
5,473	7,174	11	188	647	1,098	-	26
13,203	7,141	42	787	930	601	6	68
17,167	6,932	39	180	1,414	747	-	16
8,267	1,535	42	162	949	130	3	8
13,944	2,256	16	56	1,115	183	1	4
8,800	4,897	8	168	1,605	744	3	11
2,452	2,732	-	5	224	220	1	1
4,716	2,432	28	145	466	399	3	17
3,543	258	6	16	327	21	-	3
7,393	8,286	31	117	595	673	1	3
3,277	586	5	25	178	40	1	2

Table
4 Dis

COUNTY ARRESTS BY ETHNIC ORIGIN - 2012

COUNTY	TOTAL		ADULTS		JUVENILE	
	HISPANIC	NON HISPANIC	HISPANIC	NON HISPANIC	HISPANIC	NON HISPANIC
Atlantic	2,159	12,695	1,925	11,695	234	1000
Bergen	4,841	15,947	4,325	14,109	516	1838
Burlington	1,414	20,258	1,336	18,716	78	1542
Camden	4,143	24,559	3,399	21,465	744	3094
Cape May	704	7,578	641	7,005	63	573
Cumberland	3,153	7,574	2,889	6,900	264	674
Essex	4,657	33,145	4,401	30,680	256	2465
Gloucester	727	16,803	703	15,817	24	986
Hudson	7,984	11,308	7,043	10,670	941	638
Hunterdon	275	2,851	259	2,558	16	293
Mercer	1,927	12,690	1,650	11,196	277	1494
Middlesex	5,424	17,354	5,023	16,150	401	1204
Monmouth	2,438	24,057	2,271	22,047	167	2010
Morris	1,933	9,163	1,734	8,272	199	891
Ocean	1,863	15,712	1,741	14,531	122	1181
Passaic	5,514	10,722	4,442	9,431	1072	1291
Salem	370	5,265	337	4,852	33	413
Somerset	1,377	6,829	1,289	6,032	88	797
Sussex	276	3,898	255	3,568	21	330
Union	3,955	13,144	3,687	12,140	268	1004
Warren	380	3,734	349	3,544	31	190

Table
4 Dis

COUNTY ARRESTS BY RACE - 2015

COUNTY	TOTAL ARRESTS BY RACE			
	WHITE	BLACK	AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE	ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER
Atlantic	7,020	4,506	23	147
Bergen	14,577	4,965	65	884
Burlington	10,645	8,772	31	170
Camden	15,281	11,689	30	186
Cape May	6,659	1,116	11	36
Cumberland	5,461	4,482	7	17
Essex	7,029	18,835	72	187
Gloucester	9,352	4,666	7	62
Hudson	9,741	7,362	37	328
Hunterdon	2,121	418	7	35
Mercer	5,888	8,687	24	205
Middlesex	12,048	6,456	39	983
Monmouth	17,403	8,398	43	214
Morris	8,536	1,678	23	203
Ocean	13,628	2,253	17	67
Passaic	10,311	5,773	34	159
Salem	1,899	2,012	2	3
Somerset	4,725	2,373	28	173
Sussex	3,038	309	1	16
Union	7,179	8,807	31	155
Warren	2,926	529	6	32

Table
4 Dis

COUNTY ARRESTS BY RACE - 2015

ADULT ARRESTS BY RACE				JUVENILE ARRESTS BY RACE			
WHITE	BLACK	AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE	ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER	WHITE	BLACK	AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE	ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER
6,680	4,145	22	137	340	361	1	10
13,374	4,672	59	827	1,203	293	6	57
9,991	8,147	30	164	654	625	1	6
14,164	9,939	26	172	1,117	1,750	4	14
6,225	1,048	11	33	434	68	0	3
5,171	4,172	7	16	290	310	0	1
6,683	17,260	68	170	346	1,575	4	17
9,043	4,447	7	61	309	219	0	1
9,031	6,899	34	315	710	463	3	13
2,014	393	5	35	107	25	2	0
5,583	7,914	21	196	305	773	3	9
11,244	6,026	32	919	804	430	7	64
16,492	7,787	41	202	911	611	2	12
7,891	1,595	19	189	645	83	4	14
12,837	2,129	17	62	791	124	0	5
9,161	5,014	34	150	1,150	759	0	9
1,776	1,838	2	3	123	174	0	0
4,400	2,116	24	161	325	257	4	12
2,893	231	1	13	145	78	0	3
6,689	8,189	31	146	490	618	0	9
2,797	485	6	31	129	44	0	1

Table
H Dis

COUNTY ARRESTS BY ETHNIC ORIGIN - 2015

COUNTY	TOTAL		ADULTS		JUVENILE	
	HISPANIC	NON HISPANIC	HISPANIC	NON HISPANIC	HISPANIC	NON HISPANIC
Atlantic	1,850	9,846	1,702	9,282	148	564
Bergen	5,455	15,036	4,990	13,942	465	1094
Burlington	1,653	17,965	1,525	16,807	128	1158
Camden	3,915	23,271	3,339	20,962	576	2309
Cape May	784	7,038	730	6,587	54	451
Cumberland	2,785	7,182	2,556	6,810	229	372
Essex	3,817	22,306	3,617	20,564	200	1742
Gloucester	885	13,202	853	12,705	32	497
Hudson	7,315	10,153	6,635	9,644	680	509
Hunterdon	305	2,275	295	2,151	10	124
Mercer	2,134	12,670	2,020	11,694	114	976
Middlesex	5,544	13,982	5,033	13,188	511	794
Monmouth	2,726	23,332	2,536	21,986	190	1346
Morris	1,999	8,441	1,844	7,850	155	591
Ocean	1,791	14,174	1,690	13,355	101	819
Passaic	6,039	10,238	5,108	9,251	931	987
Salem	403	3,513	371	3,248	32	265
Somerset	1,448	5,851	1,322	5,379	126	472
Sussex	280	3,084	266	2,872	14	212
Union	3,649	12,523	3,358	11,697	291	826
Warren	329	3,164	317	3,002	12	162

Dis Table #5
2012

8. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race (Column E), from largest to smallest between 2009 and 2012.

Ranking of Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race Between 2009 and 2012			
Rank	Race	% Change	Number
1	Other	-100%	3
2	Black	-69%	33
3	Hispanic	-58%	7
4	White	-10%	66

➤ For Question 9, use Table 5: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age.

9. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age (Column E) from largest to smallest between 2009 and 2012.

Ranking of Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age Between 2009 and 2012			
Rank	Age Groups	% Change	Number
1	6-10	-100%	3
2	13-14	-84%	41
3	16-17	-81%	57
4	11 - 12	-75%	12
5	15-16	-66%	55
6			

SUMMARY OF THE CHANGE IN THE NATURE OF JUVENILES ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT BETWEEN 2009 and 2012

10. Using the answers from Questions 6-9, describe how the nature of juveniles adjudicated delinquent changed between 2009 and 2012.

The total number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent dropped significantly, however whites only dropped 10%.

Disproportionate Minority Contact And Racial And Ethnic Disparities

11. Using the data in Table 4 (Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity), compare and describe the number of Juvenile Arrests to the number of Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity between 2009 and 2012.

Disp : Table # 6+7 (2012 plan date)

There were 445 juvenile arrests in 2012, a 23% reduction from 2009. The number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent (69) is 16% of those arrested in 2012. Compared to 40% (229) of those arrested (578) in 2009.

Probation Placements

12. Using the data in Table 6 (Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity), describe the overall change in the Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2009 and 2012.

The number of Probation Placements in 2009 were 97 and 73 in 2012, which is a 25% decrease.

13. Insert into the chart below the number column (Table 6, Column C), Probation Placements by race/ethnicity beginning with the group that had the greatest number of placements in 2012.

Ranking of Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity, 2012		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number
1	Blacks	38
2	Whites	30
3	Hispanic	5
4	Other	0

14. Insert into the chart below the % change in Table 6 (Column E), Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest % change between 2009 and 2012.

Ranking of Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2009 and 2012		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	% Change
1	Others	-100%
2	Hispanics	-25%
3	Blacks	-25%
4	Whites	-23%

15. Using the information in the ranking chart above, what does this information tell you about your county's Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2009 and 2012? How has Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity changed since 2009?

There was a reduction in Probation Placements overall and in all Race/Ethnicity categories.

2015

Dis: Table 6+7

PAGE 1

RUNDATE: 04/12/17
PROGRAM: TABLE30
REQUESTOR: Jeanette Ford
REQ. CNTY: ATL
(PART D\Y2K)

RACE of Juveniles by County
Race Breakdown for Juveniles with Adjudicated Delinquent Cases by County
For the period between January 1, 2015 - December 31, 2015

County	White	Black	Hspnc	Asian	Amex.	Alskn	Other	Total	Not Indctd	Grand Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Atlantic	48 22.54	120 56.34	40 18.78	2 .94	0 .00	0 .00	3 1.41	213	0	213
Bergen	181 41.42	107 24.49	130 29.75	15 3.43	1 .23	0 .00	3 .69	437	0	437
Burlington	85 30.04	176 62.19	17 6.01	1 .35	0 .00	0 .00	4 1.41	283	0	283
Camden	133 25.63	297 57.23	81 15.61	0 .00	0 .00	0 .00	8 1.54	519	0	519
Cape May	77 69.37	20 18.02	11 9.91	1 .90	1 .90	0 .00	1 .90	111	0	111
Cumberland	43 21.94	80 40.82	66 33.67	0 .00	0 .00	0 .00	7 3.57	196	0	196
Essex	27 4.29	524 83.17	73 11.59	3 .48	0 .00	2 .32	1 .16	630	0	630
Gloucester	108 54.82	80 40.61	2 1.02	3 1.52	1 .51	0 .00	3 1.52	197	0	197
Hudson	17 5.38	160 50.63	121 38.29	16 5.06	0 .00	0 .00	2 .63	316	0	316
Hunterdon	22 88.00	2 8.00	0 .00	1 4.00	0 .00	0 .00	0 .00	25	2 7.41	27
Mercer	70 20.47	234 68.42	34 9.94	1 .29	0 .00	0 .00	3 .88	342	3	345
Middlesex	145 33.18	153 35.01	114 26.09	21 4.81	0 .00	0 .00	4 .92	437	3	440
Monmouth	148 39.15	179 47.35	47 12.43	4 1.06	0 .00	0 .00	0 .00	378	0	378
Morris	106 65.84	25 15.53	27 16.77	3 1.86	0 .00	0 .00	0 .00	161	4	165
Ocean	154 66.09	45 19.31	32 13.73	0 .00	0 .00	0 .00	2 .86	233	1	234
Passaic	129 23.98	184 34.20	219 40.71	2 .37	0 .00	0 .00	4 .74	538	1	539
Salem	28 37.84	38 51.35	7 9.46	0 .00	0 .00	0 .00	1 1.35	74	1 1.33	75
Somerset	20 35.09	21 36.84	15 26.32	1 1.75	0 .00	0 .00	0 .00	57	0	57
Sussex	25 80.65	5 16.13	1 3.23	0 .00	0 .00	0 .00	0 .00	31	0	31
Union	60 19.23	291 61.22	54 17.31	3 .96	0 .00	0 .00	4 1.28	312	0	312
Warren	37 74.00	10 20.00	3 6.00	0 .00	0 .00	0 .00	0 .00	50	1 1.96	51
TOTAL	1663 30.02	2651 47.85	1094 19.75	77 1.39	3 .05	2 .04	50 .90	5540	16	5556

- 1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).
- 2.) Figures are based on the date adjudications were entered in Court.
- 3.) These figures do NOT include any Violation of Probation (VOP) offenses.

Summary of Selections

Report Type: Adjudicated
County/Vicinage: Salem
Township: All Townships
Statute Group: All Statutes

Dispositions: INCARCER - JUV FAC
Age: WHERE AGE IS-FROM 5 TO 18

Gender: ALL
Race: All

Time Period: From Date: 01/01/2012 To Date: 12/31/2012
Transfers are set to: include
VOP's are set to: include

Gender values: M-Male, F-Female, U-Unknown or not indicated

Race values: 1-Caucasian, 2-Black, 3-Hispanic, 4-Asian/Oriental, 5-Amer Indian, 6-Other,
7-Unknown, 8-Alaskan Native, 9-Amer Ind, Eski, Aleu

Use the Page Down/Up buttons to scroll to report sections

Dis - Tables 8+9



New Jersey Courts

Independence • Integrity • Fairness • Quality Service

FJ Statistical Processing Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County

Userid: JUBWOLF
Run Date: 08/08/17
Run Time: 11:51:00
Program: fj_0x

Race/Ethnicity of Juveniles by County

(PART D)

County	White		% Black		% Hspnc		Asian % pcIsl		Amer. % Indn.		% Other		Alskn % Native		Not Indctd		Grand % Total	
Salem	3	25.00	7	58.33	2	16.67	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	12	0	.00	12
TOTAL	3	25.00	7	58.33	2	16.67	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	12	0	.00	12

- 1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).
- 2.) Figures were based on the Case Status Dates of Juvenile Delinquency Complainants
- 3.) These figures include Violation of Probation offenses
- 4.) These figures include Transferred in Cases

1/1/12
12/2/12



FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County

Userid: JWHWOLF
Run Date: 08/08/17
Run Time: 11.51.41
Program: fj_0x

Summary of Selections

Report Type: Adjudicated
County/Vicinage: Salem
Township: All Townships
Statute Group: All Statutes

Dispositions: INCARCER - JUV FAC
Age: WHERE AGE IS-FROM 5 TO 18

Gender: ALL
Race: All


Time Period: From Date: 01/01/2015 To Date: 12/31/2015
Transfers are set to: include
VOP's are set to: include

Gender values: M-Male, F-Female, U-Unknown or not indicated

Race values: 1-Caucasian, 2-Black, 3-Hispanic, 4-Asian/Oriental, 5-Amer Indian, 6-Other, 7-Unknown, 8-Alaskan Native, 9-Amer Ind, Eski, Aleu

Use the Page Down/Up buttons to scroll to report sections

Dis - Tables
8+9



FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County

Userid: JUEWOLF
Run Date: 08/08/17
Run Time: 11.51.41
Program: fj_0x

Race/Ethnicity of Juveniles by County

(PART D)

County	White	% Black	% Hspnc	Asian % PCIs	Amer. % Indn.	% Other	% Native	% Total	Not Indctd	Grand % Total
Salem	0	.00	1 100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	1	.00
TOTAL	0	.00	1 100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	1	.00

- 1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).
- 2.) Figures were based on the Case Status Dates of Juvenile Delinquency compliants
- 3.) These figures include Violation of Probation offenses
- 4.) These figures include Transferred in Cases

11/11/17
11/11/17

Disposition: Question
26 - Jms Dalz

JAMS Planning Report

Average Age by Program

Disposition Report From 1/1/2015 To 12/31/2015

MONMOUTH

<u>Program Name</u>	<u>Average Age</u>
Community Intervention Coaches	16
NEW HOPE FOUNDATION RESID. DRUG & ALCOHOL TREATME	17
PROBATION MULTI TREATMENT PROGRAM	17
PROBATION OFFENDER PROGRAM	17

MORRIS

<u>Program Name</u>	<u>Average Age</u>
Comprehensive Adolescent Program	17

OCEAN

<u>Program Name</u>	<u>Average Age</u>
In Home Counseling Services	18
Inpatient Substance Abuse	16
Out Patient Substance Abuse Treatment & Services	17
Service Learning	17
Sexual Abuse & Behavior Treatment Services	17

PASSAIC

<u>Program Name</u>	<u>Average Age</u>
DRUG AND ALCOHOL EVALUATIONS	17
Graduated Sanctions	16
Juvenile Sexual Assessment and Treatment Program	17
PAARENTING SUPPPORT AND EDUCATINON	13
Total LifeStyle and Support Program	17

SALEM

<u>Program Name</u>	<u>Average Age</u>
Behavior Modification Skills Based on a Cognitive Model	17
CONNECT TWO	17
Drug / Alcohol Evaluations	17

SUSSEX

<u>Program Name</u>	<u>Average Age</u>
Comprehensive Adolescent Program	15
Outpatient Adolescent Substance Abuse Treatment Program	18

UNION

<u>Program Name</u>	<u>Average Age</u>
---------------------	--------------------

Disp: Question # 31

4/3/2017

JAMS Planning Report
 Service Interventions needed by Program
 Disposition Report From 1/1/2015 To 12/31/2015

SALEM

	Behavior Modification Skills Based On A Cognitive	Connect Two	Drug / Alcohol Evaluations	Total
Recreational/Socialization	0	1	0	1
Role Model/Mentor	0	7	0	7
Special Day School/Alternative High	1	0	2	3
Substance Abuse Evaluation	1	2	0	3
Substance Abuse Treatment/Counseling(Inpati	0	0	1	1
Substance Abuse Treatment/Counseling(Inten	1	0	6	7
Substance Abuse Treatment/Counseling(Outp	0	1	0	1
Teaching Family	0	1	0	1
Transportation	0	4	0	4
Urine Monitoring	3	1	11	15
Vocational/Job Readiness/Job Skills	0	2	0	2
Total	16	78	30	124

8

10

7

12

4/3/2017

JAMS Planning Report
 Service Interventions needed by Program
 Disposition Report From 1/1/2015 To 12/31/2015

Disps Question # 31

SALEM

	Behavior Modification Skills Based On A Cognitive	Connect Two	Drug / Alcohol Evaluations	Total
Academic Education	0	8	0	8
Advocacy	0	2	0	2
After School Program	1	0	1	2
Anger Management Training	1	9	0	10
Child Study Evaluation/IEP	1	1	0	2
Counseling/Individual	0	12	0	12
Decision Making Skills Training	4	12	4	20
Family Support Group/Network	0	1	0	1
Financial Assistance	0	1	0	1
GED Preparation	1	2	0	3
Housing Services	0	1	0	1
Interpersonal Skills Training	0	3	1	4
Job Placement/Referral Services	0	2	0	2
✓ Life Skills Training	2	3	4	9
Medical Care	0	1	0	1
Medication/Monitoring	0	1	0	1

8 4 6

4

3

1

9

5

Disposition Analysis
Question # 31

Ranking of Service Interventions Needed					
2009			2012		
Rank	Service Interventions Needed	Total	Rank	Service Interventions Needed	Total
1	Intensive Supervision		1		
2	Sex Offender Services		2		
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		
8			8		
9			9		
10			10		

Taken From 2012 Plan

JAMS Planning Report

Problem Areas by Program

Disposition Analysis
Question # 38

Disposition Report From 1/1/2015 To 12/31/2015

Location SALEM

Problem Areas by Program

	Behavior Modification Skills Based on a	CONNECT TWO	Drug / Alcohol Evaluations	Total	
Attitudes/Orientation	0	3	2	5	8
Education	4	13	11	28	3
Family Circumstances/Parenting	0	20	2	22	4
Medical Problems	0	5	0	5	7
Peer Relations	7	15	9	31	2
Personality/Behavior	4	56	20	80	1
Substance Abuse	4	3	11	18	5
Vocational Skills/Employment	1	4	1	6	6
Total	20	119	56	195	

Program Name	Intakes
Behavior Modification Skills Based on a Cognitive Model	5
CONNECT TWO	18
Drug / Alcohol Evaluations	12

DISPOSITION DATA WORKSHEETS

Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender, 2012 and 2015

Gender	2012		2015		% Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Male	154	81.5%	83	70.9%	-46.1%
Female	35	18.5%	34	29.1%	-2.9%
Total Juveniles	189	100%	117	100%	-38.1%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2012 and 2015

Table 2: Juvenile Cases Adjudicated Delinquent with Probation & Incarceration Dispositions, 2012 and 2015

Disposition	2012		2015		% Change in Dispositions 2012-2015
	Number		Number		
01 - JJC Committed	0		0		0.0%
02 - Short-Term Commitment	0		0		0.0%
03 - 14 - Probation*	121		39		-67.8%
Total	121		39		-67.8%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2012 and 2015

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 3: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race, 2012 and 2015

Race	2012		2015		% Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
White	27	39.1%	39	33.3%	44.4%
Black	37	53.6%	66	56.4%	78.4%
Hispanic	5	7.2%	9	7.7%	80.0%
Other *	0	0.0%	3	2.6%	100.0%
Total	69	100.0%	117	100.0%	69.6%

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2012 and 2015

Table 4: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015

Race/Ethnicity	2012				2015				% Change 2012-2015	
	Juvenile Arrests**	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	% of Arrest Adjudicated Delinquent	Juvenile Arrests**	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	% of Arrest Adjudicated Delinquent	Juvenile Arrests**	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent		
White	224	27	12.1%	123	39	31.7%			-45.1%	44.4%
Black	220	37	16.8%	174	66	37.9%			-20.9%	78.4%
Hispanic	33	5	15.2%	32	9	28.1%			-3.0%	80.0%
Other*	1	-	0.0%	-	3	200.0%			-100.0%	100.0%
Total	445	69	15.5%	297	117	39.4%			-33.3%	69.6%

* ** See Required Data & Methodology Section

Source: Virginia Crime Report (New Jersey), 2012 and 2015
Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2012 and 2015

Table 5: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age, 2012 and 2015

Age Group	2012		2015		% Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
6 - 10	3	1.8%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
11 - 12	12	7.1%	4	3.4%	-66.7%
13 - 14	41	24.4%	25	21.4%	-39.0%
15 - 16	55	32.7%	52	44.4%	-5.5%
17	57	33.9%	36	30.8%	-36.8%
18 and over ^a	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	168	100%	117	100%	-30.4%

^a Sex Required Data & Methodology Section

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family-Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2012 and 2015

Table 6: Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015

Race/Ethnicity	2012		2015		% Change in Probation Placements, 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total Probation Placements	Number	% of Total Probation Placements	
White	30	41.1%	28	37.3%	-6.7%
Black	38	52.1%	38	50.7%	0.0%
Hispanic	5	6.8%	7	9.3%	40.0%
Other ^a	0	0.0%	2	2.7%	100.0%
Total	73	100.0%	75	100.0%	2.7%

^a Sex Required Data & Methodology Section

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, Restoring Our Delinquents, 2012 and 2015

Table 7: Juvenile Probation Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015

Race/Ethnicity	2012				2015				% Change 2012-2015	
	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Probation Placements	% of Adjudications placed on Probation	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Probation Placements	% of Adjudications placed on Probation	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Probation Placements	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Probation Placements
White	27	30	111.1%	39	28	71.8%	44.4%	-6.7%		
Black	37	38	102.7%	66	38	57.6%	78.4%	0.0%		
Hispanic	5	5	100.0%	9	7	77.8%	80.0%	40.0%		
Other*	-	-	0.0%	3	2	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%		
Total	69	73	105.8%	117	75	64.1%	69.6%	2.7%		

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2012 and 2015

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 8: Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015

Race/Ethnicity	2012			2015			% Change in Secure Placements 2012-2015	
	Number	% of Total Secure Placements	Number	% of Total Secure Placements				
White	3	25.0%	0	0.0%			-100.0%	
Black	7	58.3%	1	100.0%			-85.7%	
Hispanic	2	16.7%	0	0.0%			-100.0%	
Other *	0	0.0%	0	0.0%			0.0%	
Total	12	100.0%	1	100.0%			-91.7%	

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 9: Secure Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent, by Race/Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015

Race/Ethnicity	2012				2015				% Change 2012-2015	
	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Secure Placements	% of Adjudications resulted in Secure Confinement	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Secure Placements	% of Adjudications resulted in Secure Confinement	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Secure Placements	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Secure Placements
White	27	3	11.1%	39	-	0.0%	44.4%	-100.0%		
Black	37	7	18.9%	66	1	1.5%	78.4%	-85.7%		
Hispanic	5	2	40.0%	9	-	0.0%	80.0%	-100.0%		
Other*	-	-	0.0%	3	-	0.0%	-100.0%	0.0%		
Total	69	12	17.4%	117	1	0.9%	69.6%	-91.7%		

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2012 and 2015

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

REENTRY

- Definition & Rationale
- Required Data & Methodology
- Data Worksheets
- Analysis Questions

REENTRY DEFINITION & RATIONALE

In the juvenile justice system Reentry generally refers to the period of community-based supervision and services that follows a juvenile's release from a secure facility, residential program, or other structured dispositional placement.

However, for the purposes of this plan, the use of the term Reentry only applies to committed youth paroled from a Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC) facility and supervised by the JJC's Office of Juvenile Parole and Transitional Services and to juveniles disposed to a JJC program as a condition of probation and supervised by the Department of Probation. Reentry is a mechanism for providing the additional support during this transitional period that is necessary to foster the successful reintegration of juveniles into their communities. Given this goal, Reentry programs developed through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing services to youth, regardless of their age, that address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

By developing Reentry services that compliment the supervision provided by the JJC and Probation, Counties can increase the likelihood that juveniles returning to their communities will reintegrate successfully. This type of cooperative effort in the delivery of Reentry services and supervision improves each youth's chance of becoming productive, law-abiding citizens, which in turn enhances the safety and quality of the local communities in which these juveniles reside.

Reentry data describe the number of committed youth and probationers returning to the community from JJC facilities and programs, as well as the demographic and offense characteristics of these juveniles that reflect the causes and correlates of delinquent activity. By understanding the nature and extent of the population released to Reentry and the factors associated with involvement in delinquency, planners can better identify the content and scope of Reentry services and programs needed in their Counties. As such, Counties will be better equipped to make informed decisions regarding the allocation of resources to Reentry services, including those resources disseminated by the Juvenile Justice Commission (State/Community Partnership, Family Court Services, and Title II). Note, however, that the Reentry data collected through this Comprehensive Plan represent only a portion of the data that a County might collect as part of the overall Reentry services planning process.

REENTRY REQUIRED DATA & METHODOLOGY

- All data are county-specific unless otherwise indicated.
- Round all percentages to one decimal place.
- Cells in the data tables are identified with a letter/number combination, where the letter identifies the column and the number identifies the row (e.g., A1 = Column A, Row 1).

PROBATIONERS

Required Data	“Probationers” refers to youth ordered by the court to attend a JJC residential or day program as a condition of their probation. Table 1 required data is probationers admitted to JJC Residential Programs Tables 2, 3, 4, and 6 are based on the number of probationers completing a JJC residential or day programs in calendar years 2012 and 2015. Required data include probationers released by program type, race, gender and age, and probationers released from specialized programs. Table 5 is based on the number of probationers admitted to JJC residential programs in calendar years 2012 and 2015. Required data include the most severe current offense for residentially placed juvenile probationers by offense type and offense degree. <u>NOTE: Juveniles may have multiple offenses</u>
Source	New Jersey Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015 (JJC will provide these data to the Counties).
Methods	<u>Table 1. Juvenile Probationers Admitted to JJC Residential by Race/Ethnicity</u> ➤ Number (Columns A and C). Insert the number of probationers admitted to the JJC by Race/Ethnicity for each year. ➤ Percent of Total Probationers Admitted to JJC (Columns B and D). Calculate the percent of the total number of probationers admitted to the JJC by Race/Ethnicity for each year. To obtain the percent, divide the number of probationers admitted for each Race/Ethnicity by the total number of probationers admitted and multiply by 100. Formula 1 is an example of how to calculate the percent of the total number of White probationers admitted in 2015. ➤ Percent Change (Column E). Calculate the percent change in the number of probationers admitted to the JJC between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

Methods
(cont.)

Table 3. Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

- *Males by Race/Ethnicity (Columns A and D).* Insert the number of males of each race/ethnicity released from JJC programs and the total number of males released for each year.
- *Females by Race/Ethnicity (Columns B and E).* Insert the number of females of each race/ethnicity released from JJC programs and the total number of females released for each year.
- *Total by Race/Ethnicity (Columns C and F).* Insert the total number of probationers of each race/ethnicity released from JJC programs in each year, and the grand total of all probationers released in each year (Cells C5 and F5).
- *Percent Change - Males by Race/Ethnicity (Columns G).* Calculate the percent change in the number of males of each race/ethnicity released and the total number of males released between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.
- *Percent Change - Females by Race/Ethnicity (Columns H).* Calculate the percent change in the number of females of each race/ethnicity released and the total number of females released between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.
- *Percent Change – Total by Race/Ethnicity (Columns I).* Calculate the percent change in the total number of probationers of each race/ethnicity between 2012 and 2015, and in the grand total of all probationers released between 2012 and 2015 (Cell I5) using Formula 2.

Table 4. Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Age

- *Number (Columns A and C).* Add the number of probationers ages 14 and under, 15-16, 17-18, and 19 and over, and then insert the number of probationers in each age group in the appropriate cell for each year.
- *Percent of Total (Columns B and D).* Calculate what percent of the total number of probationers released in each year were in each age group. To obtain the percent, divide the number of probationers in each age group by the total number of probationers released and multiply by 100 (use Formula 1).
- *Percent Change (Column E).* Calculate the percent change in the number of probationers released from each age group and the total number of probationers released between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

COMMITTED JUVENILES

Required Data	“Committed Juveniles” refers to youth committed by the court to the custody of the Juvenile Justice Commission. Table 7 required data is committed juveniles admitted to JJC. Tables 8, 9, and 10 are based on the number of juveniles committed to the custody of the JJC, who in calendar years 2012 and 2015 were either released to a period of parole supervision or recalled to probation. Required data include committed juveniles released by departure type, race, gender, and age, and the average length of stay of committed juveniles. Tables 11, 12 and 13 are based on the number of juveniles committed to the custody of the JJC during calendar years 2012 and 2015. Required data include the committed juveniles by offense type and committed juveniles with a sex offense charge in their history. <u>NOTE: Juveniles may have multiple offenses</u>
Source	New Jersey Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015 (JJC will provide these data to the Counties).
Methods	<u>Table 7. Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC by Race/Ethnicity</u> ➤ <i>Number (Columns A and C).</i> Insert the number of committed juveniles admitted to the JJC by Race/Ethnicity for each year. ➤ <i>Percent of Total Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC (Columns B and D).</i> Calculate the percent of the total number of committed juveniles admitted to the JJC by Race/Ethnicity for each year using Formula 1. ➤ <i>Percent Change (Column E).</i> Calculate the percent change in the number of committed juveniles admitted to the JJC between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

Methods
cont.

Table 10. Committed Juveniles Released by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

- *Males by Race (Columns A and D).* Insert the number of committed males of each race/ethnicity and the total number of males released for each year.
- *Females by Race/Ethnicity (Columns B and E).* Insert the number of committed females of each race/ethnicity and the total number of females released for each year.
- *Total by Race/Ethnicity (Columns C and F).* Insert the total number of committed juveniles of each race/ethnicity released from JJC programs in each year, and the grand total of all committed juveniles released in each year (Cells C5 and F5).
- *Percent Change - Males by Race/Ethnicity (Columns G).* Calculate the percent change in the number of males of each race/ethnicity committed and the total number of males committed between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.
- *Percent Change - Females by Race/Ethnicity (Columns H).* Calculate the percent change in the number of females of each race/ethnicity committed and the total number of females committed between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.
- *Percent Change – Total by Race/Ethnicity (Columns I).* Calculate the percent change in the total number of juveniles committed of each race/ethnicity between 2012 and 2015, and in the grand total of all committed juveniles between 2012 and 2015 (Cell I5) using Formula 2.

Table 11. Committed Juveniles Released by Age

- *Number (Columns A and C).* Add the number of committed juveniles ages 14 and under, 15-16, 17-18, and 19 and over, and then insert the number of probationers in each age group in the appropriate cells for each year.
- *Percent of Total (Columns B and D).* Calculate what percent of the total number of committed juveniles in each year were in each age group. To obtain the percent, divide the number committed juveniles in each age group by the total number of committed juveniles and multiply by 100 (use Formula 1).
- *Percent Change (Column E).* Calculate the percent change in the number of committed juveniles from each age group and the total number of committed juveniles between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

Required Data	Each State Community Partnership funded program collects data regarding each youth in the program. The following required data reflects the total population of youth served in Reentry/Aftercare Programs in 2016: - Total Intakes by Program - Total Intakes by Gender - Total Intakes by Race - Average Age of Intake Population - Problem Areas by Program - Service Intervention Provided to Youth - Service Intervention Needed for Youth but not Available
Source	Juvenile Justice Commission's Juvenile Automated Management System (JAMS)
Methods	➤ Each County Youth Services Commission enters the required data into JAMS. The data is then accessed by the Juvenile Justice Commission for analysis. Once analysis is complete, aggregate data is returned to the County to be included in their Comprehensive County Youth Services Plan. This data will produce a "picture" of youth in Reentry/Aftercare Programs.

REENTRY ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

- When answering questions regarding trends, describe *whether* any change has occurred, the *direction* of any change (e.g., increase/up, decrease/down), and the *size* of any change (e.g., small, moderate, large).
- When answering questions regarding rank orders, draw comparisons between categories (e.g., using terms like least/smallest, most/largest).

NATURE & EXTENT OF REENTRY POPULATION

JUVENILE PROBATIONER ADMITTED TO JJC RESIDENTIAL & DAY PROGRAMS

1. Looking at Table 1: Juvenile Probationers Admitted to JJC Residential by Race/Ethnicity (Column E), describe how the overall change in the number of Juvenile Probationers admitted to Residential Community Homes by Race/Ethnicity has changed from 2012 and 2015.

There was an overall decrease of (-88.9%) JJC Juvenile Residential Probationers from 2012-2015.

2. Insert into the chart below the number column (Column C) Juvenile Probationers Admitted by Race/Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest number of admissions in 2015.

Ranking of Juvenile Probationers Admitted by Race/Ethnicity, 2015		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number
1	Black	1
2	White	0
3	Hispanic	0
4	Other	0

3. Insert into the chart below the % change in Table 1 (Column E) Juvenile Probationers Admitted by Race/Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest % change between 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Releases by Race/Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Group	% Change	Number
1	White	-100.0%	0
2	Black	-85.7%	1
3	Hispanic	0.0%	0
4	Other	0.0%	0

4. Using the ranking tables above, what does this information tell you about the Juvenile Probationers Admitted in the year 2015? How has Juvenile Probationers Admitted by Race/Ethnicity changed since 2012?

The Juvenile Probationers population has largely decreased amongst White and Black youth from 2012-2015. Juveniles identifying as Hispanic and Other showed no change and (0) total admissions.

JUVENILES RELEASED TO PROBATION REENTRY SUPERVISION

PROBATIONERS RELEASED IN 2015

5. Looking at Table 2: Juvenile Probationers Released by Program Type (Columns C and D), describe the overall number of juvenile probationers released and juvenile probationers released from each type of program in 2015.

In 2015, there were (0) juvenile probationers released from Day Program and (1) juvenile released from Residential Program.

6. Looking at Table 3: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Race and Gender and Table 4: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Age, describe the nature of juvenile probationers released in 2015 in terms of Race (Table 2, Cells F1-F4), Gender (Table 2, Cells D5 and E5) and Age (Table 3, Cells D1-D4).

In 2015, there was (1) release of a sixteen year-old Black male released from JJC Residential and Day Programs.

- For Questions 7, use **Table 5: Offenses of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers by Type**.

7. Insert into the chart below the Offense of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers by Type (Columns C and D), beginning with the offense type that has the greatest number in 2015.

Probationers Ranking of Offenses by Type for 2015			
Rank	Offense Type	Number	Percent
1	JJC Salem County Data Not Available	*	*
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			

8. Looking at Table 6: Juvenile Probationers Released from Specialized Programs (Cells B1 and B2), describe the number of juveniles released from Pinelands and from Drug Treatment Programs in 2015.

In 2015, There were (0) Juvenile Probationers Released from Pinelands and Drug Treatment Programs

SUMMARY OF THE NATURE OF PROBATIONERS RELEASED IN 2015

9. Using the answers to Questions 5-8, summarize what this information tells you about the nature of juveniles released to Probation in 2015.

Available data indicates that Salem County has a decreased juvenile released-to-probation population of only (1) 16 year-old Black male.

CHANGE IN PROBATIONERS RELEASED BETWEEN 2015 and 2015

10. Looking at Table 2: Juvenile Probationers Released by Program Type (Column E), describe the overall change in the number of juvenile probationers released between 2012 and 2015

and the number of juvenile probationers released from each type of program between 2012 and 2015.

The number of juvenile probationers released from each type of program has decreased from (7) total released probationers in 2012 to (1) in 2015 accounting for a (-85.7%) change overall.

- **For Questions 11, use Table 3: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Race and Gender.**

11. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Probationers Released (Cells I1-I4), from largest to smallest between 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Juvenile Probationers Released by Race Between 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Race	% Change	Number
1	White	-100.0%	0
2	Hispanic	-100.0%	0
3	Black	-75.0%	1
4	Other	0.0%	0

- **For Questions 12, use Table 4: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Age.**

12. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Probationers Released by Age (Cells E1-E4), from largest to smallest between 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Juvenile Probationers Released by Age Between 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Age	% Change	Number
1	17-18	-100.0%	0
2	15-16	0.0%	1
3	14 And Under	0.0%	0
4	19 and Over	0.0%	0

Comment: 2015 Plan Table changed from 2012 with (15-16) age group versus a (16-17) age group in 2015 plan.

- For Questions 13, use Table 5: Offenses of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers by Type.

13. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Offenses by Type (Cells E1-E6), from largest to smallest between 2012 and 2015.

Probationers Ranking of Offenses by Type Between 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Offense Type	% Change	Number
1	2015 Data Not Available	*	*
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			

14. Looking at Table 6: Juvenile Probationers Released from Specialized Programs (Cells C1 and C2), describe the change in the number of juveniles released from Pinelands and from Drug Treatment Programs between 2012 and 2015.

In 2012, there were (0) juveniles released to Pinelands and (1) juvenile released to Drug Treatment. In 2015, there were (0) juveniles released to Pinelands and (0) juvenile released to Drug Treatment.

SUMMARY OF THE CHANGE IN PROBATIONERS RELEASED BETWEEN 2012 and 2015

15. Using the answers from Questions 10-14 and the information in Table 3, Cells G5 and H5 (which provides information on probationers released by gender), describe how the nature of juvenile probationers released to Probation changed between 2012 and 2015.

The overall nature of juvenile probationers released to Probation has decreased from (7) juveniles in 2012 to (1) juvenile in 2015. The accounts for a total decrease of (-85.7%).

JUVENILES COMMITTED TO JJC

16. Using the data in Table 7 (Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC by Race/Ethnicity), describe the overall change in commitments by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015.

Salem County 2015 JJC Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC by Race/Ethnicity data unavailable.

JUVENILES RELEASED TO PAROLE SUPERVISION

COMMITTED JUVENILES RELEASED IN 2015

17. Looking at Table 8: Committed Juveniles Released by Departure Type (Columns C and D), describe the overall number of committed juveniles released and committed juveniles released by departure type in 2015.

In 2015, there was (1) juvenile released to Parole Supervision and (0) juveniles Recalled To Probation.

18. Looking at Table 10: Committed Juveniles Released by Race and Gender and Table 11: Committed Juveniles Released by Age, describe the nature of committed juveniles released in 2015 in terms of Race (Table 10, Cells F1-F4), Gender (Table 10, Cells D5 and E5), and Age (Table 11, Cells D1-D4).

In 2015, There were (2) Black males between the ages of 17-18 and (1) Hispanic male 19 years or over Released by Race and Gender.

19. Insert into the chart below the Offenses of Committed Juveniles by Type of Table 12 (Columns C and D), beginning with the offense type that has the greatest number in 2015.

Committed Juveniles Ranking of Offenses by Type for 2015 (2016 Data)			
Rank	Offense Type	Number	Percent
1	Property	3	42.9%
2	Persons	2	28.6%
3	CDS	1	14.3%
4	VOP	1	14.3%
5	*2016 DATA USED. 2015 Data N/A*		
6			

20. Looking at Table 13: Committed Juveniles with a Sex Offense Charge in their Court History (Cell B1), describe the number of juveniles with a sex offense charge in 2015.

In 2015, there was (1) juvenile with a Sex Offense Charge in their Court History.

21. Looking at Table 9: Average Length of Stay (LOS) of Committed Juveniles Released (Cell B1), describe the length of stay of committed juveniles released in 2015.

The average length of stay of committed juveniles released in 2015 was 19.58 months.

SUMMARY OF THE NATURE OF COMMITTED JUVENILES RELEASED IN 2015

22. Using the answers to Questions 17-21, summarize what this information tells you about the nature of juveniles released to Parole in 2015.

The nature of juveniles released to parole consisted of 17 year and older males with charges primarily consisting of property related offenses.

CHANGE IN COMMITTED JUVENILES RELEASED BETWEEN 2012 and 2015

23. Looking at Table 8: Committed Juveniles Released by Departure Type (Column E), describe the overall change in the number of committed juveniles released between 2012 and 2015 and in the number of committed juveniles released by departure type between 2012 and 2015.

In 2012, there were a total of (3) juveniles Released to Parole Supervision versus (1) juvenile Released to Parole Supervision in 2015 for an overall decrease of (-66.7%).

➤ **For Questions 24 use Table 10: Committed Juveniles Released by Race and Gender.**

24. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Committed Juveniles Released (Cells I1-I4), from largest to smallest between 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Committed Juveniles Released by Race, 2012 and 2015

Rank	Race	% Change	Number
1	Black	+100.0%	2
2	White	-100.0%	0
3	Hispanic	-50.0%	1
4	Other	0.0%	0

➤ For Questions 25, use Table 11: Committed Juveniles Released by Age.

25. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Committed Juveniles Released by Age (Cells E1-E4), from largest to smallest between 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Committed Juveniles Released by Age, 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Age	% Change	Number
1	19 and Over	100.0%	1
2	15-16	-100%	0
3	17-18	+66.7%	2
4	14 and Under	0.0%	0

➤ For Questions 26, use Table 12: Offenses of Committed Juveniles by Type.

26. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Offenses by Type (Cells E1-E6), from largest to smallest between 2012 and 2015.

Committed Juveniles Ranking of Offenses by Type: Offenses Experiencing an Increase Between 2012 and 2015 (2016)			
Rank	Offense Type	% Change	Number
1	Property	+100.0%	3
2	Persons	+100.0%	2
3	CDS	+100.0%	1
4	VOP	-66.7%	1
5	<i>*2016 DATA USED. 2015 Data N/A*</i>		
6			

27. Looking at Table 13: Committed Juveniles with a Sex Offense Charge in their Court History (Cell C1), describe the change in the number of juveniles with a sex offense charge between 2012 and 2015.

In 2012, there were (0) juveniles with a Sex Offense Charge in their Court History versus (1) in 2015 for an overall increase of (1).

28. Looking at Table 9: Average Length of Stay (LOS) of Committed Juveniles Released (Cell C1), describe the change in length of stay of committed juveniles between 2012 and 2015.

In 2012 the average LOS was (15.31) Months versus (19.58) months in 2015 representing an increase of (+4.27) month overall.

SUMMARY OF THE CHANGE IN COMMITTED JUVENILES RELEASED BETWEEN 2012 and 2015

29. Using the answers from Questions 23-28 and the information in Table 10, Cells G5 and H5 (which provides information on committed juveniles released by gender), describe how the nature of committed juvenile releases has changed between 2012 and 2015.

The amount of juveniles released in 2012 were (3) males and (1) female. In 2015, the amount of juveniles released were (3) males and (0) females. The release of males was disproportionately higher than that of females.

JUVENILE AUTOMATED MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JAMS)

➤ **For Questions 30- 40, use JAMS data tables from the JAMS packet.**

30. Looking at the "Total" in Table 1 (Total Intakes by Program, 2015), and comparing this information with your answers to Question 5 (overall number of probationers released), and Question 19 (overall number of committed juveniles released), describe any differences or similarities between probationers and committed juveniles released to probation or parole supervision and admissions to reentry programs, in terms of overall number of admissions.

Salem County JAMS data not available.

31. Looking at the “Total” for each gender in Table 2 (Total Intakes by Gender, 2015), the “Total” column in Table 3 (Total Intakes by Race, 2015), and Table 4 (Average Age by Program, 2015) and comparing this information with your answers to Question 6 (characteristics of probationers) and Question 20 (characteristics of committed juveniles), describe any differences or similarities between probationers and committed juveniles released to probation or parole supervision and admissions to reentry programs, in terms of race, gender, and age of youth admitted.

Salem County JAMS data not available.

32. Insert into the chart below the “Total” column of Table 6 (Problem Areas by Program), the top ten problem areas for youth as identified by the Juvenile Automated Management System (JAMS), from largest to smallest for calendar years 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Problem Areas by Program					
2012			2015		
Rank	Problem Areas	Total	Rank	Problem Areas	Total
1	Personality/Behavior	169	1	*JAMS DATA NOT AVAILABLE*	
2	Peer Relations	101	2		
3	Education	100	3		
4	Substance Abuse	69	4		
5	Other	47	5		
6	Family Circumstance	33	6		
7	Vocational Skills	30	7		
8	Attitudes/Orientation	19	8		
9	Teen Pregnancy	1	9		
10	<u>*2012 Data Taken From Plan*</u>		10		

33. How has the ranking of Problem Areas changed between 2012 and 2015? Describe in terms of those Problem Areas that have moved up in rank the most.

Model comparison not possible due to lack of 2015 JAMS Data.

34. Insert into the chart below the “Total” column of Table 8 (Service Intervention Needed, But Not Available), the top ten reentry program service areas that were identified as unavailable by the JAMS, from largest to smallest for calendar years 2012 and 2015

Ranking of Service Interventions Needed					
2012			2015		
Rank	Service Interventions Needed	Total	Rank	Service Interventions Needed	Total
1	No Services Listed in 2012	*	1	*JAMS DATA NOT AVAILABLE*	*
2			2		
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		
8			8		
9			9		
10			10		

35. How has the ranking of Service Interventions Needed changed between 2012 and 2015? Describe in terms of those Service Interventions Needed that have moved up in rank the most.

No services listed in 2012 Comprehensive Plan.

36. Insert into the chart below the “Total” column of Table 7 (Service Interventions Provided), the top ten service interventions provided to youth, as identified by the JAMS for calendar years 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Service Interventions Provided					
2012			2015		
Rank	Service Interventions Provided	Total	Rank	Service Interventions Provided	Total
1	Decision Making Skills	46	1	*JAMS DATA NOT AVAILABLE*	

2	Supervision	41	2		
3	Anger Management Training	40	3		
4	Life Skills Training	37	4		
5	Substance Abuse Eval.	28	5		
6	Urine Monitoring	28	6		
7	Role Model/Mentor	27	7		
8	Counseling/Individual	26	8		
9	Interpersonal Skills Training	22	9		
10	Transportation	16	10		

37. How has the ranking of Service Interventions Provided changed between 2012 and 2015? Describe in terms of those Service Interventions Provided that have moved up in rank the most.

Model comparison not possible due to lack of 2015 JAMS Data.

IMPLICATIONS FOR REENTRY PLAN

Extent of Need

38. Using information from your answers to Question 16 (overall change in probationers released to probation) and Question 26 (overall change in committed juveniles released to parole), describe how your County's need for reentry programs has changed in recent years.

Although the overall change in probationers has decreased overall, the need for YSC reentry services for sex offenders continue to exist.

Nature of Need

39. Based on the answers to Question 10 (summary of the nature of probationers released to probation in 2015), Question 23 (summary of the nature of committed juveniles released to parole in 2015), Question 16 (summary of the change in probationers released between 2012 and 2015), Question 30 (summary of the change in committed juveniles released between 2012 and 2015), Question 32 (characteristics of youth released to probation or parole vs. characteristics of youth admitted to reentry programs), and Question 33 and 34 (top ten problem areas and change in problem areas), what are the characteristics of youth that seem reasonable to address programmatically through your County's reentry plan?

The driving crimes for juveniles (property, persons, and substance abuse offenses) need heavier focus and funding. Also, data collection, monitoring, and communication between the community and law enforcement are need to be better streamlined to prevent, understand, and decrease all crime across the board.

Other Data Reviewed for Extent and Nature of Need – Reentry

40. Was additional data, not provided by the JJC, used in your county's planning process? (If other data was used submit a copy in Chapter 13.)

What do any other available data tell you about how your County's overall need for reentry programs has changed in recent years and what are the characteristics of youth that seem reasonable to address programmatically through your County's reentry plan? Are there additional data that relates Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial And Ethnic Disparities?

N/A.

RECOMMENDATIONS

41. Looking at your answers to Questions 38, 39 and 40, state the need and/or service gap to be addressed. Cite the data that supports the need and/or service gap. List your recommendations for your County's reentry plan?

State need and/or service gap to be addressed	Cite the data that indicates the need and/or service gap exists	Recommended service/program activity to address the need and/or service gap
Increased sex offender treatment for	MS PW SSC Data / All points by 100.0% increase in sex offender re-entry into community Sexual Crime specific therapy service.	

Comments:

42. Looking at your answers to Questions 18 and 44 what recommendations or strategies would your county make with regards to Reentry policy and practice through the lens of race and ethnicity? What recommendations or strategies would your county consider to ensure similar outcomes for similarly situated youth?

Comments:

A better look of cognitive, innovative, and effective national crime prevention models will continue to be examined and implemented for the future of Salem County's youth population.

5/3/2017

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission

Probationer Intake Report from 01/01/2012 - 12/31/2012

Table 1
Re: 2012

	BLACK			HISPANIC			OTHER			WHITE			Total
	FEMAL	MALE	Total	FEMAL	MALE	Total	MALE	Total	Total	FEMAL	MALE	Total	
ATLANTIC	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	11
BERGEN	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
BURLINGTON	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5
CAMDEN	2	35	37	0	12	12	0	0	0	2	4	6	55
CAPE MAY	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
CUMBERLAND	1	3	4	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
ESSEX	0	22	22	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
GLOUCESTER	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	6
HUDSON	1	5	6	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
MERCER	1	9	10	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	14
MIDDLESEX	0	5	5	0	6	6	1	1	1	0	4	4	16
MONMOUTH	0	4	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
MORRIS	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
OCEAN	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	5
PASSAIC	0	3	3	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
SALEM	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	9
SOMERSET	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
UNION	1	55	56	0	13	13	1	1	1	0	2	2	72
Total	6	168	174	1	47	48	2	2	2	4	21	25	249

5/3/2017

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission

Probationer Intake Report from 01/01/2015 - 12/31/2015

	BLACK			HISPANIC			WHITE			Total
	FEMAL	MALE	Total	MALE	Total		FEMAL	MALE	Total	
ATLANTIC	0	4	4	1	1		0	0	0	5
BERGEN	0	0	0	1	1		0	0	0	1
BURLINGTON	0	10	10	0	0		0	0	0	10
CAMDEN	1	19	20	3	3		1	2	3	26
CUMBERLAND	0	3	3	1	1		0	2	2	6
ESSEX	0	31	31	0	0		0	0	0	31
GLOUCESTER	0	3	3	0	0		0	0	0	3
HUDSON	0	4	4	2	2		0	0	0	6
MERCER	1	10	11	2	2		0	0	0	13
MIDDLESEX	0	3	3	1	1		0	1	1	5
MONMOUTH	0	5	5	1	1		0	0	0	6
MORRIS	0	2	2	0	0		0	0	0	2
OCEAN	0	0	0	1	1		0	1	1	2
SALEM	0	1	1	0	0		0	0	0	1
SOMERSET	0	1	1	1	1		0	0	0	2
UNION	1	11	12	2	2		0	1	1	15
Total	3	107	110	16	16		1	7	8	134

Table 1
Re: 2015

Reentry: Table # 2

2012 Plan

3. Insert into the chart below the % change in Table 1 (Column E) Juvenile Probationers Admitted by Race/Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest % change between 2009 and 2012.

Ranking of Releases by Race/Ethnicity, 2009 and 2012			
Rank	Group	% Change	Number
1	African American	100%	2
2	White	0.0	1
3	Hispanic	0.0	0
4	Other	0.0	0

4. Using the ranking tables above, what does this information tell you about the Juvenile Probationers Admitted in the year 2012? How has Juvenile Probationers Admitted by Race/Ethnicity changed since 2012?

The greatest change is African American juveniles admitted from 1 (2009) to 2 (2012).

JUVENILES RELEASED TO PROBATION REENTRY SUPERVISION

PROBATIONERS RELEASED IN 2012

5. Looking at Table 2: Juvenile Probationers Released by Program Type (Columns C and D), describe the overall number of juvenile probationers released and juvenile probationers released from each type of program in 2012.

A total of 7 juveniles were released in 2012, four from Day Program and three from Residential.

6. Looking at Table 3: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Race and Gender and Table 4: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Age, describe the nature of juvenile probationers released in 2012 in terms of Race (Table 2, Cells F1-F4), Gender (Table 2, Cells D5 and E5) and Age (Table 3, Cells D1-D4).

There were four African American males, one Hispanic male and two White males released. Of those four were 17 years old, while two were 18 yrs and one was 16 yrs old.

3/28/2017

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission
Probationers Released in 2015 County/Prog Type

Table #2
RC:

County	Program Type	Total
ATLANTIC	RESIDENTIAL	2
	Sub Total	2
BERGEN	RESIDENTIAL	1
	Sub Total	1
BURLINGTON	RESIDENTIAL	5
	Sub Total	5
CAMDEN	RESIDENTIAL	6
	Sub Total	6
CUMBERLAND	RESIDENTIAL	2
	Sub Total	2
ESSEX	RESIDENTIAL	4
	Sub Total	4
GLOUCESTER	RESIDENTIAL	3
	Sub Total	3
HUDSON	RESIDENTIAL	3
	Sub Total	3
MERCER	RESIDENTIAL	11
	Sub Total	11
MIDDLESEX	RESIDENTIAL	1
	Sub Total	1
MONMOUTH	DAY PROGRAM	4
	RESIDENTIAL	2
	Sub Total	6
OCEAN	DAY PROGRAM	1
	RESIDENTIAL	1
	Sub Total	2
SALEM	RESIDENTIAL	1
	Sub Total	1
SOMERSET	RESIDENTIAL	1
	Sub Total	1

3/28/2017

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission
Probationers Released in 2015 County/Prog Type

County	Program Type	Total
UNION	DAY PROGRAM	3
	RESIDENTIAL	5
		8
Sub Total		
Grand Total		56

3. Insert into the chart below the % change in Table 1 (Column E) Juvenile Probationers Admitted by Race/Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest % change between 2009 and 2012.

Ranking of Releases by Race/Ethnicity, 2009 and 2012			
Rank	Group	% Change	Number
1	African American	100%	2
2	White	0.0	1
3	Hispanic	0.0	0
4	Other	0.0	0

4. Using the ranking tables above, what does this information tell you about the Juvenile Probationers Admitted in the year 2012? How has Juvenile Probationers Admitted by Race/Ethnicity changed since 2012?

The greatest change is African American juveniles admitted from 1 (2009) to 2 (2012).

JUVENILES RELEASED TO PROBATION REENTRY SUPERVISION

PROBATIONERS RELEASED IN 2012

5. Looking at Table 2: Juvenile Probationers Released by Program Type (Columns C and D), describe the overall number of juvenile probationers released and juvenile probationers released from each type of program in 2012.

A total of 7 juveniles were released in 2012, four from Day Program and three from Residential.

6. Looking at Table 3: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Race and Gender and Table 4: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Age, describe the nature of juvenile probationers released in 2012 in terms of Race (Table 2, Cells F1-F4), Gender (Table 2, Cells D5 and E5) and Age (Table 3, Cells D1-D4).

There were four African American males, one Hispanic male and two White males released. Of those four were 17 years old, while two were 18 yrs and one was 16 yrs old.

3/28/2017

Re: Table #3

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission
Probationers Released in 2015 County/Race/Gender

County	Race	Female	Male	Total
MERCER	AFRICAN AMERICAN	1	10	11
	HISPANIC	0	1	1
	Sub Totals	1	11	12
MIDDLESEX	AFRICAN AMERICAN	0	1	1
	Sub Totals	0	1	1
MONMOUTH	AFRICAN AMERICAN	0	5	5
	HISPANIC	0	1	1
	Sub Totals	0	6	6
OCEAN	AFRICAN AMERICAN	0	1	1
	HISPANIC	0	1	1
	Sub Totals	0	2	2
SALEM	AFRICAN AMERICAN	0	1	1
	Sub Totals	0	1	1
SOMERSET	AFRICAN AMERICAN	0	1	1
	Sub Totals	0	1	1
UNION	AFRICAN AMERICAN	1	3	4
	HISPANIC	2	2	4
	Sub Totals	3	5	8
		8	50	58

3/28/2017

Re: Table #4

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission
Probationers Released in 2015 County/Age

County	Age	Total
MERCER	13	1
	14	1
	16	1
	17	5
	18	1
	19	2
	Sub Total	11
MIDDLESEX	18	1
	Sub Total	1
MONMOUTH	15	1
	16	2
	17	2
	18	1
	Sub Total	6
OCEAN	16	2
	Sub Total	2
SALEM	16	1
	Sub Total	1
SOMERSET	17	1
	Sub Total	1
UNION	15	1
	16	2
	17	3
	18	2
	Sub Total	8
Grand Total		56

Committed - Offense by Type and County - Year 2012

Re: Table 5

		Drug	Persons	Property	Public Order	VOP	Weapons	Total
ATLANTIC	0 0%	5 10%	12 26%	7 15%	2 4%	16 34%	4 8%	46 100%
BERGEN	0 0%	1 4%	3 14%	5 23%	0 0%	9 42%	3 14%	21 100%
BURLINGTON	0 0%	0 0%	1 11%	0 0%	3 33%	5 55%	0 0%	9 100%
CAMDEN	1 0%	26 13%	46 23%	22 11%	18 9%	73 37%	7 3%	193 100%
CAPE MAY	0 0%	0 0%	2 33%	0 0%	0 0%	3 50%	1 16%	6 100%
CUMBERLAND	0 0%	1 7%	7 50%	0 0%	0 0%	5 35%	1 7%	14 100%
ESSEX	0 0%	0 0%	25 56%	3 6%	2 4%	11 25%	3 6%	44 100%
GLOUCESTER	0 0%	0 0%	3 60%	1 20%	0 0%	0 0%	1 20%	5 100%
HUDSON	0 0%	7 9%	31 41%	6 8%	7 9%	15 20%	9 12%	75 100%
HUNTERDON	0 0%	0 0%	1 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 100%
MERCER	0 0%	3 9%	4 12%	7 22%	4 12%	7 22%	6 19%	31 100%
MIDDLESEX	0 0%	3 4%	22 33%	5 7%	3 4%	30 46%	2 3%	65 100%
MONMOUTH	0 0%	3 6%	23 51%	6 13%	6 13%	6 13%	1 2%	45 100%
MORRIS	0 0%	0 0%	2 25%	3 37%	0 0%	1 12%	2 25%	8 100%
OCEAN	0 0%	2 7%	6 21%	7 25%	3 10%	9 32%	1 3%	28 100%
PASSAIC	0 0%	3 5%	18 35%	4 7%	5 9%	17 33%	4 7%	51 100%
SALEM	0 0%	0 0%	1 14%	1 14%	0 0%	5 71%	0 0%	7 100%
SOMERSET	0 0%	0 0%	2 66%	0 0%	0 0%	1 33%	0 0%	3 100%
SUSSEX	0 0%	0 0%	2 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 100%
UNION	0 0%	5 5%	28 33%	19 22%	3 3%	22 26%	7 8%	84 100%

Reentry: Table # 5
2012

Probationer - Offense by Type and County - Year 2012

		Drug	Persons	Property	Public Order	VOP	Weapons	Total
ATLANTIC	0 0%	2 5%	12 34%	6 17%	2 5%	11 31%	2 5%	35 100%
BERGEN	0 0%	0 0%	2 50%	1 25%	0 0%	1 25%	0 0%	4 100%
BURLINGTON	0 0%	1 5%	6 33%	2 11%	2 11%	5 27%	2 11%	18 100%
CAMDEN	0 0%	17 9%	32 17%	43 23%	34 18%	52 27%	8 4%	186 100%
CAPE MAY	0 0%	0 0%	1 50%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 50%	2 100%
CUMBERLAND	0 0%	0 0%	2 18%	1 9%	3 27%	4 36%	1 9%	11 100%
ESSEX	0 0%	3 7%	14 35%	4 10%	3 7%	12 30%	4 10%	40 100%
GLOUCESTER	0 0%	2 18%	1 9%	2 18%	0 0%	5 45%	1 9%	11 100%
HUDSON	0 0%	1 5%	8 42%	4 21%	2 10%	4 21%	0 0%	19 100%
MERCER	0 0%	0 0%	1 5%	10 52%	0 0%	8 42%	0 0%	19 100%
MIDDLESEX	0 0%	3 8%	6 16%	10 27%	3 8%	13 35%	2 5%	37 100%
MONMOUTH	0 0%	0 0%	1 11%	2 22%	1 11%	2 22%	3 33%	9 100%
MORRIS	0 0%	3 60%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 40%	0 0%	5 100%
OCEAN	0 0%	1 14%	4 57%	1 14%	0 0%	1 14%	0 0%	7 100%
PASSAIC	0 0%	5 20%	7 29%	3 12%	3 12%	5 20%	1 4%	24 100%
SALEM	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	9 42%	4 19%	7 33%	1 4%	21 100%
SOMERSET	0 0%	1 16%	1 16%	1 16%	1 16%	2 33%	0 0%	6 100%
UNION	1 0%	14 6%	40 18%	90 41%	25 11%	36 16%	10 4%	216 100%
Total	1 0%	53 7%	138 20%	189 28%	83 12%	170 25%	36 5%	670 100%

Committed - Offense by Type and County - Year 2015

Re: Table 5

	Drug	Persons	Property	Public Order	VOP	Weapons	Total
ATLANTIC	0 0%	10 32%	12 38%	3 9%	4 12%	2 6%	31 100%
BERGEN	3 12%	6 24%	1 4%	6 24%	9 36%	0 0%	25 100%
BURLINGTON	0 0%	3 21%	4 28%	5 35%	2 14%	0 0%	14 100%
CAMDEN	25 21%	23 20%	14 12%	17 14%	31 26%	5 4%	115 100%
CAPE MAY	0 0%	4 40%	4 40%	0 0%	1 10%	1 10%	10 100%
CUMBERLAND	1 12%	1 12%	1 12%	2 25%	3 37%	0 0%	8 100%
ESSEX	1 1%	32 38%	11 13%	5 5%	31 36%	4 4%	84 100%
HUDSON	4 11%	12 35%	1 2%	3 8%	10 29%	4 11%	34 100%
HUNTERDON	0 0%	1 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 100%
MERCER	2 5%	11 28%	7 18%	7 18%	8 21%	3 7%	38 100%
MIDDLESEX	0 0%	5 31%	4 25%	0 0%	6 37%	1 6%	16 100%
MONMOUTH	2 7%	16 57%	7 25%	2 7%	1 3%	0 0%	28 100%
MORRIS	0 0%	0 0%	1 16%	3 50%	1 16%	1 16%	6 100%
OCEAN	4 16%	9 36%	4 16%	3 12%	5 20%	0 0%	25 100%
PASSAIC	1 3%	14 42%	1 3%	6 18%	7 21%	4 12%	33 100%
SOMERSET	0 0%	2 66%	0 0%	1 33%	0 0%	0 0%	3 100%
SUSSEX	0 0%	1 25%	1 25%	0 0%	2 50%	0 0%	4 100%
UNION	3 4%	22 32%	8 11%	6 8%	6 8%	22 32%	67 100%
WARREN	0 0%	1 50%	0 0%	0 0%	1 50%	0 0%	2 100%
Total	46 8%	173 31%	81 14%	69 12%	128 23%	47 8%	544 100%

SALEM = 0

Reentry: Tbl 5, 7, 12 (Ar)
(2015) Provided
By Armando Gonzalez

Table 5: Offenses of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers by Type, 2012 and 2015

Type	2012		2015		% Change in Offenses by Type 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Persons	1	14.30%	0	0.00%	.0%
Weapons	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	100.00%
Property	1	14.30%	0	0.00%	0.00%
CDS	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
Public Order	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
VOP	5	71.40%	0	0.00%	0.00%
Total	7	100.00%	1	100.0%	100.00%

Table 7: Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC by Race/Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015

Race/Ethnicity	2012		2015		% Change in Committed Juveniles Released, 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC	Number	% of Total Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC	
White	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
Black	1	25.00%	1	0.00%	100.00%
Hispanic	2	50.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
Total	4	100.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%

Table 12: Offenses of Committed Juveniles by Type, 2012 and 2015

Type	2012		2015		% Change in MISO by Type 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Persons	1	25.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
Weapons	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
Property	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
CDS	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
Public Order	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
VOP	3	75.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
Total	4	100.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%

Carozza, Frank

From: Armando Gonzalez [Armando.Gonzalez@njcourts.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 22, 2017 10:01 AM
To: Carozza, Frank
Subject: FW: Info Needed

I filled in what we had for 2015. Thanks.

Armando

From: Carozza, Frank [mailto:Frank.Carozza@salemcountynj.gov]
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2017 4:08 PM
To: Armando Gonzalez <Armando.Gonzalez@njcourts.gov>
Subject: Info Needed

Table 5: Offenses of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers

Type	2012		Number
	Number	% of Total	
Persons	1	14.3%	0
Weapons	0	0.0%	1
Property	1	14.3%	0
CDS	0	0.0%	0
Public Order	0	0.0%	0
VOP	5	71.4%	0
Total	7	100.0%	1

Table 7: Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC by Race/

Race/Ethnicity	2012	
----------------	------	--

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission

Re: #Table 6

Probationers Released in 2012 From Pinelands, by County

County	Total
CAMDEN	4
GLOUCESTER	1
HUDSON	2
MIDDLESEX	1
OCEAN	2
Grand Total	10

salem = 0

1/26/2014

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission

RCH Table 6

Probationers Released in 2012 From Drug Treatment Programs

County	Program	Total
ATLANTIC	D.O.V.E.S. RCH	1
	Sub Total	1
BERGEN	INTEGRITY-NEWARK	1
	Sub Total	1
CAMDEN	D.O.V.E.S. RCH	3
	INTEGRITY-NEWARK	1
	NEWARK RENAISSANCE TREATMENT	7
	Sub Total	11
CAPE MAY	D.O.V.E.S. RCH	1
	Sub Total	1
HUDSON	D.O.V.E.S. RCH	1
	Sub Total	1
MIDDLESEX	NEWARK RENAISSANCE TREATMENT	1
	Sub Total	1
MONMOUTH	D.O.V.E.S. RCH	1
	Sub Total	1
PASSAIC	NEWARK RENAISSANCE TREATMENT	1
	Sub Total	1
SALEM	INTEGRITY-NEWARK	1
	Sub Total	1
UNION	D.O.V.E.S. RCH	2
	INTEGRITY-NEWARK	2
	NEWARK RENAISSANCE TREATMENT	1
	Sub Total	5
Grand Total		24

3/28/2017

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission

Re: #Table 6

Probationers Released in 2015 From Pinelands, by County

County	Total
ATLANTIC	1
BERGEN	1
CAMDEN	2
ESSEX	1
HUDSON	3
MERCER	1
SOMERSET	1
UNION	2
Grand Total	12

Salem = 0

3/28/2017

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission

Probationers Released in 2015 From Drug Treatment Programs

Re #Table 4

County	Program	Total
ATLANTIC	OCEAN RCH	1
	Sub Total	1
CAMDEN	D.O.V.E.S. RCH	3
	Sub Total	3
CUMBERLAND	D.O.V.E.S. RCH	1
	Sub Total	1
ESSEX	COSTELLO PREP RCH	1
	Sub Total	1
GLOUCESTER	COSTELLO PREP RCH	1
	VINELAND PREPARATORY ACADEMY	1
	Sub Total	2
MERCER	D.O.V.E.S. RCH	1
	Sub Total	1
MONMOUTH	OCEAN RCH	2
	Sub Total	2
UNION	D.O.V.E.S. RCH	3
	Sub Total	3
Grand Total		14

Salem = 0



State Of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission

Re: Table 7

Committed And Wavived Juveniles

Commitments For the Period Start Date : 1/1/2012 End Date :12/31/2012

	BLACK			ASIAN			HISPANIC			OTHER			WHITE			Total
	FEMALE	MALE	Total	MALE	Total	Total	FEMALE	MALE	Total	MALE	Total	FEMALE	MALE	Total		
ATLANTIC	0	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	22
BERGEN	2	4	6	1	1	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
BURLINGTON	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5
CAMDEN	5	56	61	0	0	1	18	19	0	0	0	1	12	13	93	
CAPE MAY	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4
CUMBERLAND	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	7
ESSEX	0	20	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	21
GLOUCESTER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	3
HUDSON	1	30	31	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
HUNTERDON	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
MERCER	2	19	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	23
MIDDLESEX	2	11	13	0	0	2	13	15	1	1	0	0	6	6	6	35
MONMOUTH	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	4	16
MORRIS	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
OCEAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	7	7	7	10
PASSAIC	0	12	12	0	0	1	7	8	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	23
SALEM	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	4
SOMERSET	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	2
SUSSEX	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1



State Of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission

Re: Table 7

Salem = 0

Committed And Wavived Juveniles

Commitments For the Period Start Date : 1/1/2015 End Date : 12/31/2015

	BLACK			ASIAN			HISPANIC			OTHER			WHITE			Total
	FEMALE	MALE	Total	MALE	Total	Total	FEMALE	MALE	Total	FEMALE	MALE	Total	FEMALE	MALE	Total	
ATLANTIC	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
BERGEN	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	11
BURLINGTON	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3
CAMDEN	1	29	30	0	0	0	1	10	11	0	0	0	1	4	5	46
CAPE MAY	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	5
CUMBERLAND	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
ESSEX	4	40	44	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	46
HUDSON	1	8	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	13
HUNTERDON	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
MERCER	2	13	15	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	19
MIDDLESEX	0	2	2	1	1	1	0	5	5	0	1	1	0	2	2	11
MONMOUTH	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	5
MORRIS	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
OCEAN	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	7
PASSAIC	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	9	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	13
SOMERSET	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
SUSSEX	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
UNION	0	13	13	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
WARREN	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

3/28/2017

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission

Re: Table #8

Committed Juveniles Released in 2015 Dep Type/Prog Type

County			Total
PASSAIC	MAXED TO PI	RESIDENTIAL	1
		SECURE	7
	PAROLED	RESIDENTIAL	5
	Sub Total		13
SALEM	MAXED TO PI	SECURE	2
	PAROLED	RESIDENTIAL	1
	Sub Total		3
SOMERSET	MAXED TO PI	SECURE	2
	PAROLED	RESIDENTIAL	1
	Sub Total		3
SUSSEX	MAXED TO PI	SECURE	1
	Sub Total		1
UNION	MAXED TO PI	RESIDENTIAL	3
		SECURE	9
	PAROLED	RESIDENTIAL	9
		SECURE	4
	Sub Total		25
WARREN	MAXED TO PI	SECURE	1
	Sub Total		1
Grand Total			236

RE Entry: Table #8
(Plan 2012)

Committed Juveniles Ranking of Most Severe Current Offense (MSCO) by Degree for 2012			
Rank	MSCO Degree	Number	Percent
1	VOP	3	75.0%
2	2 nd degree	1	25%
3			
4			
5			
6			

23. Looking at Table 15: Committed Juveniles with a Sex Offense Charge in their Court History (Cell B1), describe the number of juveniles with a sex offense charge in 2012.

There were none in 2012.

24. Looking at Table 10: Average Length of Stay (LOS) of Committed Juveniles Released (Cell B1), describe the length of stay of committed juveniles released in 2012.

The average length of stay was 15.31 months in 2012.

SUMMARY OF THE NATURE OF COMMITTED JUVENILES RELEASED IN 2012

25. Using the answers to Questions 20-24, summarize what this information tells you about the nature of juveniles released to Parole in 2012.

Sixty percent of juveniles (3) were released to parole.

CHANGE IN COMMITTED JUVENILES RELEASED BETWEEN 2009 and 2012

26. Looking at Table 9: Committed Juveniles Released by Departure Type (Column E), describe the overall change in the number of committed juveniles released between 2009 and 2012 and in the number of committed juveniles released by departure type between 2009 and 2012.

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission
Committed Juveniles Released in 2012
Average Length of Stay By County

Re: Table 9

County	Total	LOS in Months
ATLANTIC	24	16.38
BERGEN	17	9.69
BURLINGTON	7	14.38
CAMDEN	79	13.42
CAPE MAY	2	7.74
CUMBERLAND	10	11.60
ESSEX	20	12.41
GLOUCESTER	2	17.88
HUDSON	42	12.63
MERCER	25	6.96
MIDDLESEX	28	12.55
MONMOUTH	16	14.24
MORRIS	4	12.80
OCEAN	13	10.29
PASSAIC	37	13.56
SALEM	5	15.31
SOMERSET	4	6.64
SUSSEX	2	10.73
UNION	18	21.30
WARREN	3	4.91
Total	358	12.93

3/28/2017

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission
Committed Juveniles Released in 2015
Average Length of Stay By County

Re: Table 9

County	Total	LOS in Months
ATLANTIC	17	22.02
BERGEN	9	10.02
BURLINGTON	10	14.08
CAMDEN	54	12.82
CAPE MAY	3	14.03
CUMBERLAND	6	16.92
ESSEX	19	10.17
GLOUCESTER	3	12.28
HUDSON	21	18.85
HUNTERDON	2	14.75
MERCER	18	8.25
MIDDLESEX	12	17.97
MONMOUTH	2	9.85
MORRIS	1	7.59
OCEAN	13	11.90
PASSAIC	13	17.32
SALEM	3	19.58
SOMERSET	3	10.52
SUSSEX	1	13.61
UNION	25	23.76
WARREN	1	5.16
Total	236	15.13



State Of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission

DE-ENTRUSTED TABLE
10

Committed And Wavived Juveniles

Commitments For the Period Start Date : 1/1/2012 End Date : 12/31/2012

	BLACK			ASIAN			HISPANIC			OTHER			WHITE			Total
	FEMALE	MALE	Total	FEMALE	MALE	Total	FEMALE	MALE	Total	FEMALE	MALE	Total	FEMALE	MALE	Total	
ATLANTIC	0	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	22
BERGEN	2	4	6	1	1	2	2	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	10
BURLINGTON	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5
CAMDEN	5	56	61	0	0	0	1	18	19	0	0	0	1	12	13	93
CAPE MAY	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	4
CUMBERLAND	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	7
ESSEX	0	20	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	21
GLOUCESTER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	3
HUDSON	1	30	31	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
HUNTERDON	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
MERCER	2	19	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	23
MIDDLESEX	2	11	13	0	0	0	2	13	15	1	0	1	0	6	6	35
MONMOUTH	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	16
MORRIS	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
OCEAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	7	7	10
PASSAIC	0	12	12	0	0	0	1	7	8	0	0	0	0	3	3	23
SALEM	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4
SOMERSET	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2
SUSSEX	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

3/28/2017

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission
Committed Juveniles Released in 2015 by County/Race/Gender

Re: Table # 10

County	Race	Female	Male	Total
PASSAIC	AFRICAN AMERICAN	0	6	6
	HISPANIC	0	7	7
	Sub Totals	0	13	13
SALEM	AFRICAN AMERICAN	0	2	2
	HISPANIC	0	1	1
	Sub Totals	0	3	3
SOMERSET	AFRICAN AMERICAN	0	3	3
	Sub Totals	0	3	3
SUSSEX	WHITE	0	1	1
	Sub Totals	0	1	1
UNION	AFRICAN AMERICAN	2	18	20
	HISPANIC	0	5	5
	Sub Totals	2	23	25
WARREN	AFRICAN AMERICAN	0	1	1
	Sub Totals	0	1	1
		18	218	236

3/28/2017

Re: Table #11

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission
Committed Juveniles Released in 2015 County/Age

County	Age	Total
PASSAIC	16	1
	17	1
	18	6
	19	3
	20	2
	Sub Total	13
SALEM	18	2
	20	1
	Sub Total	3
SOMERSET	18	2
	19	1
	Sub Total	3
SUSSEX	16	1
	Sub Total	1
UNION	17	2
	18	7
	19	10
	20	3
	21	1
	22	2
	Sub Total	25
WARREN	17	1
	Sub Total	1
Grand Total		236

RE: Table 12

2012

COMMITMENTS: Most Serious Committing Offense by Type, by County

	VOP	Public Order	CDS	Property	Weapons	Persons	TOTAL
Atlantic	5 22.7%	0 0.0%	2 9.1%	2 9.1%	3 13.6%	10 45.5%	22 100.0%
Bergen	6 60.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 20.0%	1 10.0%	1 10.0%	10 100.0%
Burlington	4 80.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 20.0%	5 100.0%
Camden	43 46.7%	3 3.3%	9 9.8%	4 4.3%	4 4.3%	29 31.5%	92 100.0%
Cape May	2 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 50.0%	4 100.0%
Cumberland	2 28.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 71.4%	7 100.0%
Essex	3 15.0%	3 15.0%	0 0.0%	1 5.0%	0 0.0%	13 65.0%	20 100.0%
Gloucester	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 33.3%	0 0.0%	2 66.7%	3 100.0%
Hudson	3 8.3%	3 8.3%	3 8.3%	1 2.8%	7 19.4%	19 52.8%	36 100.0%
Hunterdon	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%
Mercer	6 26.1%	1 4.3%	2 8.7%	6 26.1%	6 26.1%	2 8.7%	23 100.0%
Middlesex	15 42.9%	1 2.9%	0 0.0%	4 11.4%	0 0.0%	15 42.9%	35 100.0%
Monmouth	1 6.2%	1 6.2%	1 6.2%	4 25.0%	0 0.0%	9 56.2%	16 100.0%
Morris	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	1 50.0%	2 100.0%
Ocean	3 30.0%	0 0.0%	2 20.0%	1 10.0%	0 0.0%	4 40.0%	10 100.0%
Passaic	1 4.3%	0 0.0%	1 4.3%	1 4.3%	3 13.0%	17 73.9%	23 100.0%
Salem	3 75.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 25.0%	4 100.0%
Somerset	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	0 0.0%	1 50.0%	2 100.0%
Sussex	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 100.0%	1 100.0%
Union	8 25.0%	1 3.1%	1 3.1%	4 12.5%	5 15.6%	13 40.6%	32 100.0%
Warren	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 100.0%	3 100.0%
Total	105 29.9%	13 3.7%	21 6.0%	32 9.1%	30 8.5%	150 42.7%	351 100.0%

Committed - Offense by Type and County - Year 2015

RG: Table 12

	Drug	Persons	Property	Public Order	VOP	Weapons	Total
ATLANTIC	0 0%	10 32%	12 38%	3 9%	4 12%	2 6%	31 100%
BERGEN	3 12%	6 24%	1 4%	6 24%	9 36%	0 0%	25 100%
BURLINGTON	0 0%	3 21%	4 28%	5 35%	2 14%	0 0%	14 100%
CAMDEN	25 21%	23 20%	14 12%	17 14%	31 26%	5 4%	115 100%
CAPE MAY	0 0%	4 40%	4 40%	0 0%	1 10%	1 10%	10 100%
CUMBERLAND	1 12%	1 12%	1 12%	2 25%	3 37%	0 0%	8 100%
ESSEX	1 1%	32 38%	11 13%	5 5%	31 36%	4 4%	84 100%
HUDSON	4 11%	12 35%	1 2%	3 8%	10 29%	4 11%	34 100%
HUNTERDON	0 0%	1 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 100%
MERCER	2 5%	11 28%	7 18%	7 18%	8 21%	3 7%	38 100%
MIDDLESEX	0 0%	5 31%	4 25%	0 0%	6 37%	1 6%	16 100%
MONMOUTH	2 7%	16 57%	7 25%	2 7%	1 3%	0 0%	28 100%
MORRIS	0 0%	0 0%	1 16%	3 50%	1 16%	1 16%	6 100%
OCEAN	4 16%	9 36%	4 16%	3 12%	5 20%	0 0%	25 100%
PASSAIC	1 3%	14 42%	1 3%	6 18%	7 21%	4 12%	33 100%
SOMERSET	0 0%	2 66%	0 0%	1 33%	0 0%	0 0%	3 100%
SUSSEX	0 0%	1 25%	1 25%	0 0%	2 50%	0 0%	4 100%
UNION	3 4%	22 32%	8 11%	6 8%	6 8%	22 32%	67 100%
WARREN	0 0%	1 50%	0 0%	0 0%	1 50%	0 0%	2 100%
Total	46 8%	173 31%	81 14%	69 12%	128 23%	47 8%	544 100%

Salem = 0

Committed - Offense by Type and County - Year 2016

REENTRY-TABLE 12 2016

	Drug	Persons	Property	Public Order	VOP	Weapons	Total	
ATLANTIC	1 2%	0 0%	9 19%	24 52%	4 8%	5 10%	3 6%	46 100%
BERGEN	0 0%	0 0%	9 64%	1 7%	1 7%	3 21%	0 0%	14 100%
BURLINGTON	0 0%	0 0%	1 9%	5 45%	2 18%	3 27%	0 0%	11 100%
CAMDEN	0 0%	6 8%	20 26%	14 18%	8 10%	22 29%	5 6%	75 100%
CAPE MAY	0 0%	0 0%	1 50%	0 0%	1 50%	0 0%	0 0%	2 100%
CUMBERLAND	0 0%	3 6%	10 23%	19 44%	2 4%	7 16%	2 4%	43 100%
ESSEX	11 14%	1 1%	30 38%	7 9%	2 2%	12 15%	14 18%	77 100%
GLOUCESTER	0 0%	1 11%	3 33%	0 0%	1 11%	3 33%	1 11%	9 100%
HUDSON	0 0%	0 0%	10 31%	2 6%	3 9%	10 31%	7 21%	32 100%
MERCER	0 0%	1 1%	12 23%	16 30%	3 5%	14 26%	6 11%	52 100%
MIDDLESEX	4 9%	2 4%	19 45%	6 14%	2 4%	8 19%	1 2%	42 100%
MORRIS	3 25%	0 0%	3 25%	0 0%	5 41%	1 8%	0 0%	12 100%
OCEAN	0 0%	0 0%	2 22%	2 22%	2 22%	2 22%	1 11%	9 100%
PASSAIC	0 0%	2 4%	17 37%	5 11%	2 4%	17 37%	2 4%	45 100%
SALEM	0 0%	1 14%	2 28%	3 42%	0 0%	1 14%	0 0%	7 100%
SOMERSET	0 0%	0 0%	2 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 100%
SUSSEX	0 0%	0 0%	2 66%	0 0%	1 33%	0 0%	0 0%	3 100%
UNION	0 0%	2 4%	18 38%	11 23%	5 10%	9 19%	2 4%	47 100%
WARREN	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 100%	0 0%	1 100%
Total	19 3%	19 3%	170 32%	115 21%	44 8%	118 22%	44 8%	529 100%

1/30/2014

2012 Commitments

RE: Table 13

of Youth with a Sex Offense History

	Total
ATLANTIC	1
BERGEN	1
BURLINGTON	1
CAMDEN	4
CUMBERLAND	1
GLOUCESTER	1
HUDSON	4
MIDDLESEX	3
MONMOUTH	1
MORRIS	1
OCEAN	3
PASSAIC	1
SOMERSET	2
SUSSEX	1
UNION	2
Total	27

Salem = 0

3/28/2017

2015 Commitments

Table 13

of Youth with a Sex Offense History

	Total
ATLANTIC	3
BERGEN	2
CAMDEN	4
CAPE MAY	1
ESSEX	3
HUDSON	3
MIDDLESEX	1
MONMOUTH	1
OCEAN	2
PASSAIC	1
SALEM	1
SOMERSET	1
UNION	2
Total	25

Re: Table #11
(Plan 2012)

- For Questions 13, use Table 4: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Age.

13. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Probationers Released by Age (Cells E1-E4), from largest to smallest between 2009 and 2012.

Ranking of Juvenile Probationers Released by Age Between 2009 and 2012			
Rank	Age	% Change	Number
1	15	-100%	0
2	16	-100%	1
3	17	-67%	1
4	18	-34%	2

- For Questions 14, use Table 5: Most Severe Current Offense (MSCO) of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers by Type.

14. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Most Severe Current Offense (MSCO) by Type (Cells E1-E6), from largest to smallest between 2009 and 2012.

Probationers Ranking of Most Severe Current Offense (MSCO) by Type Between 2009 and 2012			
Rank	MSCO Type	% Change	Number
1	Property	+100%	2
2	VOP	-100%	0
3	Persons	0	1
4			
5			
6			

- For Questions 15, use Table 6: Most Severe Current Offense (MSCO) of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers by Degree.

15. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Most Severe Current Offense (MSCO) by Degree (Cells E1-E6), from largest to smallest between 2009 and 2012.

Re: Analysis question
~~32~~ 32 + 34
 (2012)

36. Insert into the chart below the "Total" column of Table 6 (Problem Areas by Program), the top ten problem areas for youth as identified by the Juvenile Automated Management System (JAMS), from largest to smallest for calendar years 2009 and 2012.

Ranking of Problem Areas by Program					
2009			2012		
Rank	Problem Areas	Total	Rank	Problem Areas	Total
1	Personality / Behavior	186	1	Personality / Behavior	169
2	Education	125	2	Peer Relations	101
3	Peer Relations	96	3	Education	100
4	Family Circumstance	59	4	Substance Abuse	69
5	Substance Abuse	56	5	Other	47
6	Attitudes / Orientation	24	6	Family Circumstance	33
7	Vocational Skills	7	7	Vocational Skills	30
8	Medical	3	8	Attitudes / Orientation	19
9	Teen Pregnancy	1	9	Teen Pregnancy	1
			10		

37. How has the ranking of Problem Areas changed between 2009 and 2012? Describe in terms of those Problem Areas that have moved up in rank the most.

Personality /Behavior continues to be first in 2009 and 2012 with Peer Relations and Substance Abuse moving up the ranks from 2009 to 2012

38. Insert into the chart below the "Total" column of Table 8 (Service Intervention Needed, But Not Available), the top ten reentry program service areas that were identified as unavailable by the JAMS, from largest to smallest for calendar years 2009 and 2012.

Data was not available.

Ranking of Service Interventions Needed					
2009			2012		
Rank	Service Interventions Needed	Total	Rank	Service Interventions Needed	Total

Re-Analysis Question # 34 (2012 Blank) + 36

1			1		
2			2		
			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		
8			8		
9			9		
10			10		

39. How has the ranking of Service Interventions Needed changed between 2009 and 2012? Describe in terms of those Service Interventions Needed that have moved up in rank the most.

Not applicable.

40. Insert into the chart below the "Total" column of Table 7 (Service Interventions Provided), the top ten service interventions provided to youth, as identified by the JAMS for calendar years 2009 and 2012.

Ranking of Service Interventions Provided					
2009			2012		
Rank	Service Interventions Provided	Total	Rank	Service Interventions Provided	Total
1	Decision Making Skills	46	1	Other	45
2	Supervision	41	2	Decision Making Skills	41
3	Anger Mgt. Training	40	3	Interpersonal Skills Training	40
4	Life Skills Training	37	4	Counseling / Family	37
5	Substance Abuse Eval.	28	5	Anger Mgt. Training	33
6	Urine Monitoring	28	6	Counseling / Individual	32
7	Role Model / Mentor	27	7	After School Care	12
8	Counseling / Individual	26	8	Case Management	6

9	Interpersonal Skills Training	22	9	Advocacy	5
10	Transportation	16	10	Academic Education	3

41. How has the ranking of Service Interventions Provided changed between 2009 and 2012? Describe in terms of those Service Interventions Provided that have moved up in rank the most.

Decision Making Skills is the most used to address problems, but Other has risen to first in 2012. Supervision and Transportation disappeared from the top ten in 2012 as well as Urine Monitoring and Substance Abuse Evaluation. However, Advocacy, After School Care and Family Counseling were added in 2012.

RE-ENTRY DATA WORKSHEETS

PROBATIONERS

Table 1: Juvenile Probationers Admitted to JJC Residential by Race/Ethnicity, 2012 & 2015

Race/Ethnicity	2012		2015		% Change in Probationers Admitted, 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total Probationers Admitted to JJC	Number	% of Total Probationers Admitted to JJC	
White	2	22.2%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Black	7	77.8%	1	100.0%	-85.7%
Hispanic	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Other *	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	9	100.0%	1	100.0%	-88.9%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015

* No Reported Data in Methodology Section

Table 2: Juvenile Probationers Released by Program Type, 2012 and 2015

Program Type	2012		2015		% Change in Released by Program Type 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Day Program	4	57.1%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Residential	3	42.9%	1	100.0%	-66.7%
Total Releases	7	100.0%	1	100.0%	-85.7%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015

Table 3: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Race and Gender, 2012 and 2015

Race	2012			2015			% Change in Probationers Released by Race and Gender 2012-2015		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
White	2	0	2	0	0	0	-100.0%	0.0%	-100.0%
Black	4	0	4	1	0	1	-75.0%	0.0%	-75.0%
Hispanic	1	0	1	0	0	0	-100.0%	0.0%	-100.0%
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total Releases	7	0	7	1	0	1	-85.7%	0.0%	-85.7%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015

Table 4: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Age, 2012 and 2015

Age	2012		2015		% Change in Release by Age 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
14 and under	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
15 - 16	1	14.3%	1	100.0%	0.0%
17 - 18	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
19 and over	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	7	100%	1	100%	-85.7%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015

Table 5: Offenses of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers by Type, 2012 and 2015

Type	2012		2015		% Change in Offenses by Type 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Persons	1	14.3%	N/A	0.0%	*
Weapons	0	0.0%	N/A	0.0%	*
Property	1	14.3%	N/A	0.0%	*
CDS	0	0.0%	N/A	0.0%	*
Public Order	0	0.0%	N/A	0.0%	*
VOP	5	71.4%	N/A	0.0%	*
Total	7	100.0%	N/A	0.0%	*

Source: Juvenile Justice System, 2012 and 2015

Table 6: Juvenile Probationers Released from Specialized Programs, 2012 and 2015

Table 6: Juvenile Probationers Released from Specialized Programs, 2012 and 2015					
Program Type	2012		2015		% Change in Probationers Released from Specialized Programs 2012-2015
	Number		Number		
Pinebluffs	0		0		0%
Drug Treatment *	1		0		-100%

* See Appendix I for the details.

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015

* See Appendix A: Juvenile Justice

COMMITTED JUVENILES

Table 7: Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC by Race/Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015

Race/Ethnicity	2012		2015		% Change in Committed Juveniles Released, 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC	Number	% of Total Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC	
White	1	25.0%	N/A	0.0%	*
Black	1	25.0%	N/A	0.0%	*
Hispanic	2	50.0%	N/A	0.0%	*
Other	0	0.0%	N/A	0.0%	*
Total	4	100.0%	N/A	0.0%	*

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015

Table 8: Committed Juveniles Released by Departure Type, 2012 and 2015

	2012		2015		% Change in Release by Departure Type 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Released to Parole Supervision*	3	100.0%	1	100.0%	-66.7%
Recalled to Probation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total Releases	3	100.0%	1	100.0%	-66.7%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015

* See Appendix Table 6: Methodology

Table 9: Average Length of Stay (LOS) of Committed Juveniles Released, 2012 and 2015

	2012	2015	% Change in Average Length of Stay 2012-2015
	Number	Number	
Average LOS in Months	15.31	19.58	27.9%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015

Table 10: Committed Juveniles Released by Race and Gender, 2012 and 2015

Race	2012				2015				% Change in Committed Juveniles Released by Race and Gender 2012-2015			
	Male	Female	Total		Male	Female	Total		Male	Female	Total	
White	0	1	1		0	0	0		0.0%	-100.0%	-100.0%	
Black	1	0	1		2	0	2		100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Hispanic	2	0	2		1	0	1		-50.0%	0.0%	-50.0%	
Other	0	0	0		0	0	0		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Total Releases	3	1	4		3	0	3		0.0%	-100.0%	-25.0%	

Source: Asheville Juvenile Courtroom, 2012 and 2015

Table 11: Committed Juveniles Released by Age, 2012 and 2015

Age	2012		2015		% Change in Release by Age 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
14 and under	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
15 - 16	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
17 - 18	3	75.0%	2	66.7%	-33.3%
19 and over	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	100.0%
Total Releases	4	100.0%	3	100.0%	-25.0%

Source: Asheville Juvenile Courtroom, 2012 and 2015

Table 12: Offenses of Committed Juveniles by Type, 2012 and 2015 (2016)

Type	2012		2015 (2016)		% Change in MSCO by Type 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Persons	1	25.0%	2	28.6%	100.0%
Weapons	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Property	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	100.0%
CDS	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	100.0%
Public Order	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
VOP	3	75.0%	1	14.3%	-66.7%
Total	4	100.0%	7	100.0%	75.0%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2013

Table 13: Committed Juveniles with a Sex Offense Charge in their Court History, 2012 and 2015

	2012	2015	% Change in Sex Offense History 2012-2015
Sex Offense*	0	1	100.0%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2013

* Sex Offense Data & Methodology

COUNTY VISION OF THE JUVENILE JUSTICE CONTINUUM

Introduction

This final section is intended to bring each individual continuum point within the County Youth Services Commission (CYSC) plan together for the purpose of developing a Vision of local programs and services. By its nature, the Vision requires counties to visualize what their optimal juvenile justice continuum would look like, without the restrictions of funding parameters. Thus, the county Vision should reflect, regardless of funding availability, the programs and/or types of services that the CYSC envisions as part of a reasonable juvenile justice continuum.

To develop this Vision, the CYSC will draw upon the Recommendations section from the earlier pieces of the plan corresponding to each point on the continuum (prevention, diversion, detention, disposition, and reentry). In the Recommendation sections CYSCs used data regarding the extent and nature of the juvenile population served at each point on the continuum to identify programmatic needs. CYSCs then compared the characteristics of juveniles served to the characteristics of the programs providing services to identify where gaps in services currently exist at each point on the continuum. Finally, CYSCs used this information to make specific Recommendations regarding their Comprehensive Plan, identifying how the Recommendation addressed identified needs and gaps in services.

After reviewing the Recommendations section for each point on the continuum, CYSCs should develop their Vision using the Vision chart (attached). Again, CYSCs should draw on their Recommendations to develop a Vision that represents what your County's ideal Continuum of Care would look like, regardless of funding limitations.

Process

CYSCs should use the Vision Chart to list, at each point on the continuum, the programs and/or types of services needed, given the characteristics of youth served at that point, and as identified in each Recommendation section. To complete the Vision Chart, CYSCs are to:

1. Complete, for each point on the continuum, the data analysis and answer the analysis questions.
2. Look at the answers to the Implication questions at each individual point on the continuum and discuss the data, using a group process. In the development of the recommendations and vision, counties are expected to work through either a sub-committee and/or groups of juvenile justice key actors. Through these group discussions, counties should develop, for each point on the continuum, recommendations to be considered in the development of the county vision.

VISION

Salem County

The types of programs listed, should represent what your County's ideal Continuum of Care would look like, regardless of funding limitations.

PREVENTION

Delinquency Prevention Programs are strategies and services designed to increase the likelihood that youth will remain free from initial involvement with the formal or informal juvenile justice system. The goal of delinquency prevention is to prevent youth from engaging in anti-social and delinquent behavior and from taking part in other problem behaviors that are pathways to delinquency. Primary Delinquency Prevention programs are those directed at the entire juvenile population without regard to risk of involvement in the juvenile justice system. Secondary Delinquency Prevention programs are those directed at youth who are at higher risk of involvement in the juvenile justice system than the general population. Given this goal, Delinquency Prevention programs developed through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing services that address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

PREVENTION				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	<u>VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAM</u> (COMMUNITY POLICING PROGRAMS / INTERVENTION AND PREVENTION PROGRAM)	NO	NO	YES
2	<u>MENTORING / LIFE SKILLS PROGRAMS</u> (POLICE ATHLETIC LEAGUES / BOYS AND GIRLS CLUBS / MUNICIPAL ALLIANCE PROGRAMS, YAP, BIG BROTHERS BIG SISTERS)	YES	YES	YES
3	<u>EMPLOYMENT / CAREER READINESS PROGRAMS</u> (WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT IN-SCHOOL YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS / BOYS AND GIRLS CLUBS)	YES	YES	YES
4	<u>ACADEMIC SUCCESS PROGRAMS</u> (ONE-STOP, PATHSTONE, BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB)	YES	NO	YES
5	<u>RECREATION PROGRAMS</u> (POLICE ATHLETIC LEAGUES / BOYS AND GIRLS CLUBS / MUNICIPAL ALLIANCE PROGRAMS)	YES	NO	YES

DIVERSION

The Diversion stage of the juvenile justice system offers alleged juvenile offenders an opportunity to avoid arrest and/or prosecution by providing alternatives to the formal juvenile justice system process. The goal of Diversion is to provide services and/or informal sanctions to youth who have begun to engage in antisocial and low level delinquent behavior in an effort to prevent youth from continuing on a delinquent pathway. Youth who do not successfully complete a diversion program may ultimately have their case referred for formal processing by the juvenile court. Given this goal, Diversion programs developed through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing services and/or informal sanctions that address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

LAW ENFORCEMENT				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	<u>STATION HOUSE ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM REFERRAL OPTIONS</u> – (POSITIVE ROLE MODEL / SOCIALIZATION SKILLS / EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES)	YES	NO	YES
2	<u>COMMUNITY SERVICE OPTIONS</u> (VOLUNTEER AND PROBATION BASED)	YES	NO	YES
3	<u>STATION HOUSE ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM REFERRAL OPTIONS</u> – DRUG & ALCOHOL SERVICES (DRUG & ALCOHOL EVALUATIONS / TREATMENT [INDIVIDUAL / GROUP] / EDUCATION [JUVENILE / FAMILY] / SCHOOL BASED SUPPORT GROUPS)	YES	NO	YES
4	<u>CURBSIDE ADJUSTMENTS-</u> (ATTORNEY GENERAL MANDATED GUIDELINES)	NO	NO	YES
5	<u>Continuing Education Programs-</u> Juvenile and Police Based. (INTERNET BASED WEBINAR).	NO	NO	YES

FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION UNIT (FCIU)				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	<u>MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELING</u> (ANGER MANAGEMENT / FAMILY COUNSELING / EDUCATION ADVOCACY / TRAUMA COUNSELING)	YES	NO	YES
2	<u>INDIVIDUAL MENTORING</u> (POSITIVE ROLE MODEL / SOCIALIZATION SKILLS / EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES)	YES	NO	YES
3	<u>DRUG & ALCOHOL SERVICES</u> (DRUG & ALCOHOL EVALUATIONS / TREATMENT [INDIVIDUAL / GROUP] / EDUCATION [JUVENILE / FAMILY] / SCHOOL BASED SUPPORT GROUPS)	YES	NO	YES
4	<u>FAMILY ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES</u> (FAMILY LIFE SKILLS CLASSES / FAMILY FOCUSED RECREATION ACTIVITIES)	YES	NO	YES
5	<u>FAMILY COUNSELING</u> (LONG TERM THERAPY OPTIONS)	YES	NO	YES

FAMILY COURT				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	<u>MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELING</u> (ANGER MANAGEMENT / FAMILY COUNSELING / EDUCATION ADVOCACY / TRAUMA COUNSELING)	YES	NO	YES
2	<u>INDIVIDUAL MENTORING</u> (POSITIVE ROLE MODEL / SOCIALIZATION SKILLS / EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES)	YES	NO	YES
3	<u>DRUG & ALCOHOL SERVICES</u> (DRUG & ALCOHOL EVALUATIONS / TREATMENT [INDIVIDUAL / GROUP] / EDUCATION [JUVENILE / FAMILY] / SCHOOL BASED SUPPORT GROUPS)	YES	NO	YES
4	<u>COMMUNITY SERVICE OPTIONS</u> (COURT ORDERED AND VOLUNTEER)	YES	NO	YES
5	<u>FAMILY COUNSELING</u> (LONG TERM THERAPY OPTIONS)	YES	NO	YES

DETENTION

"Detention" is defined as the temporary care of juveniles in physically restricting facilities pending court disposition (N.J.A.C. 13:92-1.2).

An objective of detention is to provide secure custody for those juveniles who are deemed a threat to the physical safety of the community and/or whose confinement is necessary to insure their presence at the next court hearing (N.J.A.C. 13:92-1.3). For the purpose of this plan a limited amount of funding may be provided to support court ordered evaluations for adjudicated youth who reside in the detention center, if all other resources have been exhausted.

DETENTION				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	COGNITIVE SKILLS PROGRAMS (COGNITIVE PROCESS TRAINING / PERSONALITY ASSESMENT / CONFLICT RESOLUTION TRAINING / COMMUNICATION SKILLS TRAINING / TEAM BUILDING EXERCISES)	NO	NO	YES
2	LIFE SKILLS PROGRAMS (ADL TRAINING, BANKING, BUDGETING, TIME MANAGEMENT)	NO	NO	YES
3	MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELING (ANGER MANAGEMENT / FAMILY COUNSELING / EDUCATION ADVOCACY / TRAUMA COUNSELING)	NO	NO	YES
4	TRANSPORTATION FOR FAMILY VISITS (VAN / TAXI / BUS PASS)	NO	YES	YES
5	PRE-RELEASE REENTRY TRANSITION SERVICES (CASE MANAGEMENT / WORK READINESS / EDUCATION REENTRY)	NO	NO	YES

DETENTION ALTERNATIVES

Detention Alternative Programs provide supervision to juveniles who would otherwise be placed in a secure detention facility while awaiting their adjudicatory hearing, expanding the array of pre-adjudication placement options available to the judiciary. Detention Alternative Programs/Services are not to be provided in the detention center. These programs are designed to provide short-term (45 – 60 days) supervision sufficient to safely maintain appropriate youth in the community while awaiting the final disposition of their case. As such, these programs help to reduce the overall detention population and relieve detention overcrowding and its related problems where it exists.

DETENTION ALTERNATIVES				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	<u>IN-HOME DETENTION ALTERNATIVE</u> (SUPERVISION / COUNSELING / EMPLOYMENT & EDUCATION ASSISTANCE)	YES	YES	NO
2	<u>ELECTRONIC MONITORING PROGRAM</u> (SUPERVISION / COUNSELING / EMPLOYMENT & EDUCATION ASSISTANCE)	YES	YES	NO
3	<u>SHELTER BEDS</u> (SUPERVISION / COUNSELING / EMPLOYMENT & EDUCATION ASSISTANCE)	YES	NO	YES
4				
5				

DISPOSITION

Disposition is the phase of the juvenile justice system where youth adjudicated delinquent are ordered by the court to comply with specific sanctions, supervision, and services as a consequence for their delinquent behavior. In New Jersey, the range of dispositions available to the court include but are not limited to restitution/fines, community service, probation, and commitment to the Juvenile Justice Commission. For youth disposed to a term of probation supervision, among the conditions of probation that might be imposed by the court is the completion of a Dispositional Option Program. The structure of these Dispositional Option Programs are varied, but common among these options are intensive supervision programs, day and evening reporting centers, and structured day and residential programs. Given this goal, Disposition programs developed through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing sanctions, supervision, and services that address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

DISPOSITION				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	MENTAL HEALTH COUNSELING (ANGER MANAGEMENT / FAMILY COUNSELING / EDUCATION ADVOCACY)	YES	YES	YES
2	INDIVIDUAL MENTORING (POSITIVE ROLE MODEL / SOCIALIZATION SKILLS / EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES / SUPERVISION)	YES	YES	YES
3	SEX OFFENDER SERVICES (SEX OFFENDER EVALUATIONS / TREATMENT / COMMUNITY SUPPORTS)	YES	YES	NO
4	DRUG & ALCOHOL SERVICES (DRUG & ALCOHOL EVALUATIONS / TREATMENT [INDIVIDUAL / GROUP] / EDUCATION [JUVENILE / FAMILY] / SCHOOL BASED SUPPORT GROUPS)	YES	YES	YES
5	COGNITIVE SKILLS PROGRAM (COGNITIVE PROCESS TRAINING / PERSONALITY ASSESMENT / CONFLICT RESOLUTION TRAINING / COMMUNICATION SKILLS TRAINING / TEAM BUILDING EXERCISES)	YES	YES	YES

REENTRY

For the purposes of this plan, the use of the term Reentry only applies to committed youth paroled from a Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC) facility and supervised by the JJC's Office of Juvenile Parole and Transitional Services and to juveniles disposed to a JJC program as a condition of probation and supervised by the Department of Probation. Reentry is a mechanism for providing additional support during this transitional period in order to foster the successful reintegration of juveniles into their communities. Given this goal, Reentry programs developed through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing services to youth, regardless of their age, that address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

REENTRY				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	CASE MANAGEMENT SERVICES (SOCIAL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS / EMPLOYMENT SERVICES / EDUCATION ADVOCACY)	YES	NO	NO
2	HOUSING ASSISTANCE (PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAM)	NO	NO	YES
3	EX-OFFENDER EMPLOYMENT SERVICES (WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT / DVR)	YES	YES	NO
4	TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE (BUS PASSES FOR SOCIAL SERVICE / EMPLOYMENT SERVICE / COURT RELATED APPOINTMENTS)	NO	NO	YES
5				

Appendix D: District Totals by County, 2014-15

Analysis Question
24 Prev

COUNTY	DISTRICT	ENROLLMENT	VIOLENCE	VANDALISM	WEAPONS	SUBSTANCES	HIB	TOTAL
	PINELANDS REGIONAL	1,581	21	8	0	9	3	41
	PLUMSTED TWP	1,493	8	2	1	5	22	38
	POINT PLEASANT BEACH BORO	818	1	0	1	2	6	10
	POINT PLEASANT BORO	2,787	1	2	2	1	6	12
	SEASIDE HEIGHTS BORO	220	1	1	0	0	4	6
	SOUTHERN REGIONAL	2,938	20	0	0	17	21	58
	STAFFORD TWP	2,234	4	2	0	0	6	11
	TOMS RIVER REGIONAL	15,759	63	24	19	77	83	262
	TUCKERTON BORO	331	2	0	0	0	0	2
County Total		71,262	352	80	48	203	317	981
PASSAIC								
	BLOOMINGDALE BORO	596	0	0	0	0	2	2
	CLIFTON CITY	10,840	127	3	23	51	83	281
	HALEDON BORO	1,034	12	0	0	0	3	13
	HAWTHORNE BORO	2,279	16	3	0	7	9	34
	LAKELAND REGIONAL	954	7	0	1	7	5	20
	LITTLE FALLS TWP	880	1	0	0	0	0	1
	NORTH HALEDON BORO	706	8	0	3	0	3	12
	PASSAIC CITY	13,187	50	11	8	49	126	239
	PASSAIC CO ED SERV COMM	72	1	0	0	1	0	2
	PASSAIC CO MANCHESTER REG	896	18	0	0	7	2	26
	PASSAIC COUNTY VOCATIONAL	3,356	17	21	2	11	12	61
	PASSAIC VALLEY REGIONAL	1,348	7	7	1	2	4	21
	PATERSON CITY	25,038	70	21	7	103	297	494
	POMPTON LAKES BORO	1,702	3	1	2	1	12	19
	PROSPECT PARK BORO	866	0	0	0	0	9	9
	RINGWOOD BORO	1,220	11	3	0	0	9	23
	TOTOWA BORO	1,076	0	0	0	0	3	3
	WANAQUE BORO	954	12	1	0	0	3	16
	WAYNE TWP	7,974	23	0	4	5	35	64
	WEST MILFORD TWP	3,600	14	1	0	19	0	34
	WOODLAND PARK	1,096	34	2	1	0	9	44
County Total		79,672	431	74	52	263	626	1,418
SALEM								
	ALLOWAY TWP	374	0	1	0	0	2	3
	ELSBORO TWP	124	0	0	0	0	2	2
	LOWER ALLOWAYS CREEK	178	1	0	0	0	4	5
	MANNINGTON TWP	182	2	0	0	0	3	5
	OLDMANS TWP	265	0	0	0	0	0	0
	PENNS GRV-CARNEY'S PT REG	2,271	0	0	1	3	6	10
	PENNSVILLE	1,720	8	3	2	3	8	23
	PITTSBURGH TWP	1,682	17	2	4	3	30	54
	QUINTON TWP	359	4	0	1	0	2	7
	SALEM CITY	1,176	18	2	1	0	1	22
	SALEM CO SPECIAL SERVICE	210	5	2	0	0	0	7
	SALEM COUNTY VOCATIONAL	826	14	0	1	1	0	15
	UPPER PITTSBURGH TWP	360	0	0	0	0	0	0
	WOODSTOWN-PILESBURGH REG	1,520	41	8	0	8	13	64

Appendix D: District Totals by County, 2014-15

COUNTY	DISTRICT	ENROLLMENT	VIOLENCE	VANDALISM	WEAPONS	SUBSTANCES	HIB	TOTAL
	County Total	11,245	110	18	10	18	71	217
SOMERSET								
	BEDMINSTER TWP	544	0	0	0	0	3	3
	BERNARDS TWP	5,703	7	5	1	13	17	42
	BOUND BROOK BORO	1,805	12	1	4	2	41	59
	BRANCHBURG TWP	1,564	1	0	0	0	1	2
	BRIDGEWATER-RARITAN REG	8,529	32	17	6	14	32	95
	FRANKLIN TWP	7,513	27	17	6	19	27	92
	GREEN BROOK TWP	897	3	0	1	0	2	5
	HILLSBOROUGH TWP	7,229	13	2	1	7	13	36
	MANVILLE BORO	1,413	10	2	0	4	11	25
	MONTGOMERY TWP	4,751	1	1	2	4	40	47
	NORTH PLAINFIELD BORO	3,290	27	4	4	10	12	54
	SOMERSET CO ED SERV COMM	163	23	2	1	1	10	36
	SOMERSET CO VOCATIONAL	444	2	1	0	0	0	3
	SOMERSET HILLS REGIONAL	2,037	8	4	0	2	18	31
	SOMERVILLE BORO	2,397	18	2	2	13	6	39
	SOUTH BOUND BROOK	465	7	0	0	1	15	23
	WARREN TWP	1,839	3	0	0	0	9	12
	WATCHUNG BORO	690	0	0	0	0	4	4
	WATCHUNG HILLS REGIONAL	2,198	2	0	1	20	1	23
	County Total	53,468	196	58	29	110	262	631
SUSSEX								
	ANDOVER REG	559	0	0	0	0	0	0
	BYRAM TWP	896	1	1	0	0	14	16
	FRANKFORD TWP	547	1	0	1	0	3	5
	FRANKLIN BORO	458	0	0	0	0	1	1
	FREDON TWP	250	0	0	0	0	0	0
	GREEN TWP	470	0	0	0	0	5	5
	HAMBURG BORO	270	0	0	0	0	0	0
	HAMPTON TWP	317	0	0	0	0	0	0
	HARDYSTON TWP	743	0	0	0	0	2	2
	HIGH POINT REGIONAL	999	17	2	2	18	4	42
	HOPATCONG	1,669	1	0	0	0	7	8
	KITTATINNY REGIONAL	1,074	0	1	0	3	3	7
	LAFAYETTE TWP	253	1	0	0	0	2	3
	LENAPE VALLEY REGIONAL	821	15	0	0	3	0	18
	MONTAGUE TWP	218	0	0	0	0	2	2
	NEWTON TOWN	1,556	23	2	4	2	7	36
	OGDENSBURG BORO	264	1	1	1	0	4	7
	SANDYSTON-WALPACK TWP	145	0	0	0	0	3	3
	SPARTA TWP	3,291	2	2	2	10	13	26
	STANHOPE BORO	318	0	0	0	0	1	1
	STILLWATER TWP	348	1	3	1	0	0	5
	SUSSEX CO ED SERV COMM	38	0	0	0	0	0	0
	SUSSEX COUNTY VOCATIONAL	766	2	0	2	0	5	9
	SUSSEX-WANTAGE REGIONAL	1,147	6	2	1	0	31	40
	VERNON TWP	3,323	14	3	2	2	12	32

New Jersey Kids Count 2016 County Profiles

County Rankings

Atlantic
2015 Rank: 20

Bergen
2015 Rank: 5

Burlington
2015 Rank: 9

Camden
2015 Rank: 17

New Jersey Kids Count County Rankings 2016

County	2015	2016	
Atlantic	20	20	A
Bergen	5	4	A
Burlington	9	9	A
Camden	17	17	A
Cape May	14	13	A
Cumberland	21	21	A
Essex	18	18	A
Gloucester	10	9	A
Hudson	16	13	A
Hunterdon	2	2	A
Mercer	13	14	A
Middlesex	4	5	A
Monmouth	7	7	A
Morris	11	11	A
Ocean	12	12	A
Passaic	15	15	A
Salem	19	19	A
Somerset	3	1	A
Sussex	8	8	A
Union	12	11	A
Warren	6	11	A

New Jersey Kids Count 2016 County Profiles

Ocean 2015 Rank: ...	Passaic 2015 Rank: 18..	Salem 2015 Rank: 19..	Somerset 2015 Rank: 3..	Union 2015 Rank: 6..
-------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------

Salem County Kids Count Profile 2016

Indicator	Year	County	NJ	2015 Rank	2016 Rank
Child Population	2014	14 357	2,012,081	21	21
Total Population	2014	64 715	8,938,175	21	21
Percentage of Children in Poverty	2014	23	16	21	16
Median Income of Families with Children	2014	\$75 821	\$89 020	17	13
Percentage Unemployed	2015	5.6	4.3	16	18
Percentage of HH Spending More Than 30% of Income on Rent	2014	62	50	3	21
Percentage of Eligible Children Receiving Free/Reduced Price School Breakfast	2015-16	43	44	11	10
Percentage of Women Receiving Early Prenatal Care	2012	77	78	19	15
Percentage of Births to Girls 10-19	2012	7	5	20	12
Infant Mortality (rate per 1,000 live births)	2012	7	4	15	8
Child Abuse/Neglect Investigations*	2014	37	45	20	20
Children in Out-of-Home Placement*	2015	5	3	13	13
Juvenile Arrests*	2013	25	12	13	20
% of Family Income Spent on Licensed Child Care for a Family with One Infant and One Preschooler	2014	23	24	15	10
% of Students Chronically Absent	2013-14	12	12	Null	12

*Please note that the 2015-16 school breakfast percentage data are preliminary and based upon the most recent data available. School meal eligibility data as of 2014-15 school year and receiving data as of October 2015.

*Child Abuse, Neglect, Out-of-Home Placement, and Juvenile Arrests: Rate per 1,000 children under 13.



2017 Salem County Profile

Quick Facts

Total Population	2015	64,181
Child Population	2015	14,952
Median Income of Families with Children	2015	\$22,535

Child and Family Economics

Domain Rank: 13

Indicator	Year	Data	Indicator Rank
Percent of Children Living Below the Poverty Threshold	2015	21	14
Percent of Households Spending More than 30% of Income on Rent	2015	24	5
Unemployment Rate (Percent)	2015	11	18

Education

Domain Rank: 17

Indicator	Year	Data	Indicator Rank
High School Graduation Rate (Percent)	2015-16	83	16
Percent of Eligible Children Receiving Free, Reduced-Price School Breakfast	2015-16	78	9
Percent of Students Chronically Absent	2014-15	16	16

Child Health

Domain Rank: 9

Indicator	Year	Data	Indicator Rank
Percent of Babies Born with Low Birthweights	2015	8	19
Percent of Children Under Age 5 Tested for Lead	2015	98	12
Percent of Children Under Age 13 with Health Insurance	2015	91	1

Safety and Well-Being

Domain Rank: 19

Indicator	Year	Data	Indicator Rank
Child in Household with at Least One Person with a Mental Health Condition	2015	13	13
Child in Household with at Least One Person with a Substance Use Disorder	2015	14	14
Percent of Children with at Least One Health Condition	2015	20	20



Adopted for Children of New Jersey is the national independent organization that works to ensure that all children in the United States have the opportunity to thrive. We work to ensure that all children have the opportunity to thrive.

Adopted for Children of New Jersey is the national independent organization that works to ensure that all children have the opportunity to thrive.

newadoption.org

Carozza, Frank

From: Ernest, Melanie
Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2017 3:35 PM
To: Carozza, Frank
Subject: MAP info

The County Alliance Coordinator oversees and provides support & technical assistance to thirteen (13) Municipal Alliances, representing all fifteen (15) municipalities in Salem County, with the oversight of the County Alliance Steering Subcommittee (CASS), which meets quarterly. Every alliance plans and implements substance abuse prevention programs for their community using DEDR funds and matched funds as well as monies raised through local fundraising efforts.

Just some of the programs MAPSA helps support include DARE, GREAT, Red Ribbon Week, Project Graduation, Senior Citizen Education, peer leadership & mentoring programs, as well as other alcohol & drug-free alternatives, i.e. dances, movie nights and family/community-wide events, like as National Night Out .

Maggie Vaughan, County Coordinator
Victoria Yuhasz, Administrative Assistant
Tele: 856-935-7510 ext. 8449 **Fax:** 856-935-8483
maggie.vaughan@salemcountynj.gov
june.sieber@salemcountynj.gov

Melanie Ernest
Executive Director
Salem County Inter Agency Council of Human Services, Inc.
98 Market Street
Salem, NJ 08079
Phone - 856-935-7510 Ext. 8314
Melanie.Ernest@SalemCountyNJ.gov

NEW JERSEY
JUVENILE DETENTION ALTERNATIVES INITIATIVE
INNOVATIONS FUNDING

JANUARY 2018 – DECEMBER 2018



*NEW JERSEY
JUVENILE JUSTICE COMMISSION*

Christopher S. Porrino, Attorney General
Chair, JJC Executive Board

Kevin M. Brown, Executive Director

CY 2018
New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative
Innovations Funding

GENERAL INFORMATION

INTRODUCTION & PURPOSE

The purpose of JDAI Innovations Funding is to provide an additional resource and support to those JDAI sites that have demonstrated an active commitment to the implementation of JDAI Core Strategies. The Innovations Funding process includes two phases.

1. Completing and submitting the **Eligibility Criteria Checklist**, required attachments, and letter of intent to prepare an Innovations Application.
2. Preparing and submitting an **Innovations Application**, which includes:
 - a) Innovations Cover Page
 - b) Up to three Innovations Proposal(s)
 - c) Budget Summary & Narrative
 - d) County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement meeting minutes indicating approval of the Innovations Application.

Note that the Innovations Proposal is based on the overall format of the JDAI Core Strategy Framework. Sites actively using this JDAI tool to guide the development of local workplans, the identification of strategies for local systems-change, and the measurement of results, will find that the information recorded in the Framework translates directly into the preparation of an Innovations Application.

This General Information document describes the allocation of funds, application process, timeframes/due dates, application review process, use of funds, and reporting requirements. The Eligibility Criteria Checklist, Innovations Cover Page, Innovations Proposal, and Budget are included in this application packet as separate documents.

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

The amount allocated for CY-2018 Innovations funding is \$2,160,000. Innovations funds are available to New Jersey JDAI sites active throughout 2016 that meet the required criteria presented in the Eligibility Criteria Checklist. A site that meets the Core Eligibility Criteria for Base Funding, as determined by the Innovations Subcommittee of the New Jersey Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement, shall receive \$60,000. Sites that meet the Exceptional Eligibility Criteria for Supplemental funding, as determined by the Innovations Subcommittee, will receive an additional \$60,000 (total of \$120,000). **Sites should not request in Phase One (Eligibility) funds in excess of what they intend to apply for during Phase Two (Application).** Any balance that remains after determining the eligibility and corresponding level of funding awarded to each site may be divided among all eligible sites. Similar to the funding levels above, sites meeting the Exceptional Criteria will receive balance funds that are twice the amount of balance funds awarded to sites meeting the Core Criteria.

These funds are administered through the Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC) budget and are in coordination with the guidelines of the State/Community Partnership Program.

should be sharply focused and present a strong likelihood for achieving well-defined and measurable outcomes.

- ✓ Innovations that seek to improve the success of youth on detention alternatives. This includes innovations that help to minimize the occurrence of rule violations and/or those that seek to intervene with youth experiencing difficulty complying with basic rules of supervision in order to minimize reliance on detention in such instances.
- ✓ Other innovations designed to increase success among youth on detention alternatives.
- ✓ Innovations that incorporate, encourage, and support the voice of families, including holding educational family clinics regarding the juvenile justice process, producing and sharing educational materials/videos/pamphlets, and providing assistance to families during the court process (transportation, advice, volunteer support, etc.) (see for example p. 61 of Pathways 14).
- ✓ Innovations that incorporate, encourage, and support the voice of youth.
- ✓ Innovations that incorporate the voice of communities and promote direct community-involvement.
- ✓ Community Resource Developments to promote the success of and assist youth and families currently involved in the court process (see Pathways 14).
- ✓ Innovations that seek to improve the success of youth on probation. This includes innovations that help to minimize the occurrence of technical violations, and/or those that seek to intervene with youth experiencing difficulty complying with basic rules of supervision in order to minimize reliance on detention in such instances.
- ✓ Specialized probation caseloads with interventions that seek to increase the likelihood of success for youth in "high-violation groups," or for other specialized groups, such as girls or youth not in school, to meet the objectives described above.
- ✓ Other probation innovations designed to increase success among youth on probation.
- ✓ Case processing innovations, including those related to expediting cases and reducing the frequency of adjournments/continuances.
- ✓ Innovations that reduce over-reliance on clinical evaluations/multiple evaluations.
- ✓ Developing incentives for staff who volunteer to take on new, additional responsibilities as a result of JDAI systems-improvement efforts, or who demonstrate exceptional initiative or commitment in implementing a new practice designed to enhance the success of youth or the success of an innovative policy/practice.
- ✓ School-based innovations, if local data suggest referrals to detention are resulting from offenses occurring at school, on school property, and/or at school-sponsored events (see for example, Pathways 14, p.71 regarding Clayton County).
- ✓ Innovations that clearly and specifically address disproportionate minority contact and racial/ethnic disparities in the detention system.
- ✓ In sites where females are highly represented in the detention system, gender-responsive innovations that reduce reliance on secure detention for girls.

Other Considerations

- Sites are encouraged to build on "what is," enhancing something in existence and/or making a piece of the system "work smarter and better."
- Sites are encouraged to consider multi-faceted approaches to improving an identified need/problem area. In other words, if the Core Strategy Framework identifies multiple contributors to a given problem that merit multiple solutions, the innovation might be a multi-pronged one.

5. On an annual basis, the County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement must report on the process and outcome measures identified in each approved Innovations Proposal. County Councils will be sent a standardized form at the end of the project year to use when reporting on these measures.

MONITORING

1. Innovations projects shall be monitored annually and in accordance with the guidelines of the State Community Partnership Program using approved JJC's Comprehensive Monitoring tool.
2. The Research & Reform Specialist shall be notified in advance of and invited to attend the monitoring of all Innovation projects.
3. In addition to the Youth Services Commission Administrator, who may already be a member of the County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement, two members of the County Council shall participate in the monitoring of all Innovations projects, and shall report back to the County Council regarding the outcome of all monitoring activities.

CY 2018
STATE OF NEW JERSEY
JUVENILE JUSTICE COMMISSION
JUVENILE DETENTION ALTERNATIVE INITIATIVE (JDAI) - Innovation Funds

County: _____

Chief Executive Officer: _____

Title: ☐ Freeholder Director ☐ County Executive _____

Mailing Address: _____

Telephone: () _____ Fax: () _____

Chief Financial Officer: _____

Title: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Telephone: () _____ Fax: () _____

Email Address: _____

County Youth Services Commission Administrator: _____

Title: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Telephone: () _____ Fax: () _____

Email Address: _____

**JDAI County Council on Juvenile Justice System
Improvement/Co-chair:** _____

Title: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Telephone: () _____ Email Address: _____

**JDAI County Council on Juvenile Justice System
Improvement /Co-chair:** _____

Title: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Telephone: () _____ Email Address: _____

CY 2018
ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA CHECKLIST
COUNTY: _____

The JDAI County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement should review and complete this Eligibility Criteria Checklist to determine whether the site is eligible to apply for Innovations Funding. Sites that meet the criteria are to submit the completed Eligibility Criteria Checklist, required attachments, and a letter of intent to prepare an Innovations Application to the Juvenile Justice Commission. Upon receiving confirmation of eligibility, sites shall prepare and submit the Innovations Application to the JJC.

Criteria Timeframe

Eligibility criteria refer to activity in JDAI sites as of March 31, 2017 and criteria that refer to the "past year" refer to activity during the period of April 1, 2016 through March 31, 2017.

Core Eligibility Criteria for Base Funding

Sites must meet **all five** of the following Core Eligibility Criteria and be able to provide the required documentation to receive Base Innovations Funding. Check which of the following criteria are met.

Collaboration

1. ☐ An active JDAI site in 2016 (attach current County Council membership list to checklist).
2. ☐ The JDAI site has held a combined total of twelve, well-attended Council / Subcommittee meetings in the past year. At least four of these meetings must have been full Council meetings, and at least four of these meetings must have been Subcommittee meetings (the balance may be of either type). These meetings must be evidenced by meeting minutes, attendance sign-in sheets or lists, and meeting agendas (attach to checklist).

Reliance On Data

3. ☐ The JDAI site has demonstrated a commitment to the Core Strategy of relying on data to drive system-improvement, in that the site a) produces the data minimally required to conduct such systems-analysis (i.e., monthly ADP, admissions, LOS, and nature of admitting offense, disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender), as evidenced by inclusion in the NJ JDAI quarterly data reports; and that the site b) has put in place mechanisms that rely on local participation for producing the data, as evidenced by a written policy/procedure or other brief, written description of the process by which the data are maintained and collected. (Attach only b. to checklist. Do not attach the quarterly report, as the JJC will provide one copy of that report to Innovations Subcommittee members during the review process).

Detention Alternative Data

4. ☐ The JDAI site regularly produces **detention alternative outcome data** in a format that allows for consistent measurement of JDAI outcomes statewide, as evidenced by inclusion in the NJ JDAI quarterly data reports. (Do not attach the quarterly report, as the JJC will provide one copy of that report to Innovations Subcommittee members during the review process).
5. ☐ The County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement regularly produces and reviews ADP, admissions, and LOS **data for the full continuum of detention alternatives**, disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender, as evidenced by inclusion in the NJ JDAI quarterly

3. ☐ The County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement has demonstrated commitment to the institutionalization of systems-change, as evidenced by the **reallocation of local funds** to JDAI efforts, and as supported by documentation in prior Influence and Leverage Report. (Attach only the one or two pages from the Influence and Leverage Reports that indicate the site's reallocated resources).
4. ☐ The County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement has successfully addressed the core strategy related to reducing length of stay (LOS) in detention, as evidenced by:
- ☐ A total average or median LOS in 2016 that was less than the average or median LOS (by at least one day) in either 2015 or 2014 or in the site's Pre-JDAI year.
- OR-
- ☐ An average or median LOS for youth released to detention alternatives or to dispositional placement in 2016 that was less than that (by at least one day) in either 2015 or 2014 or in the site's earliest available year of data included in the JDAI Quarterly data report (see table labeled "Average LOS by Departure Type").
- OR-
- ☐ Sites unable to provide the required evidence regarding changes in LOS can submit a plan endorsed by the County's CJJSI that describes what actions will be taken to reduce LOS this year.

The five mandatory criteria have been met and four additional criteria have been met, and the required documentation can be provided (check one).

- ☐ **YES** County can demonstrate with required evidence that it meets both Base and Exceptional Criteria and intends to submit an Innovations Application for \$120,000.
- ☐ **NO** County can demonstrate with required evidence that it meets the Base Criteria and intends to submit an Innovations Application for \$60,000.

NOTE:
ONLY SUBMIT DOCUMENTATION FOR THE EXCEPTIONAL CRITERIA IF THE COUNTY INTENDS TO APPLY FOR THE FULL \$120,000

CY 2018
New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative
Innovations Funding

INNOVATION PROPOSAL

COUNTY: _____

Project Type: (check one)	☐ New ☐ Renewal (attached most recent monitoring report)* ☐ Renewal with Modifications (attached most recent monitoring report)*
Original or Revision: (check one)	☐ Original Proposal ☐ Revised Proposal**
	Revision Date: _____

* If "Renewal" or "Renewal with Modifications" is checked, please use a formatting change such as shading, highlighting, or underlining to draw attention to all information that represents a change from last year's proposal. Information intended for deletion should in fact be deleted (i.e., do not use strikethroughs or other formatting to indicate intended deletions).

** Similarly, if the proposal originally submitted is revised as a result of the review process or as a result of a future amendment/modification request made by the county, please use a formatting change such as shading, highlighting, or underlining to draw attention to all information that represents a change from the original proposal or most recent revision. Information intended for deletion should in fact be deleted (i.e., do not use strikethroughs or other formatting to indicate intended deletions).

General Instructions

Sites should follow this application strictly and avoid providing extra information that is not directly requested. Sites must use this proposal format, typing directly into this document. Any site seeking to use these funds for more than one innovative purpose must complete a separate Innovation Proposal for each of these proposed innovations. However, a maximum of three innovations proposals per site are allowed.

Innovation Proposal Summary Information

Innovation Proposal #	_____ of _____
Project Title for this Innovation Proposal	_____
Requested Amount for this Innovation Proposal	\$ _____

- ✓ Proposed Solution
- ✓ Objective #1
- ✓ Objective #2
- ✓ Objective #3
- ✓ Objective #4
- ✓ Specific Elements/Components

Tracking Implementation of the Solution/Process Measures

Describe the various measures that will be used to track the implementation of the solution and how this information will be collected/maintained. (These are the "process" or "output" measures, and should reflect the steps taken to actually implement the project and its components. As general examples, process measures include things like: number of youth served, number/type of service hours provided, number/type of incentives awarded, mentors/employers recruited, beds/units acquired, reports produced, etc.)

- ✓ Process/Output/Implementation Measures
- ✓ Methods for Maintaining/Collecting Data Regarding Process/Output/Implementation Measures

Impact of Proposed Solution & Outcome Measures

Briefly state the anticipated impact of the proposed solution in terms of the contributing factors described earlier and their effect on the detention system (action words include reduce, increase, etc.). Describe the various measures that will be used to evaluate these anticipated outcomes. Then, briefly describe the potential unintended consequences of the solution, and the measures/methods that will be used to monitor the occurrence of these unintended outcomes. Finally, describe how the data needed to report all of these outcome measures will be maintained/collected.

- ✓ Expected Impact

CY 2018
New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative
Innovations Funding

County

BUDGET SUMMARY & NARRATIVE

Original or ☐ Original Budget
Revision: ☐ Revised Budget*
(check one)

Revision Date:

***If the budget originally submitted is revised as a result of the review process or as a result of a future amendment/modification request made by the county, please use a formatting change such as shading, highlighting, or underlining to draw attention to all information that represents a change from the original budget or most recent revision. Information intended for deletion should in fact be deleted (i.e., do not use strikethroughs or other formatting to indicate intended deletions).*

Budget Summary

TOTAL INNOVATIONS FUNDING REQUESTED		\$
5% COUNTY ADMINISTRATION		\$
BALANCE FOR INNOVATIONS PROJECTS		\$
Innovation Proposal #	Innovation Project Title	Funds Requested
1		\$
2		\$
3		\$
INNOVATIONS PROJECT SUBTOTAL		\$

* Up to 5% of the total award to the county may be used for administration costs. Any funds allocated for administrative costs shall be used to directly support the Youth Services Commission in administering the Innovations grant program.

* Up to 5% of the total of any sub-award from the county to a contracted provider can be used for/allocated to the provider's administrative costs.

Carozza, Frank

Fa

Def: Data N/A
Question #8

From: Gina Blevins [gina.blevins@jjc.nj.gov]
Sent: Thursday, August 24, 2017 1:33 PM
To: Carozza, Frank
Subject: RE: Can you answer this for Salem County 2015?

Hi Frank,

Sorry I meant to reply yesterday. No sir I don't have this information on hand. I thought the Kid's Count data book could help but it only ranks the counties in NJ but not the townships within the county.

From: Carozza, Frank [mailto:Frank.Carozza@salemcountynj.gov]
Sent: Thursday, August 24, 2017 9:51 AM
To: Gina Blevins <gina.blevins@jjc.nj.gov>
Subject: RE: Can you answer this for Salem County 2015?

Hi Gina:

Any update on this?

Thanks,

From: Gina Blevins [mailto:gina.blevins@jjc.nj.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, August 23, 2017 8:02 AM
To: Carozza, Frank
Subject: Re: Can you answer this for Salem County 2015?

Hi Frank. I think I may be able to but will be out of the office until after 12. I will check and get back to you this afternoon.

From: Carozza, Frank <Frank.Carozza@salemcountynj.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, August 22, 2017 3:40:23 PM
To: Gina Blevins
Subject: Can you answer this for Salem County 2015?

Hi Gina:

Is there any way you can answer this for Salem County 2015?

➤ **For Questions 8-11, use data from the JJC "Data for Detention Section of Comprehensive Plan" report (JDAI sites), or from data collected locally (non-JDAI sites).**

1. Insert into the chart below the top three municipalities of residence for youth admitted to detention in 2015, beginning with the municipality with the highest frequency.

Ranking of Municipality where Juveniles Resides, 2015

Rank	Municipality	Frequency	Percent
1			
2			
3			

Thanks,

- *Frank Carozza*

Frank Carozza
Youth Services Coordinator
Salem County Inter Agency Council of Human Services, Inc.
98 Market Street
Salem, NJ 08079
Phone - 856-935-7510 Ext. 8451
Fax: (856)935-7747
FCarozza@SalemCountyNJ.gov