

COMPREHENSIVE COUNTY YOUTH SERVICES PLAN

JANUARY 2018 – DECEMBER 2020

GUIDELINES



*NEW JERSEY
JUVENILE JUSTICE COMMISSION*

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

Kevin M. Brown, Executive Director

2018-2020 Comprehensive County Youth Services Planning Guidelines

General Instructions

- **All forms within the guidelines are required.** The enclosed forms cannot be re-typed or re-formatted in any way.
- Counties may use additional data to support their plans. If a County chooses to use additional data, this data must be appended to Section 11.
- The Comprehensive County Youth Services (CCYS) Plan is to be submitted to the Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC) no later than September 1, 2017.
- Counties are to submit one original (in the binder provided) and six copies of the CCYS Plan.
- The one original (in the binder provided) and all six copies of the CCYS Plan must follow the same order as the planning guideline Table of Contents (Section by Section).

Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC) Funding Sources
Local Level Funding Administered by the JJC

1. State/Community Partnership Program

The State/Community Partnership Grant Program (Partnership Program) was established within the Juvenile Justice Commission to support, with grants allocated by a formula to Counties through County Youth Services Commissions, sanctions and services for juveniles adjudicated or charged as delinquent and programs for the prevention of juvenile delinquency (N.J.S.A. 52:17B-179).

The goals of the Partnership Program are to: (1) encourage the development of sanctions and services for juveniles adjudicated and charged as delinquent and programs for the prevention of juvenile delinquency that protect the public, ensure accountability and foster rehabilitation; (2) increase the range of sanctions for juveniles adjudicated delinquent; (3) reduce overcrowding in state juvenile institutions and other facilities to ensure adequate bed space for serious, violent and repetitive offenders; (4) reduce overcrowding in County detention facilities; (5) provide greater access to community-based sanctions and services for minority and female offenders; (6) expand programs designed to prevent juvenile delinquency; and (7) promote public safety by reducing recidivism.

Partnership funds are awarded to the Counties by the JJC upon approval of County Comprehensive Youth Services Plans. County Youth Services Commissions administer the Partnership Program on behalf of County governments.

2. Family Court Services Program

Effective December 31, 1983 legislation was passed to establish in each county one or more juvenile-family crisis intervention units. Each unit could operate as a part of the court intake service, or where provided for by the county, through any other appropriate office or private service pursuant to an agreement with the Administrative Office of the Courts, provided that all such units were subject to the Rules of Court.

In 1986, legislation was passed which provided funds to the Department of Human Services for allocation to the Counties to support programs and services for juveniles involved with or at risk of involvement with the Family Court. The appropriation was directed to two program areas: Juvenile Family Crisis Intervention Units (JFCIU's) and the development of community-based services and programs to serve Family Court clients. When the Juvenile Justice Commission was established in 1995, the funds which supported the Family Court Services Program were moved to the JJC 's budget and are administered in coordination with the guidelines of the State/Community Partnership Program.

On January 1, 2006 Family Crisis Intervention Units that were staffed by the Judiciary were transferred to non Judiciary entities. Allocations for those counties were determined and an agreement was signed between the Judiciary, the JJC and the Department of Human Services. The JJC accepted the agreed upon funding allocation for each in-court Family Crisis Intervention Unit and included this amount in that county's Family Court Services allocation. These funds are administered in coordination with the guidelines of the State Community Partnership Program established pursuant to N.J.S.A. 52:17B-179. Entities selected by each county's planning process to serve as the Family Crisis Intervention Unit must execute an agreement with the Administrative Office of the Courts pursuant to N.J.S.A. 2A:4A-76. The entity must agree to provide services consistent with the Family Crisis Intervention Unit manual approved by the New Jersey Judiciary Judicial Council. Program services must be provided in coordination with the Mobile Response and Stabilization Services in each county as contracted by the NJ Department of Human Services, Division of Child Behavioral Health Services, Office of Children's Services.

3. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)

Formula Grant Program

The Federal JJDP Act of 2002, is comprised of five major Titles (I through V). Title IIB specifically focuses on the requirements for implementation of the Formula Grants Program.

Formula grants are awarded to states on the basis of relative population under the age of 18 for the purpose of meeting the Act's mandates and to improve the State's juvenile justice

system. It is required that two-thirds of Formula Grant funds be passed through to the locals, with one-third available for State level initiatives.

The Act requires that states, through their State Advisory Group (SAG) submit a comprehensive plan for juvenile justice every three years and updates to that plan annually. The Plan includes an summary of the state's juvenile justice system, an analysis of juvenile crime statistics and an assessment of the needs of its juveniles. Based on the plan, funding is then prioritized and allocated among thirty-four Standard Program Areas. Formula Grants Program Areas are located at <https://www.nttac.org/index.cfm?event=fgaps>.

4. Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) Innovations

JDAI strives to create more effective and efficient processes surrounding the use of juvenile detention. To help jurisdictions accomplish this goal, JDAI provides a framework for conducting a thorough, data-driven examination of the detention system, and for using that information to develop and implement strategies for system improvement.

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 the eight JDAI Core Strategies. Funds are used in furtherance of data driven policies and practices that are clearly consistent with the eight JDAI Core Strategies.

1. Collaboration

Key juvenile justice stakeholders coordinate detention reform activities and conduct joint planning and policymaking under a formal governance structure. They work together to identify detention bottlenecks and problems; to develop common understandings and solutions; to generate support for proposed reforms and routinely monitor reform progress.

2. Data Driven Decisions

JDAI depends upon objective data analysis to guide detention reform planning and policy development. Data on detention population, utilization and operations is collected to provide a portrait of who is being detained and why, as well as suggesting what points in the process may need attention. As a results-based initiative, JDAI establishes and tracks performance measures. All data is disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender to monitor disparities in the system.

3. Objectives Admissions Criteria and Instruments

Detention admissions policies and practices must distinguish between the youth who are likely to flee or commit new crimes and those who are not. JDAI sites develop Risk Assessment Instruments to screen for individual risk using reliable, standardized techniques. Absent an objective approach, high-risk offenders may be released and low-risk offenders detained.

4. Non-Secure Alternatives to Detention

New or enhanced non-secure alternatives to detention programs increase the options available for arrested youth yet ensure that juveniles are held accountable for their behavior and the community is protected. Pre-trial detention alternative programs target only the youth who would otherwise be detained.

5. Case Processing Reforms

Modifications of juvenile court procedures accelerate the movement of delinquency cases, streamline case processing and reduce unnecessary delay. Case processing reforms are introduced to expedite the flow of cases through the system. These changes reduce length of stay in custody, expand the availability of non-secure program slots and ensure that interventions with youth are timely and appropriate.

6. Special Detention Cases

Special strategies are necessary for handling difficult populations of youth who are detained unnecessarily. The data analysis directs the site to the cases or cluster of cases in need of special attention. They may include children detained on warrants, children detained for probation violations, or children detained pending dispositional placement. Addressing these cases can have immediate and significant impact on reducing detention populations.

7. Reducing Racial Disparities

Reducing racial disparities requires specific strategies aimed at eliminating bias and ensuring a level playing field for youth of color. Ongoing objective data analysis is critical. Racial disparities are the most stubborn aspect of detention reform. Real lasting change in this arena requires determined leadership and targeted policies and programming.

8. Conditions of Confinement

Reducing overcrowding in detention can immediately improve conditions. To monitor conditions of confinement in secure detention centers and to identify problems that need correction, JDAI sites establish "self-inspection" teams of local volunteers. These self-inspection teams are trained in a rigorous methodology and ambitious standards that carefully examine all aspects of facility policies, practices and programs. The teams then prepare comprehensive reports on their findings and monitor implementation of corrective action plans.

PLANNING BODIES

Provide a current list of members and their designees with corresponding Positions/Representatives who are minimally required by the rules and regulations of each planning body except for the Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement. Based upon a person's responsibility within the County, they may be listed more than once.

Instructions

1. Insert the race/ethnicity and name of the person who corresponds with the Position/Representative identified on the form.
2. Enter the race/ethnicity, name and position/representative of any additional members of your committee. Also place an X under the planning body that they represent.
3. If a required person has a designee, include their designee's name in parenthesis. For example, John Smith (Jane Carter).
4. If a required position/representative is vacant, submit a current copy of the letter requesting their participation.

Planning Bodies

CYSC – County Youth Services Commission

CJJSI – County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement

No	Race/ Ethnicity*	Name & Designee	Position/Representative	CYSC	CJJSI
1			Youth Services Commission Administrator	X	
2			Presiding Judge – Family Part of the Superior Court	X	
3			Family Division Manager (or Assistant Family Division Manager)	X	
4			Chief Probation Officer	X	
5			Highest elected official of County government (e.g., Freeholder/ County Executive)	X	
6			County Prosecutor	X	
7			County Public Defender	X	
8			County DCP&P District Manager	X	
9			County Mental Health Administrator	X	
10			County Superintendent of Schools	X	
11			Superintendent of the County Vocational School	X	
12			County Human Services Department Director	X	
13			Youth Shelter Director	X	
14			Youth Detention Center Director	X	
15			Juvenile Family Crisis Intervention Unit - Director	X	
16			President – Juvenile Officers Association or other law enforcement representative who works primarily with youth/Police	X	
17			County Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Director	X	
18			Workforce Investment Board Representative	X	

* Race/Ethnicity: White, Black, Hispanic or Other (Other represents Native American, Alaskan Native and Asian or Pacific Islander).

Planning Bodies

CYSC – County Youth Services Commission

CJJSI – County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement

No	Race/ Ethnicity*	Name & Designee	Position/Representative	CYSC	CJJSI
19			Business Representative	X	
20			Court Liaison - Juvenile Justice Commission	X	
23			Juvenile Judge – Family Part of the Superior Court		X
24			Trial Court Administrator – Family Part of the Superior Court		X
25			Family Division Manager – Family Part of the Superior Court		X
26			JJC JDAI Detention Specialist		X
27			County Public Defender’s Office		X
28			County Prosecutor’s Office		X
29			Probation Division		X
30			Private/ Non-profit organization		X
31			Parents of youth in the juvenile justice system or youth member		
32			Juvenile Justice		
33			Parent/Family/Youth Association		
34					
35					
36					

* Race/Ethnicity: White, Black, Hispanic or Other (Other represents Native American, Alaskan Native and Asian or Pacific Islander).

Planning Bodies

CYSC – County Youth Services Commission

CJJSI – County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement

No	Race/ Ethnicity*	Name & Designee	Position/Representative	CYSC	CJJSI
37					
38					
39					
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					
47					
48					
49					
50					
Total Number of Members					

* Race/Ethnicity: White, Black, Hispanic or Other (Other represents Native American, Alaskan Native and Asian or Pacific Islander).

County Management Structure

This section refers to and should reflect all the names and titles of staff that are responsible for implementing activities associated with the corresponding JJC grants.

Instructions

1. Insert the name and title of all staff responsible for implementing activities. If applicable, identify with an asterisk if staff is funded in whole or part through a JJC grant.
2. For corresponding JJC grants, check all applicable grants in which each staff is responsible for implementing activities (in any capacity).
3. Describe grant activities associated with each staff.
4. Attach an Organizational Chart showing your department and /or agency up to the highest elected official of County Government.

County Management Structure

Name	Title	JJC Grants				Duties
		SCP	FC	JDAI		

SCP – State Community Partnership

FC – Family Court

* Staff is funded in whole or part through a JJC grant.

Legend

JDAI – Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative

PLANNING PROCESS

County

Instructions

This section will allow you to describe to the public your county's planning process regarding identifying the needs of youth in your county. Your answers to each of the following questions should describe your county's planning *process*, **not the results/outcome** of the planning process. Answer all questions using this form.

1. List the County Youth Services Commission meetings held in 2017:
2. Describe the planning process for this Comprehensive Plan for all points of the continuum, indicating the planning activities that identified needs or service gaps. Also, indicate any policy or practice changes you have made at each point in the continuum based on your 2018-2020 Plan recommendations.

Prevention:

Diversion:

Detention:

Disposition:

Reentry:

Comments:

3. Use the table below to describe any additional data or information other than that provided by the JJC (i.e. JJC Residential and Commitments Data, Detention Statistics Report, etc.) used in your county's planning process. Attach any additional information you used (i.e., surveys, data, articles, questionnaires, etc.).

Point of Continuum	Description	Source	Timeframe/ Year(s)	How was the data used?
<i>Diversion</i>	<i>Ex: Municipal Arrest</i>	<i>State Police, Uniform Crime Report</i>	<i>Jan – Dec 2015</i>	<i>To focus on municipalities that had high arrest for youth.</i>
<i>Disposition</i>	<i>Survey</i>	<i>YSC funded programs</i>	<i>February 2016</i>	<i>To understand from youth perspective what services they need to be successful.</i>

Comments:

4. If you are a JDAI site, list topics and discussion points that were shared between the Youth Services Commission and the County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement and any activities that helped to facilitate the completion of this Comprehensive Plan.

5. Describe efforts made by the YSC to seek additional funding to supplement the funding received through the Partnership/Family Court Program.

Additional Comments:

EXISTING CONTINUUM OF PROGRAM & SERVICES

Existing Continuum of Program & Services should include those funded through the Juvenile Justice Commission (State/Community Partnership & Family Court, JJDP and JDAI) and all other programs/services (**regardless of JJC funding source**) that are considered to be a part of the county's continuum.

Instructions

1. List the programs and/or services, not the Agency, your county considers a part of its Continuum regardless of its funding source.
2. Indicate the annual level of service in parenthesis.
3. Indicate the funding source in parenthesis.

CY 2017 Existing Services Continuum of Care (Points of Intervention) County of

Delinquency Prevention Programs <i>Name/LOS/Funding Source</i> 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____	Law Enforcement Diversion Programs <i>Name/LOS/Funding Source</i> 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____	Family Crisis Intervention Unit <i>Name/LOS/Funding Source</i> 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____	Detention Alternative Programs (Pre-Adjudicated Youth) <i>Name/LOS/Funding Source</i> 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____
Least Restrictive Most Restrictive			
Family Court Diversion Programs <i>Name/LOS/Funding Source</i> 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____	Re-Entry Programs <i>Name/LOS/Funding Source</i> 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____		
Least Restrictive Most Restrictive			
Community Based Disposition Options (Post-Adjudicated Youth) <i>Name/LOS/Funding Source</i> 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____	Detention Alternative Programs (Post-Adjudicated Youth) <i>Name/LOS/Funding Source</i> 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____		
Least Restrictive Most Restrictive			

Comments:

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

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

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION DEFINITION & RATIONALE

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. For the purposes of this Plan, Primary Delinquency Prevention programs are those directed at the entire juvenile population in a targeted area like a specific school, neighborhood or town/community where delinquency risk factors are prevalent. Secondary Delinquency Prevention programs are those directed at specific youth who are at higher risk of involvement in the juvenile justice system than the general population based on exhibited behaviors associated with delinquency. Given this goal, Delinquency Prevention programs that are developed annually through the comprehensive planning process must serve a clearly identified target population of at-risk youth and services must address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

Delinquency Prevention data describe trends in juvenile delinquency and in factors that reflect the causes and correlates of delinquent activity. By understanding the nature and extent of delinquent behavior and the factors associated with involvement in delinquency, Counties can better identify the content and scope of prevention programs needed. This information will help Counties make informed decisions regarding the allocation of resources to delinquency prevention, including those disseminated by the Juvenile Justice Commission (e.g., Title II, State/Community Partnership, and Family Court Services).

The Delinquency Prevention data required for this Comprehensive Plan is meant to become the foundation for prevention program planning. However, it should be noted that the typical prevention planning process requires an in-depth analysis of community, family, peer, and education factors that identify problem areas in a specific school, neighborhood or town/community in the County.

This Comprehensive Plan requires only a small portion of the data that could potentially be collected at the County or municipal level. Counties are encouraged to examine all other data not provided by the JJC in its planning process.

The Causes and Correlates of Delinquency

While planning for their local juvenile justice continuum, counties must consider the programs and services within their local continuum with regard to how they address the causes and correlates of delinquency. The causes and correlates of delinquency include characteristics, circumstances, and behaviors that research and experience have shown to be associated with continued involvement in delinquent activity. A description of factors commonly known to have the strongest association with delinquent behavior follows.

Family/Household. Parenting skills- including the ability to supervise and monitor behavior, and to control and respond to negative behavior through the use of consistent rules and discipline – are typically lacking or ineffective in families of delinquent youth. Additionally, youth from homes characterized by a lack of support, communication and cohesiveness are more likely to engage in ongoing antisocial behavior; so are adolescents from families where interpersonal relationships are abusive or otherwise dysfunctional, or where parents are experiencing their own legal, substance use or mental health problems. Finally, housing and family instability are also associated with continued behavioral problems.

Education/Vocation. Poor academic performance, a lack of interest in and commitment to school, and negative behavior in the educational setting are each associated with ongoing involvement in delinquent activity. For adolescents beginning the transition into adulthood, employment and vocational problems- including a lack of experience, training and interest are similarly influential. Additionally, learning disabilities and other intellectual challenges can impair intervention efforts in other areas.

Substance Abuse. Substance use disorders are highly prevalent among juvenile delinquents. In some cases, substance abuse might lead to or facilitate delinquency; in others, substance abuse might stem from the same causal factors as delinquency. Either way, there is an undeniable association between substance abuse and delinquent activity.

Peers/Role Models. Without a doubt, young people are influenced by their peers. As youth enter the adolescent years, the peer group typically replaces the parent as the most relevant source of information and behavioral reinforcement. Whether a juvenile is introduced to delinquent activity via delinquent peers, or whether an already delinquent juvenile seeks out like-minded companions, there is a clear association between negative peer relationships and antisocial behavior.

Attitudes/Behaviors. Delinquent youth often present with attitudes and perceptions that support or justify their negative behavior. These attitudes allow a youth to rationalize delinquency by assigning blame to external sources or by minimizing the harm caused to others. Often these youth do not see a need for change or, believe change is not possible, or feel changes is pointless because 'what will be, will be.' Additionally, many

juveniles with assaultive histories lack anger management and conflict resolution skills, responding to frustration or aggravation with angry outbursts, or relying on aggression to settle disagreements.

Use of Time/Leisure Activity. Youth who participate in constructive recreational activities or who have pro-social hobbies or interests are less likely to engage in delinquency and other antisocial behavior than youth who do not. The association between a lack of involvement in pro-social activities and delinquency is two-pronged. First, involvement in pro-social activities increases the youth's interaction with and exposure to positive peers and adults and promotes feelings of confidence and self-efficacy. Second, the more unstructured and unsupervised time a youth has, the more time the youth has to engage in negative behaviors.

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION 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).

DEMOGRAPHICS

Required Data	Total County population and County youth population (ages 10-17) by gender for calendar years 2012, 2014 and 2015. Total County youth population (ages 10 –17) by race and ethnicity for calendar years 2012 and 2015.
Source	Puzzanchera, C., Sladky, A. and Kang, W. (2016). "Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2015." Online. Available: http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop/
Methods	<u>Table 1. Total County Population by Gender</u> ➤ <i>Number (Columns A, C, E).</i> Insert the number of males and females for each year. Insert the number of people that comprised the County's total population for each year. ➤ <i>Percent of Total Population (Columns B, D, F).</i> Calculate the percent of the County's total population that was male and the percent that was female for each of the three years. To obtain the percent, divide the number of people of each gender by the total population and multiply by 100. Formula 1 is an example of how to calculate the percent of the County's population that was male in 2015. <u>Formula 1.</u> $\frac{\text{Number of Males in 2015 (A1)}}{\text{Total Population in 2015(A3)}} = \text{___} \times 100 = \% \text{ Male in 2015 (B1)}$ ➤ <i>Percent Change (Column G).</i> Calculate the percent change in the male youth population, the female youth population, and the County's total youth population between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2. <u>Formula 2.</u> $\frac{\text{Most Recent Year \# (2015) – Prior Year \# (2012)}}{\text{Prior Year \# (2012)}} = \text{___} \times 100 = \% \text{ Change 2012-2015}$ <u>Table 2. County Youth Population (ages 10-17) by Gender</u> ➤ <i>Number (Columns A, C, E).</i> For years 2012, 2014 and 2015 insert the number of male youth and the number of female youth ages 10-17.

Methods (cont.)	➤ <i>Percent of Total Population (Columns B, D, F).</i> Calculate the percent of the County's youth population that was male and the percent that was female. To obtain the percent, divide the number of youth of each gender by the total youth population (ages 10-17) and multiply by 100 using Formula 1. ➤ <i>Percent Change (Column G).</i> Calculate the percent change in the male youth population, the female youth population, and the County's total youth population between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.
Data Checks	➤ In Tables 1 and 2, the figures in Row 1 and Row 2 should add up to the figure in Row 3 for each of the three years (but not for percent change). For example, A1 (number of males) + A2 (number of females) = A3 (total population), and B1 (% male) + B2 (% female) = 100% (total population).

Methods	<u>Table 3. Total County Youth Population (ages 10-17) by Race</u> ➤ <i>Number (Columns A and C).</i> Insert the number of youth by race for each year. *Note: For "Other", add Asian and American Indian then insert the total number of these youth for each year. Hispanic youth is not captured within each race category because Hispanic is identified as an ethnic origin not a Race. As a result, Hispanic is not a race category and will be analyzed independently unless otherwise indicated. ➤ <i>Percent of Total County Youth Population (Columns B and D).</i> Calculate the percent of the County's total youth population for each year using Formula 1. ➤ <i>Percent Change (Column E).</i> Calculate the County's percent change in the youth population by Race, and the County's percent change in the total youth population between 2012 and 2015 for each race using Formula 2.
----------------	--

Methods	<u>Table 4. Total County Youth Population (ages 10-17) by Ethnicity</u> ➤ <i>Number (Columns A and C).</i> Insert the number of youth by ethnicity for each year. ➤ <i>Percent of Total Population (Columns B and D).</i> Calculate the percent of the County's total youth population for each year using Formula 1. ➤ <i>Percent Change (Column E).</i> Calculate the percent change in the youth population by Ethnicity and the County's total youth population between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.
Data Checks	➤ In Table 4, the figures in Rows 1 and 2 should add up to the figure in Row 3 for each of the year (but not for percent change). For example, A1 (Hispanic) + A2 (Non Hispanic) = A3 (total youth population), and B1 (Hispanic) + B2 (Non Hispanic) = 100% (total youth population).

NATURE & EXTENT OF DELINQUENCY

JUVENILE ARRESTS

Required Data	Juvenile arrests by offense category for calendar years 2012, 2014 and 2015.																
Source	Uniform Crime Report 2012, 2014 and 2015, located at www.njsp.org/info/stats.html (JJC will provide these data to the Counties).																
Methods	<u>Table 5. County Juvenile Arrests by Offense Category</u> ➤ <i>Number (Columns A, D, G).</i> Add the number of arrests in the UCR categories listed below to obtain the number of juvenile arrests in each offense category. Add and insert the results for each year. Insert your County's total number of juvenile arrests for 2012 (A8), 2014 (D8), and 2015 (G8). <table> <tr> <td><u>Offense Category</u></td><td><u>Add these UCR Categories</u></td></tr> <tr> <td>Violent</td><td>Murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, manslaughter, simple assault.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Weapons</td><td>Weapons only.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Property</td><td>Burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, forgery & counterfeiting, fraud, embezzlement, stolen property, criminal/malicious mischief.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Drug/Alcohol</td><td>Drug abuse violations, driving under the influence, liquor laws.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Special Needs</td><td>Arson, prostitution and commercialized vice, sex offenses (except forcible rape & prostitution), offenses against family and children.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Public Order & Status Offenses</td><td>Gambling, disorderly conduct, vagrancy, curfew & loitering law violations, and runaways.</td></tr> <tr> <td>All Other Offenses</td><td>All other offenses (except traffic).</td></tr> </table> ➤ <i>Percent of All Juvenile Arrests (Columns B, E, H).</i> Calculate the percentage of the County's total juvenile arrests for each offense category for each year. To obtain the percent, divide the number of arrests in each offense category by the total number of juvenile arrests and multiply by 100. Formula 3 is an example of how to calculate the percent of the County's total juvenile arrests for violent offenses in 2015. <u>Formula 3.</u> $\frac{\text{Number Violent Offense Arrests 2015 (A1)}}{\text{Grand Total Juvenile Arrests 2015 (A8)}} = \frac{\quad}{\quad} \times 100 = \frac{\% \text{Violent}}{\text{2015 (B1)}}$	<u>Offense Category</u>	<u>Add these UCR Categories</u>	Violent	Murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, manslaughter, simple assault.	Weapons	Weapons only.	Property	Burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, forgery & counterfeiting, fraud, embezzlement, stolen property, criminal/malicious mischief.	Drug/Alcohol	Drug abuse violations, driving under the influence, liquor laws.	Special Needs	Arson, prostitution and commercialized vice, sex offenses (except forcible rape & prostitution), offenses against family and children.	Public Order & Status Offenses	Gambling, disorderly conduct, vagrancy, curfew & loitering law violations, and runaways.	All Other Offenses	All other offenses (except traffic).
<u>Offense Category</u>	<u>Add these UCR Categories</u>																
Violent	Murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, manslaughter, simple assault.																
Weapons	Weapons only.																
Property	Burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, forgery & counterfeiting, fraud, embezzlement, stolen property, criminal/malicious mischief.																
Drug/Alcohol	Drug abuse violations, driving under the influence, liquor laws.																
Special Needs	Arson, prostitution and commercialized vice, sex offenses (except forcible rape & prostitution), offenses against family and children.																
Public Order & Status Offenses	Gambling, disorderly conduct, vagrancy, curfew & loitering law violations, and runaways.																
All Other Offenses	All other offenses (except traffic).																

- *Rate Per 1,000 Youth (Columns C, F, I).* Calculate the arrest rate per 1,000 youth for each offense category and the County's total juvenile arrest rate for each year. To obtain the rate per 1,000 youth, divide the number of juvenile arrests by the total County youth population (ages 10-17) and multiply by 1,000. Formula 4 is an example of how to calculate the violent offenses arrest rate per 1,000 youth for 2015. For an arrest rate in any given offense category substitute the violent offenses arrests number used in Formula 4 with another offense category (e.g., weapons, property, etc.).

Formula 4.

$$\frac{\text{Number of Violent Offenses Arrests 2015 (A1)}}{\text{Grand Total Youth Population 2015 (Table 2, A3)}} = \frac{\quad}{\quad} \times 1,000 = \text{Violent Arrest Rate 2015 (C1)}$$

- *Percent Change (Column J).* Calculate the percent change in each offense category and the County's total juvenile arrests between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

Data Checks

- In Table 5, the figures in Rows 1 through 7 should add up to the figure in Row 8 (Grand Total of Juvenile Arrests) for each of the three years (but not for percent change). For example, A1 (#violent) + A2 (#weapons) + A3 (#property) + A4 (#drug/alcohol) + A5 (#special needs) + A6 (#public order & status) + A7 (#all other) = A8 (total juvenile arrests).

Required Data

Juvenile Arrests by Race and Ethnicity for calendar years 2012 and 2015.

Source

Uniform Crime Report 2012 and 2015, located at www.njsp.org/info/stats.html (JJC will provide these data to the Counties).

Methods

Table 6. Total County Youth Population compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race

- *Total County Youth Population (Columns A, and D).* Insert your County's total youth population by Race for 2012 and 2015. Note: For "OTHER", add American Indian and Asian, then enter the total number of these youth for each year.
- *Juvenile Arrests (Columns B and E).* Insert the number of juvenile arrests by race for each year.
- *Percent of Youth Population Arrested (Columns C and F).* Calculate the percent of the total county youth population that were arrested by Race for each year. To obtain the percent for each race, divide the number of arrests by the youth population number for that race and multiply by 100. Formula 5 is an example of how to calculate the percent of the white youth population arrested in 2015.

Formula 5.

$$\frac{\text{White Juvenile Arrests 2015 (B1)}}{\quad} = \frac{\quad}{\quad} \times 100 = \% \text{ of White}$$

	White Youth Population 2015 (A1)	Youth Arrested (C1)
Methods (cont.)	➤ <i>Percent Change (Column G and H).</i> Calculate the percent change for the County's total youth population by Race and the County's juvenile arrests between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.	
	<u>Table 7. Total County Youth Population compared to Juvenile Arrests by Ethnicity</u>	
	➤ <i>Total County Youth Population (Columns A and D).</i> Insert your County's total youth population by Ethnicity for 2012 and 2015.	
	➤ <i>Juvenile Arrests (Columns B and E).</i> Insert the number of juvenile arrests by ethnicity for each year.	
	➤ <i>Percent of Youth Population Arrested (Columns C and F).</i> Calculate the percent of the county total youth population that were arrested by Ethnicity for each year using Formula 5.	
	➤ <i>Percent Change (Column G and H).</i> Calculate the percent change for the County's total youth population by Ethnicity and the County's juvenile arrests between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.	

VIOLENCE, VANDALISM, WEAPONS, AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE IN COUNTY SCHOOLS

Required Data	Total incidents of violence, vandalism, weapons, and substance abuse 2012-2013 and 2015-2016.
Source	New Jersey Department of Education Violence, Vandalism, and Substance Abuse in New Jersey Schools Report (Appendix D District totals by county) 2012-2013 and 2015-2016 located at www.state.nj.us/education/data
Methods	<u>Table 8. Violence, Vandalism, Weapons, and Substances in County Schools</u> ➤ <i>Number (Columns A, C).</i> For <i>academic year</i> 2012-2013, enter the number of incidents under each category of violence, vandalism, weapons, and substances in column A. For <i>academic year</i> 2015-2016, insert the total number of incidents of violence, vandalism, weapons, and substances in column C. ➤ <i>Percent of Total Incidences (Columns B, D).</i> Calculate the percent of the total incidences for each year. To obtain the percent, divide the number of incidents by the total school based incidences and multiply by 100 using Formula 1. ➤ <i>Percent Change (Column C).</i> Calculate the percent change using Formula 2.

NATURE & EXTENT OF COMMUNITY FACTORS

THAT PUT YOUTH AT RISK

ENROLLMENT IN AND DROPOUTS FROM COUNTY SCHOOLS

Required Data*	Total Enrollment, 2014-2015 and 2015-2016.
	Total Dropouts, 2012-2013 and 2014-2015. <i>* Years for all data represent the last two years for which data are available.</i>
Source	New Jersey Department of Education, Education Statistics located at www.state.nj.us/education/ .
Methods	<u>Table 9. Enrollment in and Dropouts from County Schools</u>
	➤ Insert the total enrollment in and the total dropouts from County schools for each academic year listed.
	➤ <i>Percent Change (Column E).</i> Calculate the percent change for which data are available using Formula 2.

COMMUNITY INDICATORS OF CHILDREN AT RISK

Required Data*	Number of County children receiving TANF in 2012, 2014 and 2015.
	Number of County children receiving NJ SNAP (formally Food Stamps) in 2012, 2014 and 2015.
	Number of substantiated child abuse cases in the County in 2010, 2012 and 2014.
	Number of County teens (ages 10-19) who gave birth in 2009, 2010 and 2012.
	<i>* Years for all data represent the last three years for which data are available.</i>
Source	Advocates for Children of New Jersey through the KIDS COUNT Data Center located at http://datacenter.kidscount.org/data#NJ/2/0/char/0
Methods	<u>Table 10. Community Indicators of Children At Risk</u>
	➤ <i>Number (Columns A-G).</i> Insert the number of County children receiving Welfare; the number receiving Food Stamps; the number of proven cases of child abuse and/or neglect; and the number of births to teens for each year indicated.
	➤ <i>Percent Change (Column H).</i> Calculate the percent change over for which data are available for each indicator using Formula 2.

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION 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).

DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Using the data in Table 2 (County Youth Population, ages 10-17, Row 3), describe how the male, female, total youth population has changed between 2012 and 2015.
2. Insert into the chart below the youth population by race and ethnicity beginning with the group that had the greatest number of youth in the year 2015.

Ranking of Youth Population by Race, 2015		
Rank	Group	Number
1		
2		
3		

Ranking of Youth Population by Ethnicity, 2015		
Rank	Group	Number
1		
2		

3. Insert into the chart below the youth population by race and ethnicity beginning with the group with the highest % change between 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Total County Youth Population by Race, 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Group	% Change	Number
1			
2			
3			

Ranking of Total County Youth Population by Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Group	% Change	Number
1			
2			

4. Using the information in Question 1 and the ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about your county's overall youth population by gender, race and ethnicity in 2015? How has population changed since 2012?

NATURE & EXTENT OF DELINQUENCY

JUVENILE ARRESTS

5. Using Table 5 (County Juvenile Arrests by Offense Category, Row 8), describe the overall change in delinquency arrests between 2012 and 2015.
6. Insert into the chart below juvenile arrests offense categories beginning with the category that has the greatest number of arrests in 2015.

Ranking of Offense Categories, 2015		
Rank	Offense Category	Number
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		

7. Insert into the chart below juvenile arrests offense categories beginning with the highest % change between 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Offense Categories between 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Offense Category	% Change	Number
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			

8. Using the information in Questions 5 and the ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about your county's overall juvenile arrests in 2015? How has juvenile arrests changed since 2012?

Disproportionate Minority Contact And Racial And Ethnic Disparities

9. Looking at data worksheets Table 6 and 7 (Total County Youth Population compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race), describe the % of youth population arrested for 2015 (Column F) by Race and Ethnicity.
10. Insert into the chart below Juvenile Arrests in 2015 by race and ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest number of arrests.

Ranking of Juvenile Arrests by Race, 2015		
Rank	Group	Number
1		
2		
3		

Ranking of Juvenile Arrests by Ethnicity, 2015		
Rank	Group	Number
1		
2		

11. Insert into the chart below Juvenile Arrests between 2012 and 2015 by Race and Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest % change.

Ranking of Juvenile Arrests by Race, 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Group	% Change	Number
1			
2			
3			

Ranking of Juvenile Arrests by Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Group	% Change	Number
1			
2			

12. Using the information in Questions 9 and ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about your county's overall juvenile arrest by race and ethnicity in 2015? How have juvenile arrests by race and ethnicity changed since 2012?

VIOLENCE, VANDALISM, WEAPONS, AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE IN COUNTY SCHOOLS

- For Questions 13-15, use Table 8 (Violence, Vandalism, Weapons, and Substance Abuse in County Schools).

13. Look at the Total of School Based Incidences (Row 5) and describe the overall change in the total school based incidences over the academic periods, 2012-2013 and 2015-2016.

14. Insert into the chart below school incidences beginning with the category that has the greatest number of incidences.

Ranking of School Based Incidences, 2015-2016		
Rank	Incidences	Number
1		

2		
3		
4		

15. Insert into the chart below school incidences beginning with the highest % change between the academic periods 2012-2013 and 2015-2016.

Ranking of School Based Incidences between 2012-2013 and 2015-2016			
Rank	Incidents	% Change	Number
1			
2			
3			
4			

16. Using the information in Question 13, and ranking charts above, what does the information tell you about your county's overall school based incidents over the academic period 2015-2016. How has school based incidents changed since the academic period 2012-2013?

NATURE & EXTENT OF COMMUNITY FACTORS THAT PUT YOUTH AT RISK

ENROLLMENT IN AND DROPOUTS FROM COUNTY SCHOOLS

- For Questions 17 use Table 9 (Enrollment in and Dropouts from County Schools).

17. Look at the % Change Over Years (Column E) and describe how enrollment in schools and dropouts has changed between academic periods 2014-2015 and 2015-2016.

COMMUNITY INDICATORS OF CHILDREN AT RISK

- For Questions 18, use Table 10 (Community Indicators of Children At Risk).

18. Insert into the chart below the % Change Over Years (Column H), from largest to smallest.

Ranking of Community Indicators			
Rank	Community Indicator	% Change	Number
1			
2			
3			
4			

19. Using the information in the above chart, describe how the community indicators of children at risk changed over a period.

20. Using information from your county's Municipal Alliance Plan, describe the overall risk and protective factors for each domain. How was this information used in your planning process?

IMPLICATIONS FOR DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PLAN

Extent of Need (overall increases or decreases in population, arrests, incidents in school and community indicators)

21. Taken collectively, what do the increases and decreases in the answers to Question 1 (changes in youth population), Question 5 (changes in overall juvenile arrests) and Question 13 (Total of School Based Incidents), tell you about how your County's overall need for prevention programs/services have changed in recent years?

Nature of Need (specific changes in the nature of populations, arrests, incidents in school and community indicators)

22. Based on the answers to Question 12 (nature and change in the nature of delinquency arrests), Question 16 (nature and change in the nature of school based incidents), Question 19 (change in the nature of community indicators), and Question 20 (highest priority risk factors), which offense categories and which indicators of youth at risk seem reasonable to address through your County's delinquency prevention programs/services?
23. Looking at your answers to Questions 9, what does this information tell you collectively about the youth population and juvenile arrests in your county by race and ethnicity at this point of the juvenile justice continuum within your county?

Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need – Delinquency Prevention Programs

24. 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 prevention programs has changed in recent years and which offense categories and which indicators of youth at risk seem reasonable to address through your County's prevention programs/services? Are there additional data that relates to Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial And Ethnic Disparities?

RECOMMENDATIONS

25. Looking at your answers to Questions 21, 22 and 24, 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 juvenile prevention 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

Comments:

26. Looking at your answers to Questions 23 and 24 what recommendations or strategies would your county make with regards to Delinquency Prevention 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:

DIVERSION

(Law Enforcement, Family Crisis
Intervention Unit, and Family Court)

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

DIVERSION DEFINITION & RATIONALE

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 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.

Diversion Process

In New Jersey, juveniles are dealt with informally through one or more of the following: Law Enforcement Station House Adjustments, Family Crisis Intervention Units (FCIU), Family Court Juvenile Conference Committees, or Family Court Intake Service Conferences.

Law enforcement officers might divert a youth suspected of a delinquent act if, in lieu of making an arrest, the officer chooses to dismiss the youth with a warning and reprimand, or to refer the youth to a social service agency. This process is known as a station house adjustment.

Youth who are accused of committing a delinquent act directly tied to family dysfunction may be diverted, with their families, to the Family Crisis Intervention Unit. The FCIU can provide services to youth and their families to resolve the immediate crisis leading to delinquency, thereby preventing the juvenile and his or her family from entering the formal court system.

Diversions within Family Court occur after a complaint has been filed, but prior to the case being formally heard by a judge. At this point, youth may be diverted to either a Juvenile Conference Committee (JCC) or to an Intake Service Conference (ISC). First and second time offenders charged with low level delinquent offenses may be diverted first to the JCC - a committee of volunteers from the community who attempt to settle the complaint. Complaints not resolved at the JCC level are referred to an Intake Service Conference. An ISC is a meeting between the youth and an intake officer who attempts to settle the case. Complaints not resolved at the ISC may be referred to a judge for formal disposition.

Diversion Programs

Diversion programs are the structured services and sanctions typically provided to youth and/or their families at any point in the Diversion process. A law enforcement agency or the court might operate a Diversion program directly or the youth might participate in a program operated by a contracted service provider.

Diversion data describe trends in the extent and nature of cases diverted in your County that reflect the causes and correlates of delinquent activity. By understanding the volume of the existing types of diversion cases and the factors associated with involvement in delinquency,

Counties can more effectively plan the content and scope of Diversion programs. This information will help Counties make informed decisions regarding the allocation of resources to Diversion programming, including those disseminated by the Juvenile Justice Commission (e.g., State/Community Partnership, Family Court Services, Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative – Innovations Funding, and Title II). Note, however, that the Diversion data collected through this Comprehensive Plan represent only a portion of the data that a County might collect as part of the overall Diversion planning process.

DIVERSION 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).

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Required Data	Juvenile cases handled within department and released, referred to juvenile court or probation department, referred to welfare agency, referred to other police agency, and referred to criminal or adult court for calendar years 2012, 2014, and 2015.
Source	Uniform Crime Report 2012, 2014, and 2015, located at www.njsp.org/info/stats.html .
Methods	<i>Table 1. Police Disposition of Juveniles Taken into Custody by Disposition Type</i> ➤ <i>Number (Columns A, C, E).</i> Insert the number of dispositions for each disposition type and the number of total police disposition of juveniles for each year. ➤ <i>Percent of Total Dispositions (Columns B, D, F).</i> Calculate the percent of each disposition type and the County's total police disposition of juveniles for each year. To obtain the percent, divide the number of disposition type by the total police disposition of juveniles and multiply by 100. Formula 1 is an example of how to calculate the percent of the County's total juveniles handled within department and released in 2015. <u>Formula 1.</u> $\frac{\text{Number Handled and Released 2015 (A1)}}{\text{Total Disposition 2015 (A6)}} = \frac{\quad}{\quad} \times 100 = \text{\% Handled and Released 2015 (B1)}$ ➤ <i>Percent Change (Column G).</i> Calculate the percent change for each disposition type and the County's total police disposition of juveniles using Formula 2. <u>Formula 2.</u> $\frac{\text{Most Recent Year \# (2015) - Prior Year \# (2012)}}{\text{Prior Year \# (2012)}} = \frac{\quad}{\quad} \times 100 = \text{\% Change 2012-2015}$
Data Checks	➤ In <i>Table 1</i>, the figures in Row 1 through Row 5 should add up to the figure in Row 6 for each of the three years (but not for percent change).

FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION UNIT (FCIU)

Required Data	Total FCIU cases by category, petitions filed, and referral types for calendar years 2012, 2014, and 2015.
Source	Administrative Office of the Courts, 2012, 2014, and 2015 (JJC will provide these data to the Counties).
Methods	<u>Table 2. FCIU Caseload by Category</u> ➤ <i>Number (Columns A, C, E).</i> Insert the number of cases that comprised each category of the County's FCIU caseload and the total number of cases for each year. ➤ <i>Percent of Total Caseload (Columns B, D, F).</i> Calculate each category's percent of the County's total FCIU cases for each year. To obtain the percent, divide the number of cases in each category by the total caseload and multiply by 100 (use Formula 1). ➤ <i>Percent Change (Column G).</i> Calculate the percent change in each category and the County's total FCIU cases between 2012 and 2015 (use Formula 2). <u>Table 3. FCIU Petitions Filed by Petition Type</u> ➤ <i>Number (Columns A, C, E).</i> Insert the number of cases that comprised each petition type and the total number of petitions filed for each year.
Methods (cont.)	➤ <i>Percent of Total Petitions Filed (Columns B, D, F).</i> Calculate the percent of the petitions filed, for the two types of petitions that can be filed, for each year. To obtain the percent, divide the number of petitions filed by the County's total petitions filed and multiply by 100 (use Formula 1). ➤ <i>Percent Change (Column G).</i> Calculate the percent change in the two types of petitions indicated and the County's total petitions filed between 2012 and 2015 (use Formula 2). <u>Table 4. FCIU Referrals by Referral Type</u> ➤ <i>Number (Columns A, C, E).</i> Insert the number of referrals for each referral type and the County's total FCIU referrals for each year. ➤ <i>Percent of Total Referrals (Columns B, D, F).</i> Calculate the percent of total referrals for each year. To obtain the percent, divide the number of referral type by the total number of referrals and multiply by 100 (use Formula 1). ➤ <i>Percent Change (Column G).</i> Calculate the percent change for each referral type and the County's total referrals between 2012 and 2015 (use Formula 2).

Data Checks	➤ In <i>Table 2</i>, the figures in Row 1 through Row 6 should add up to the figure in Row 7 for each of the three years (but not for percent change). In <i>Table 3</i>, the figures in Row 1 and Row 2 should add up to the figure in Row 3 for each of the three years (but not for percent change). In <i>Table 4</i>, the figures in Row 1 through Row 3 should add up to the figure in Row 4 for each of the three years (but not for percent change). ➤ For example <i>Table 3</i>, A1 (juveniles/family crisis) + A2 (out-of-home) = A3 (total petitions filed), and B1 (% juveniles/family crisis) + B2 (% out-of-home) = 100% (total petitions filed).
--------------------	---

FAMILY COURT

Required Data	Total juveniles diverted from Family Court for calendar years 2012, 2014, and 2015.
Source	Administrative Office of the Courts, 2012, 2014, and 2015 (JJC will provide data to the Counties).
Methods	<u><i>Table 5. Juvenile Court Referral (New Filings)</i></u> ➤ <i>Number (Columns A, B, C)</i>. Insert the total number of juveniles diverted for each year. ➤ <i>Percent Change (Column D)</i>. Calculate the percent change in the County's total juveniles diverted between 2015 and 2012 (use Formula 2).

DIVERSION 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 DIVERTED CASES

LAW ENFORCEMENT STATION HOUSE ADJUSTMENTS

- For Questions 1-2, use Table 1 (Police Disposition of Juveniles Taken into Custody by Disposition Type).
1. Look at the Total Police Disposition of Juveniles (Row 6) and describe the overall change in police disposition of juveniles between 2012 and 2015.
 2. Look at Cases Handled within Department and Released (Row 1) and describe the overall change in police diversion of juveniles between 2012 and 2015.

FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION UNITS

- For Questions 3-7, use Table 2 (FCIU Caseload by Category, 2012 and 2015).
3. Look at the FCIU Total Caseload (Row 7) and describe the overall change in the FCIU caseload between 2012 and 2015.

4. Insert into the chart below the FCIU caseloads beginning with the category that has the greatest number of cases.

Ranking of FCIU Caseload Categories for 2015		
Rank	Category	Number
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		

5. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Number of Cases column (Column G), between 2012 and 2015, from largest to smallest.

Ranking of FCIU Caseload Categories between 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Category	% Change	Number
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			

6. Using the information in the ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about your county's overall FCIU caseload in 2015? How has FCIU caseloads changed since 2012?

➤ **For Question 7, use Table 3 (FCIU Petitions Filed by Petition Type).**

7. Look at the Total Petitions Filed (Row 3), and describe the overall change in FCIU filings between 2012 and 2015.

➤ **For Questions 8-11, use Table 4 (FCIU Referrals by Referral Type).**

8. Look at the Total Referrals (Row 4) and describe the overall change in FCIU referrals between 2012 and 2015.

9. Insert into the chart below the referral types beginning with the category that has the greatest number of cases.

Ranking of FCIU Referral Types for 2012		
Rank	Referral Type	Number
1		
2		
3		

10. Insert into the chart below the FCIU referral types between 2012 and 2015, from largest to smallest.

Ranking of FCIU Referral Types between 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Referral Type	% Change	Number
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			

11. Using the information in the ranking chart above, what does this information tell you about your county's overall FCIU Referrals to Juvenile Court between 2012 and 2015? How has FCIU Referral change since 2012?

JUVENILE COURT REFERRALS (NEW FILINGS)

12. Using the data in Table 5, describe the overall change in referral to juvenile court by race and ethnicity between 2012 and 2015.

13. Insert into the chart below the referrals to juvenile court by race/ethnicity beginning with the group that has the greatest number of referrals.

Ranking of Referrals to Juvenile Court by Race/Ethnicity, 2012		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number
1		
2		
3		
4		

14. Insert into the chart below the % change in Referrals to Juvenile Court between 2012 and 2015 by Race/Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest % change.

Ranking of Referrals to Juvenile Court by Race/Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	% Change
1		
2		
3		
4		

15. Using the information in the ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about referrals to juvenile court by race and ethnicity between 2012 and 2015? How have referrals to juvenile court changed since 2012?

Disproportionate Minority Contact And Racial And Ethnic Disparities

16. Using the data in Table 6 (Total Referrals to Juvenile Court compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity), compare and describe the number of Juvenile Arrests to the number of Referrals to Juvenile Court by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015.

FAMILY COURT DIVERSIONS

➤ **For Question 17, use data from Table 7 (Total Juveniles Diverted from Family Court).**

17. Using the data in Table 7 (Cell E5) describes the overall change in Family Court Diversions between 2012 and 2015.

18. Using the data in Table 7, describe the overall change in Juvenile Cases diverted by race and ethnicity between 2012 and 2015.

19. Insert into the chart below the number of cases diverted by Race/Ethnicity in 2015, beginning with the group that had the greatest number of cases diverted.

Ranking of Juvenile Cases Diverted by Race/Ethnicity, 2012		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number
1		
2		
3		
4		

20. Insert into the chart below the % change in Juvenile Cases Diverted between 2012 and 2015 by Race/Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest % change.

Ranking of Juvenile Cases Diverted by Race/Ethnicity, 2012		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	% Change
1		
2		
3		
4		

21. Using the information in the ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about juvenile case diverted by race and ethnicity between 2012 and 2015? How has Juvenile Cases Diverted changed since 2012?

Disproportionate Minority Contact And Racial And Ethnic Disparities

22. Using the data in Table 8 (Total Juvenile Cases Diverted compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity), compare and describe the number of Juvenile Arrests to the number of Juvenile Cases Diverted by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015.

IMPLICATIONS FOR DIVERSION PLAN

Extent of Need – Law Enforcement Station House Adjustments

23. Taken collectively, what do the answers to Question 1 (changes in overall police disposition) and Question 2 (police diversion of juveniles) tell you about your County's overall need for station house adjustment programs?

Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need - Law Enforcement Station House Adjustments

24. 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 station house adjustment programs and which offense categories seem reasonable to address through your station house adjustment programs? Are there additional data that relates Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial And Ethnic Disparities?

Extent of Need - Family Crisis Intervention Units

25. Taken collectively, what do the answers to Question 3 (changes in overall FCIU caseload), Question 7 (changes in FCIU petitions filed), and Question 8 (changes in FCIU referrals) tell you about how your County's overall need for an FCIU and programs used by the FCIU has changed in recent years?

Nature of Need- Family Crisis Intervention Units

26. Based on the answers to Question 6 (change in nature of FCIU caseload) and Question 11 (changes in the nature of FCIU referrals), which types of crisis seem reasonable to address through your County's FCIU diversion programs?

Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need -- Family Crisis Intervention Units

27. 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 an FCIU and programs used by the FCIU has changed in recent years and which types of crisis

seem reasonable to address through your County's FCIU diversion programs? Are there additional data that relates Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial And Ethnic Disparities?

Extent of Need - Family Court Diversions

28. What does the answer to Question 17 tell you about your County's overall need for Family Court diversion programs?

Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need - Family Court Diversions

29. 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 your County's overall need for Family Court diversion programs and the types of offenses/behaviors seem reasonable to address through your County's Family Court diversion programs? Are there additional data that relates Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial And Ethnic Disparities?

Extent of Need – Referrals to Juvenile Court and Juvenile Cases Diverted

30. Taken collectively, what do the answers to Question 12 (overall referral to juvenile court) and Question 18 (overall change in Juvenile cases diverted), tell you about how your County's overall Referrals to Juvenile Court and Juvenile Cases Diverted by race/ethnicity changed in recent years?

Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need - Juvenile Court Diversions

31. 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 your County's overall need for Family Court diversion programs and the types of offenses/behaviors seem reasonable to address through your County's Family Court diversion programs? Are there additional data that relates Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial And Ethnic Disparities?

RECOMMENDATIONS

Law Enforcement Station House Adjustments

32. Looking at your answers to Questions 23 and 24, 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 Law Enforcement Station House Adjustment programs?

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

Comments:

Family Crisis Intervention Units

33. Looking at your answers to Questions 25, 26 and 27, 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 Family Crisis Intervention Unit programs?

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

Comments:

Family Court Diversions

34. Looking at your answers to Questions 28 and 29, 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 Family Court Diversion programs?

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

Comments:

35. Looking at your answers to Questions 30 and 31 what recommendations or strategies would your county make with regards to Diversion 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:

DETENTION

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

DETENTION/DETENTION ALTERNATIVE DEFINITION & RATIONALE

The Detention phase/component of juvenile justice includes detention, the temporary care of juveniles and the provision of Detention Alternative Programs.

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 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 (typically 30 – 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 data describe the number of juveniles placed in detention, the characteristics of those juveniles, and the types of offenses for which they are detained. By understanding the nature and extent of the detained population and the extent to which detention is used and the characteristics of the youth, planners can better identify the content and scope of Detention Alternative Programs needed in their Counties. As such, Counties will be better equipped to make informed decisions regarding the allocation of resources to Detention Alternative Programs, including those disseminated by the Juvenile Justice Commission (State/Community Partnership, Family Court Services, Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) – Innovations Funding, and Title IIB). It should be noted, however, that the Detention data collected through this Comprehensive Plan represent only a portion of the data that a County might collect as part of the overall Detention Alternative Program planning process. Counties involved in the JDAI are encouraged to incorporate any information gathered through the work of their local steering committees and subcommittees.

DETENTION

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).

DETENTION

Required Data	➤ Number of juveniles admitted to the county detention center in 2012 and 2015, by gender, race/ethnicity, and age. ➤ Number of referrals to juvenile court (new complaints docketed) in 2012 and 2015, by race/ethnicity. ➤ Average daily population in detention in 2012 and 2015. ➤ Most serious current offense for juveniles admitted to detention in 2012, by type and by degree (see note below under Sources). ➤ Municipality of residence for juveniles admitted to detention in 2012 (see note below under Sources). ➤ Age of juveniles admitted to detention in 2012 (see note below under Sources). ➤ Juveniles admitted to YSC-funded detention alternatives, by gender, race/ethnicity, and age (2015), and also problem areas, service interventions needed, and service interventions provided (2012 and 2015).
Sources	Juvenile Justice Commission: <i>New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) 2015 Annual Data Report</i> Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System. Juvenile Justice Commission: JAMS Data Packet. Data collected locally (non-JDAI sites). ➤ NOTE: Counties not active in JDAI in 2015 will need to work with the detention center housing their youth to obtain data on all youth admitted to detention in 2015, in terms of offense (by type), municipality of residence, and age. The figures should not include youth admitted to commitment program status, in counties where this distinction is applicable. For offense type, use the following categories:

Sources
(Cont.)

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| ○ Homicide | ○ Theft |
| ○ Kidnapping | ○ Resisting Arrest/Hindering Apprehension |
| ○ Carjacking | ○ CDS/Drug Offenses |
| ○ Sex Offense | ○ Other Persons Offenses |
| ○ Robbery | ○ Other Property Offenses |
| ○ Assault | ○ Other Public Order Offenses |
| ○ Arson | ○ Violation of Probation (VOP) |
| ○ Weapons | ○ Failure to Appear (FTA) |
| ○ Terroristic Threats | ○ Violation of a Detention Alternative |
| ○ Eluding | ○ Violation of Other Court Order (VOCO)/ |
| ○ Burglary | Other Violation |

Methods

Table 1. Juvenile Detention Admissions by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

- *Male (Columns A, D).* From the JJC “Data for Detention Section of Comprehensive Plan” report, insert the number of male admissions by race for each year.
- *Female (Columns B, E).* From the JJC “Data for Detention Section of Comprehensive Plan” report, insert the number of female admissions by race for each year.
- *Total (Columns C, F).* Add the number of male and female admissions to get the total number of admissions by race for each year; totals can also be found in the JJC source report provided.
- *Percent Change (Column G, H, I).* Calculate the percent change for each race by gender and the overall total percentage change by race from 2012 to 2016 using Formula 1.

Formula 1.

$$\frac{\text{Most Recent Year \# (2015)} - \text{Prior Year \# (2012)}}{\text{Prior Year \# (2012)}} = \underline{\hspace{1cm}} \times 100 = \% \text{ Change } 2012\text{-}2015$$

Table 2. Juvenile Detention Admissions compared to Referrals to Juvenile Court by Race/Ethnicity

- *Referrals (New Complaints Docketed) to Juvenile Court (Columns A and D).* Using the AOC report provided, insert the number of referrals to juvenile court for 2012 and 2015. *Note for “Other”, add Asian Pacific Islander, American Indian, Alaskan Native and Other, then insert the total number of these youth for each year.
- *Detention Admissions (Columns B and E).* Using the JJC “Data for Detention Section of Comprehensive Plan” report (or referring back to Table 1), insert the number of detention admissions for each race/ethnicity for 2012 and 2015.

Methods
(Cont.)

- *Percent of Referrals (New Complaints Docketed) to Juvenile Court Admitted to Detention (Columns C and F).* Calculate the percent of referrals (new complaints docketed) to juvenile court that were admitted to detention by race/ethnicity for each year using Formula 2.
- *Percent Change (Column G and H).* Calculate the percent change for referrals (new complaints docketed) to juvenile court and detention admissions between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 1.

Formula 2.

$$\frac{\text{White Juveniles Admitted to Detention 2015 (B1)}}{\text{White Juveniles Referred to Court 2015 (A1)}} = \underline{\hspace{2cm}} \times 100 = \% \text{ of Referrals Admitted to Detention (C1)}$$

Table 3. Juvenile Detention Population

- *Number (Columns A, B).* From the JJC “Data for Detention Section of Comprehensive Plan” report, insert the average daily population in detention for 2012 and 2015.
- *Percent Change (Column C).* Calculate the percent change in average daily population from 2012 to 2015 using Formula 1.

Data
Checks

In Table 1, the figures in Row 1 through Row 4 should add up to the figure in Row 5 for each of the three years. For example, A1 (White) + A2 (Black) + A3 (Hispanic) + A4 (Other) = A5 (Total Admissions).

2015 STATEWIDE DETENTION CAPACITY & UTILIZATION

Detention Center ^a	Total 2015 (YTD) ADP ^b In Detention Center	Approved Capacity ^c	ADP as % of Capacity	Has Been Approved for a Commitment Program?	Multi-Jurisdiction Facility?
Atlantic	13.4	27	49.6%		X
Bergen	11.8	20	59.0%	X	^d X
Burlington	13.4	24	55.8%		X
Camden	37.6	61	61.6%		X
Essex	104.3	242	43.1%		X
Middlesex	45.8	100	45.8%	X	X
Morris	10.2	43	23.7%	X	X
Ocean	13.1	30	43.7%	X	
Union	44.5	76	58.6%	X	X
TOTAL	294.1	669	44.0%	5 Programs	8 Multi-Jurisdiction

^a The focus of this table is the "detention center" and not the "county," so population figures reflect all youth in the facility listed, regardless of sending county/county of residence. This table includes all detention centers operational as of July 1, 2015, regardless of whether the facility is located in a JDAI site. Hudson's facility closed on March 27, 2015, with youth transferred to Union and Bergen; ADP in the Hudson facility prior to closure was 30.6. Cumberland's facility closed on June 30, 2015, with youth transferred primarily to Burlington; ADP in the Cumberland facility prior to closure was 11.0.

^b Average daily population in this table includes all youth in the building, including those in post-disposition detention commitment programs and federal holds (where applicable).

^c "Capacity" refers to JJC approved capacity in an operational facility as of December, 2015. NOTE: not all facilities are presently staffed for full capacity, i.e., some facilities that have populations well-below approved capacity are staffed to accommodate the actual, lower population.

^d Bergen houses females from Union and Hudson counties.

Juvenile in Detention Facilities in New Jersey

<u>County</u>	<u>Admissions</u>			<u>Average Daily Population</u>			<u>Average Length of Stay (Days)</u>		
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Atlantic	119	15	134	10.2	0.3	10.5	25.0	10.2	23.8
Camden	297	59	356	27.1	4.6	31.8	34.2	30.2	33.5
Essex	626	77	703	78.9	3.0	81.7	42.7	16.2	39.8
Monmouth	67	5	72	8.2	0.3	8.5	23.9	21.4	23.8
Hudson	255	20	275	26.0	1.9	28.0	42.0	36.8	41.5
Mercer	119	19	138	14.6	1.3	16.0	42.6	26.8	40.6
Union	134	12	146	22.7	1.0	23.8	59.7	36.8	57.4
Bergen	103	14	117	7.7	0.6	8.4	24.7	17.3	23.9
Burlington	104	20	124	7.9	1.1	9.0	28.4	10.4	25.6
Ocean	47	23	70	9.3	1.7	11.0	54.4	30.7	47.0
Somerset	31	4	35	2.3	0.0	2.4	20.6	2.5	18.3
Passaic	224	18	242	21.8	0.5	22.3	34.8	21.3	34.8
Middlesex	164	24	188	16.1	0.6	16.8	33.7	12.6	33.7
Cumberland	60	9	69	8.3	0.4	8.7	41.7	16.1	38.5
Warren	22	0	22	1.4	0.0	1.4	26.6	*	26.6
Gloucester	53	9	62	3.4	0.2	3.6	19.2	9.3	17.7
Cape May	12	2	14	1.2	0.3	1.4	43.6	80.0	46.0
Sussex	18	8	26	1.5	0.5	2.0	32.3	16.6	27.9

DETENTION 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 DETAINED POPULATION

JUVENILE DETENTION ADMISSIONS & AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION

- For Questions 1-5, use Table 1 (Juvenile Detention Admissions by Race/Ethnicity and Gender).
1. Using the data in Table 1 (Cell I5), describe the overall change in juvenile detention admissions between 2012 and 2015.
 2. Insert into the chart below detention admissions by race/ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest number of admissions for 2015 (Column F).

Ranking of Detention Admissions by Race/Ethnicity for 2015		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number
1		
2		
3		
4		

3. Insert into the chart below detention admissions by gender, beginning with the group that had the greatest number of admissions in 2015 (Cells D5 & E5).

Ranking of Detention Admissions by Gender for 2015		
Rank	Gender	Number
1		
2		

4. Insert into the chart below the % change in admissions by race/ethnicity (Column I), beginning with the groups that had the greatest number of detention admissions between 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of % Change in Detention Admissions by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Group	% Change	Number
1			
2			
3			
4			

5. Using the information in the ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about your county's juvenile detention admissions by race/ethnicity and gender in 2015? How have admissions by race/ethnicity and gender changed since 2012?

Disproportionate Minority Contact and Racial And Ethnic Disparities

6. Using the data in Table 2, describe admissions to detention as a percentage of referrals to juvenile court for each racial/ethnic group in 2012 and 2015 (Columns C & F). Also compare changes in this figure from 2012 to 2015, in percentage points, across each racial/ethnic group (Column G).

7. Using the data in Table 3, describe how the average daily population in detention has changed between 2012 and 2015.

ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH IN DETENTION

➤ 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).

8. 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			

9. Describe the age of youth admitted to detention in 2015, including the age category with the most youth, and the average age.

10. Insert into the chart below the top ten offense types for youth admitted to detention in 2015, beginning with the offense type with the highest frequency.

Ranking of Most Serious Current Offense, by Type, 2015			
Rank	Category	Frequency	Percent
1			
2			
3			
4			

5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

11. Insert into the chart below the degrees of the offenses for which youth were admitted to detention in 2015, beginning with the degree with the highest frequency.

Ranking of Most Serious Current Offense, by Degree, 2015			
Rank	Degree	Frequency	Percent
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			

12. Describe the typical youth in detention by discussing the most common characteristics of the population by drawing on your answers for question 5 and for questions 8 through 11 (municipality, age, offense). Please use the information from all 5 answers in your response.

CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH SERVED BY YSC-FUNDED DETENTION ALTERNATIVES

➤ For Questions 13-20, use JAMS data tables from the JAMS packet.

13. Looking at the “Total” in Table 1 for each program on the detention point of the continuum (Total Intakes by Program, 2012 & 2015), describe how admissions to detention alternative programs have changed from 2012 to 2015.

14. Looking at the total for each gender in Table 2 (Total Intakes by Gender, 2015) and the “Total” column in Table 3 (Total Intakes by Race, 2015), and comparing this information with your answer to Question 5 (detention admissions by race/ethnicity and gender), describe any differences or similarities between juvenile detention admissions and admissions to detention alternative programs, in terms of the gender and race/ethnicity of youth admitted.

15. Looking at Table 4 (Average Age by Program, 2015) and comparing this information with your answer to Question 9 (age at admission), describe any differences or similarities between the age of youth placed in detention and the age of youth placed in detention alternative programs.

16. Insert into the chart below the top 10 Problem Areas for youth admitted to detention alternatives (“Total” column of Table 6), beginning with the Problem Area affecting the largest number of youth, for 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Problem Areas by Program					
2012			2015		
Rank	Problem Areas	Total	Rank	Problem Areas	Total
1			1		
2			2		
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		

8			8		
9			9		
10			10		

17. 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.
18. Insert into the chart below the top 10 Service Interventions Needed, But Not Available, for youth admitted to detention alternative programs ("Total" column of Table 8), beginning with the Service Intervention most often needed, for 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Service Intervention Needed					
2012			2015		
Rank	Service Intervention Needed	Total	Rank	Service Intervention Needed	Total
1			1		
2			2		
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		
8			8		
9			9		
10			10		

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

20. Insert into the chart below the top 10 Service Interventions Provided for youth admitted to detention alternative programs ("Total" column of Table 7), beginning with the Service Intervention most often provided, for 2012 and 2015.

Ranking of Service Intervention Provided					
2012			2015		
Rank	Service Intervention Provided	Total	Rank	Service Intervention Provided	Total
1			1		
2			2		
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		
8			8		
9			9		
10			10		

21. 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.

IMPLICATIONS FOR JUVENILE DETENTION PLAN

Extent of Need

22. Taken collectively, what do the answers to Question 1 (overall change in detention admissions), Question 7 (change in average daily population), and Question 13 (change in detention alternative admissions) tell you about how your County's overall need for secure detention beds and detention alternative programs has changed in recent years?

Nature of Need

23. Based on the answers to Question 5 (detention admissions by race/ethnicity and gender), Question 12 (description of the typical detained youth), Question 14 (race/ethnicity and gender of youth admitted to detention as compared to youth admitted to detention alternatives), Question 15 (age of youth admitted to detention as compared to age of youth admitted to detention alternatives), Questions 16 and 17 (top ten problem areas and change in problem areas), Questions 18 and 19 (interventions needed but not available), and Questions 20 and 21 (interventions provided), what are the characteristics of youth and the service needs that you must account for or address programmatically through your County's juvenile detention plan?
24. Looking at your answer to Question 6, 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?

Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need

25. Was additional data, not provided by the JJC, was used in your county's planning process? (If other data was used submit a copy in Chapter 13.) If so, what does that data tell you about how your County's overall need for secure detention and detention alternative programs has changed in recent years and about the needs and characteristics of youth that should be addressed through your county's juvenile detention plan? Are there additional data that relates Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial and Ethnic Disparities?

RECOMMENDATIONS

29. Looking at your answers to Questions 22, 23, and 25, 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 juvenile detention 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

Comments:

30. Looking at your answers to Questions 24 and 25, what recommendations or strategies would your county make with regards to Juvenile Detention 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:

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 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).

DISPOSITION

Required Data	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent for calendar years 2012 and 2015 by: • Gender • Lead Disposition • Race / Ethnicity • Age Group • Probation Placements Juvenile arrests by race/ethnicity for calendar years 2012 and 2015. Secure Placements (Youth committed to the JJC) by race/ethnicity for calendar years 2012 and 2015.
Source	Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System, 2012 and 2015 (JJC will provide these data to the Counties). Uniform Crime Report 2012 and 2015, located at www.njsp.org/info/stats.html (JJC will provide these data to the Counties). Juvenile Justice Commission, Research and Evaluation Unit. (JJC will provide these data to the Counties).
Methods	<u>Table 1. Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender</u> ➤ <i>Number (Columns A and C).</i> Insert the number of adjudicated males and females for each year. ➤ <i>Percent of Total (Columns B and D).</i> Calculate the percent of the total number of juveniles that was male and the percent that was female for each year (use Formula 1). To obtain the percent, divide the number of each gender by the total number of juveniles and multiply by 100. Formula 1 is an example of how to calculate the percent of the total juveniles adjudicated in 2015 that was male.

Methods
(cont.)

Formula 1

$$\frac{\text{Number of Males 2015 (A1)}}{\text{Total Juveniles 2015 (A3)}} = \underline{\hspace{1cm}} \times 100 = \% \text{ of Total (B1)}$$

- Percent Change (Column E). Calculate the percent change for each gender and for the total juveniles between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

Formula 2

$$\frac{\text{Most Recent Year \# (2015) – Prior Year \# (2012)}}{\text{Prior Year \# (2012)}} = \underline{\hspace{1cm}} \times 100 = \% \text{ Change 2012-2015}$$

Table 2. Juvenile Cases Adjudicated Delinquent with Probation & Incarceration Dispositions

- *Number (Columns A and B).* Insert the total number of juveniles for each year that were disposed to the following dispositions: JJC Committed (refers to those youth that have been incarcerated) and Short-Term Commitments. *For “Probation”, add dispositions 03 through 14 (Residential Program JJC, DYFS Residential, DMH-H/DHS, Other Residential, Non-Residential Program JJC, DYFS Non-Residential, Division of Mental Retardation, Other Remedial Non-Residential, DYFS (Unspecified), JJC Incarceration Suspended, Probation and Probation Suspended) then insert the total number for each year.
- *Percent Change (Column C).* Calculate the percent change in the total number of dispositions by type between 2012 and 2015 and in the total number of disposition types between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

Table 3. Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity

- *Number (Columns A and C).* Insert the number of White, Black, and Hispanic juveniles for each year. *Note: For “Other”, add Asian Pacific Island, American Indian, Alaskan Native, and Other, and insert the total number of these juveniles for each year.
- *Percent of Total (Columns B and D).* Calculate the percent of the total number of juveniles that was male and the percent that was female for each year. To obtain the percent, divide the number of each gender by the total number of juveniles and multiply by 100 (Use Formula 1).
- *Percent Change (Column E).* Calculate the percent change in the number of juveniles from each race and the total number of juveniles between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

Table 4. Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity

- *Juvenile Arrests (Columns A and D).* Insert your County's total number of juvenile arrests by Race/Ethnicity for 2012 and 2015. **Note: The total number for juvenile arrests (A5 and D5) does not include the number of Hispanics because the UCR data identifies Hispanic as an ethnic origin not a Race category.
- *Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent (Columns B and E).* Insert your County's total number of adjudications by Race/Ethnicity for 2012 and 2015.
- *Percent of Arrests Adjudicated Delinquent (Columns C and F).* Calculate the percent of the arrests adjudicated delinquent by Race/Ethnicity for each year using Formula 3. Formula 3 is an example of how to calculate the percent of white youth population arrested that were adjudicated delinquent.
- *Percent Change (Column G and H).* Calculate the percent change in juvenile arrest and juveniles adjudicated delinquency for each Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

Formula 3.

$$\frac{\text{White Juvenile Adjudicated Delinquent 2015 (B1)}}{\text{White Juvenile Arrests 2015 (A1)}} = \underline{\hspace{1cm}} \times 100 = \text{\% of White Youth Arrested Adjudicated Delinquent (C1)}$$

Table 5. Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age

- *Number (Columns A and C).* Insert the number of juveniles in each age group in the appropriate cell for each year. *Note: "18 and over" refers to those youth that are in the "out of range" column in the data.
- *Percent of Total (Columns B and D).* Calculate the percent of the total number of juveniles each year that were in each age group. To obtain the percent, divide the number of juveniles in each age group by the total number and multiply by 100. (Use Formula 1)
- *Percent Change (Column E).* Calculate the percent change in the number of juveniles from each age group and the total number of juveniles between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

**Data
Checks**

In *Table 1*, the figures in Row 1 and Row 2 should add up to the figure in Row 3 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). In *Table 2*, the figures in Row 1 through Row 3 should add up to the figure in Row 4 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). In *Table 3*, the figures in Row 1 through Row 4 should add up to the figure in Row 5 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). In *Table 4*, the figures in Row 1 through Row 4 should add up to the figure in Row 5 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). The same pattern will occur for Tables 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

**Methods
(cont.)**

Table 6. Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity

- *Number (Columns A and C)*. Insert the number of juveniles placed on probation by Race/Ethnicity for each year. *Note: For “Other”, add Asian Pacific Islander, American Indian, Alaskan Native and Other, then insert the total number of these youth for each year.
- *Percent of Total Probation Placements (Columns B and D)*. Calculate the percent of the total number of juveniles placed on probation by Race/Ethnicity for each year using Formula 1.
- *Percent Change (Column E)*. Calculate the percent change in the number of juveniles placed on probation by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

Table 7. Juvenile Probation Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity

- *Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent (Columns A and D)*. Insert your County’s total number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent by Race/Ethnicity for 2012 and 2015.
- *Probation Placements (Columns B and E)*. Insert the number of White, Black, and Hispanic juveniles for each year. *Note: For “Other”, add Asian Pacific Islander, American Indian, Alaskan Native and Other, then insert the total number of these youth for each year.
- *Percent of Adjudicated Placed on Probation (Columns C and F)*. Calculate the percent of juveniles adjudicated placed on Probation by Race/Ethnicity for each year using Formula 3.
- *Percent Change (Column G and H)*. Calculate the percent change in the number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent and probation placements by race/ethnicity between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

Methods
(cont.)

Table 8. Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity

- *Number (Columns A and C).* Insert the number of secure placements by Race/Ethnicity for each year.
- *Percent of Total Secure Placements (Columns B and D).* Calculate the percent of secure placements by Race/Ethnicity for each year using Formula 1.
- *Percent Change (Column E).* Calculate the percent change in the number of secure placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

Table 9. Secure Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity

- *Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent (Columns A and D).* Insert your County's total number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent by Race/Ethnicity for 2012 and 2015.
- *Secure Placements (Columns B and E).* Insert the number secure placements by Race/Ethnicity for each year.
- *Percent of Adjudications Resulted in Secure Placement (Columns C and F).* Calculate the percent of adjudications that resulted in secure placement by Race/Ethnicity for each year using Formula 3.
- *Percent Change (Column G and H).* Calculate the percent change in the number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent and secure placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

JUVENILE AUTOMATED MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS (JAMS)

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 Dispositional Option Programs in 2009: - 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 but not Available
Source	Juvenile Justice Commission, 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 Dispositional Option Programs.

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.

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.
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			
2			
3			

4			
---	--	--	--

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			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			

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.

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.
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.

➤ **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			
2			
3			
4			

➤ 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			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			

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.

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.

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.
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		
2		
3		
4		

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		
2		
3		
4		

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?

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.

- 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.

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		
2		
3		
4		

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		
2		
3		
4		

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?

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.

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.
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.
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.
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.

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.

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.

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

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

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.

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

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?

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?

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?

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?

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

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:

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 2. Juvenile Probationers Released by Program Type

- *Number (Columns A and C).* Insert the number of probationers released from each type of program in the appropriate cells for each year.
- *Percent of Total (Columns B and D).* Calculate the percent of the total number of probationers released in each year from each type of program (day and residential) using Formula 1.
- *Percent Change (Column E).* Calculate the percent change in the number of new probationers released from day programs, the number of probationers released from residential programs, and the total number of probationers released between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

Formula 1

$$\frac{\text{Number of White Youth Admitted 2015 (A1)}}{\text{Total Youth Admitted 2015 (A5)}} = \frac{\quad}{\quad} \times 100 = \% \text{ of Total White Probationer Admitted (B1)}$$

Formula 2

$$\frac{\text{Most Recent Year \# (2015) – Prior Year \# (2012)}}{\text{Prior Year \# (2012)}} = \frac{\quad}{\quad} \times 100 = \% \text{ Change 2012-2015}$$

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.

Methods
(cont.)

Table 5. Offenses of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers by Type

- *Number (Columns A and C).* Insert the number of probationers in each year with an Offense of a the particular type listed.
- *Percent of Total (Columns B and D).* Calculate what percent of the total number of probationers with an Offense of a particular type listed. To obtain the percent, divide the number of probationers with a particular offense type by the total number of residentially placed probationers and multiply by 100 (use Formula 1).
- *Percent Change (Column E).* Calculate the percent change in each of the offense types and in the total number of residentially placed probationers between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

Table 6. Juvenile Probationers Released from Specialized Programs

- *Number (Columns A and B).* Insert the number of probationers released from each type of specialized program for each year.
- *Percent Change (Column C).* Calculate the percent change in the number of probationers released from each type of specialized program between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

*Please note that Drug Treatment Programs include those programs operated by the JJC and programs that contract with the JJC for services/beds.

Data
Checks

In *Table 1*, the figures in Row 1 through Row 4 should add up to the figure in Row 5 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). In *Table 2*, the figures in Row 1 through Row 2 should add up to the figure in Row 3 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). In *Table 3 and 4*, the figures in Row 1 and Row 4 should add up to the figure in Row 5 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). In *Table 5 and 6*, the figures in Row 1 through Row 6 should add up to the figure in Row 7 for each of the two years (but not for percent change).

For example *Table 1*, A1 (White) + A2 (Black) + A3 (Hispanic) + A4 (Other) = A5 (Total Admissions).

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. <i>NOTE: Juveniles may have multiple offenses</i>
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 8. Committed Juveniles Released by Departure Type

- *Number (Columns A and C).* Insert the number of committed juveniles released from JJC custody via each departure type in 2012 and 2015. Add the number of committed youth paroled and the number who maxed out and insert the combined number for each year in the row labeled “Released to Parole Supervision.” Note that while “maxed out” refers to youth who complete their entire term of commitment while in JJC custody (i.e. are not granted parole by the State Parole Board), these youth are required by legislation to serve an additional 1/3 of their term of commitment under parole supervision following release.
- *Percent of Total (Columns B and D).* Calculate the percent of the total number of committed juveniles released by departure type for each year. To obtain the percent, divide the number of committed juveniles released by each departure type by the total number of releases and multiply by 100 (use Formula 1).
- *Percent Change (Column E).* Calculate the percent change for each program type and the overall total percent change between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

Table 9. Average Length of Stay (LOS) of Committed Juveniles Released

- *Number (Columns A and B).* Insert the average length of stay for committed juveniles for each year.
- *Percent Change (Column C).* Calculate the percent change in the average length of stay 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.

Table 12. Offenses of Committed Juveniles by Type

- *Number (Columns A and C).* Insert the number of committed juveniles in each year with an offense of the particular type listed.
- *Percent of Total (Columns B and D).* Calculate what percent of the total number of committed juveniles had an offense of the particular type listed. To obtain the percent, divide the number of committed juveniles with a particular offense type by the total number of committed juveniles and multiply by 100 (use Formula 1).
- *Percent Change (Column E).* Calculate the percent change in each of the offense types and in the total number of committed juveniles between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

NOTE: * Juveniles may have multiple offenses

Table 13. Committed Juveniles with a Sex Offense Charge in their Court History

- *Number (Columns A and B).* Insert the number of committed juveniles with a sex offense charge in the appropriate cell for each year.
- *Percent Change (Column C).* Calculate the percent change in the number of committed juveniles with a sex offense charge between 2012 and 2015 using Formula 2.

*Please note that the data includes charges that have been sustained, amended or dismissed.

**Data
Checks**

In *Tables 8, 11 and 12* the figures in Row 1 through Row 4 should add up to the figure in Row 5 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). In *Table 9* the figures in Row 1 and Row 2 should add up to the figure in Row 3 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). In *Table 13 and 14*, the figures in Row 1 through Row 6 should add up to the figure in Row 7 for each of the two years (but not for percent change).

For example *Table 8*, A1 (White) + A2 (Black) + A3 (Hispanic) + A4 (Other) = A5 (Total Admissions).

JUVENILE AUTOMATED MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JAMS)

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.

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		
2		
3		
4		

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			
2			
3			
4			

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?

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.
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).

- 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			
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.

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.

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.

- 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			
2			
3			
4			

- 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 2015 and 2015			
Rank	Age	% Change	Number
1			
2			
3			
4			

- 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			
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.

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.

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.

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.
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).
19. Insert into the chart below the Offenses of Committed Juveniles by Type (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			
Rank	Offense Type	Number	Percent
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			

20. Looking at Table 12: 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.

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.

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.

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.

➤ 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			

2			
3			
4			

➤ 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			
2			
3			
4			

➤ 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			
Rank	Offense Type	% Change	Number
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
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.

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.

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 11, 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.

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.
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.

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

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			1		
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.

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			1		
2			2		
3			3		
4			4		

5			5		
6			6		
7			7		
8			8		
9			9		
10			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.

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.

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?

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 does 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?

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

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:

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.

- Looking at the Recommendation Pages of each point on the continuum, complete the Vision chart. For planning purposes, the Vision chart will include programs and services already in existence, as well as identify gaps in programs and services. Note that the programs and services listed on the Vision Chart should represent a reasonable vision for the county's juvenile justice system.

Vision Chart

- For each point of the continuum, the County should list in order of highest need each program and/or service needed to complete the County's ideal Continuum of Care.
- For each program and/or service listed, the County should indicate, with a Yes or No, if the program/service currently exists, is currently being funded by the County, and/or if it is not meeting the need therefore is a gap in service. Multiple columns could have a Yes or No if applicable.

CYSCs should use their completed Vision as the basis for completing the Comprehensive Application. Counties apply for the State/Community Partnership Grant Program, the Family Court Services Grant Program and the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative – Innovations Funding through one Comprehensive Application. Required in the application is a continuum that represents the types of programs and services the county anticipates funding through a combination of these funding sources, administered through the JJC. Statewide gaps in services will be identified through a comparison of the Vision.

VISION

Delinquency Prevention Programs	→	Law Enforcement Diversion Programs	→	Family Crisis Intervention Unit
1 _____		1 _____		1 _____
2 _____		2 _____		2 _____
3 _____		3 _____		3 _____
4 _____		4 _____		4 _____
+				
Family Court Diversion Programs	→			Detention Alternative Programs (Pre-Adjudicated Youth)
1 _____				1 _____
2 _____				2 _____
3 _____				3 _____
4 _____				4 _____
□				
Community Based Disposition Options (Post-Adjudicated Youth)	→	Reentry Programs		Other: _____
1 _____		1 _____		1 _____
2 _____		2 _____		2 _____
3 _____		3 _____		3 _____
4 _____		4 _____		4 _____

VISION

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				
2				
3				
4				
5				

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				
2				
3				
4				
5				

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				
2				
3				
4				
5				

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				
2				
3				
4				
5				

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				
2				
3				
4				
5				

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				
2				
3				
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				
2				
3				
4				
5				

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				
2				
3				
4				
5				

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION DATA WORKSHEETS

DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 1. Total County Population by Gender, 2012, 2014 and 2015

	2012		2014		2015		% Change 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	
Males		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Females		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
TOTAL POPULATION	-	#DIV/0!	-	#DIV/0!	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2015

Table 2. County Youth Population (ages 10-17) by Gender, 2012, 2014 and 2015

	2012		2014		2015		% Change 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	
Males (ages 10-17)		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Females (ages 10-17)		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
TOTAL YOUTH POPULATION (ages 10-17)	-	#DIV/0!	-	#DIV/0!	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2015

Table 3. Total County Youth Population (ages 10-17) by Race, 2012 and 2015

Race	2012		2015		% Change 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	
White		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other*		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Youth Population	-	#DIV/0!	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2015

*See Required Data and Methodology Section

Table 4. Total County Youth Population (ages 10-17) by Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015

Ethnicity	2012		2015		% Change 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	
Hispanic		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Non -Hispanic		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Youth Population	-	#DIV/0!	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2015

NATURE AND EXTENT OF DELINQUENCY

Table 5. County Juvenile Arrests by Offense Category, 2012, 2014 and 2015

Offense Categories*	2012			2014			2015			% Change in Number of Arrests 2012-2015
	Number	% of All Juvenile Arrests	Rate per 1,000 youth	Number	% of All Juvenile Arrests	Rate per 1,000 youth	Number	% of All Juvenile Arrests	Rate per 1,000 youth	
Violent Offenses		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Weapons Offenses		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Property Offenses		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Drug/Alcohol Offenses		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Special Needs Offenses		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Public Order & Status Offenses		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
All Other Offenses		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
GRAND TOTAL OF JUVENILE ARRESTS	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Uniform Crime Report (New Jersey), 2012 and 2015

*See Required Data and Methodology Section

Table 6. Total County Youth Population compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race, 2012 and 2015

Race	2012			2015			% Change 2012-2015	
	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests	% of Youth Population Arrested	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests	% of Youth Population Arrested	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests
White			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other*			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2015

Source: Uniform Crime Report (New Jersey), 2012 and 2015

*See Required Data and Methodology Section

Table 7. Total County Youth Population compared to Juvenile Arrests by Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015

Ethnicity	2012			2015			% Change 2012-2015	
	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests	% of Youth Population Arrested	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests	% of Youth Population Arrested	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests
Hispanic			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Non-Hispanic			#DIV/0!			#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Youth Population	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2015

Source: Uniform Crime Report (New Jersey), 2012 and 2015

Table 8. Violence, Vandalism, Weapons, and Substance Abuse in County Schools, 2012-2013 & 2015-2016

School Based Incidences	2012-2013		2015-2016		% Change in School Based Incidents
	Number	% of Total Incidences	Number	% of Total Incidences	
Incidents of Violence		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Incidents of Vandalism		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Incidents of Weapons		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Incidents of Substances		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
TOTAL SCHOOL BASED INCIDENTS	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: New Jersey Department of Education, 2012-2013 & 2015-2016

NATURE & EXTENT OF COMMUNITY FACTORS THAT PUT YOUTH AT RISK

Table 9. Enrollment in and Dropouts from County Schools,

	Last 2 Years for Which Data are Available				% Change Over Years
	2012-2013	2014-2015	2015-2016		
Academic Indicators					
Total Enrollment		0	0		#DIV/0!
Total Dropouts	0	0			#DIV/0!

Source: New Jersey Department of Education, 2012-2013, 2014-2015 and 2015-2016.

Table 10. Community Indicators of Children At Risk

	Last Years for Which Data are Available					% Change
	2009	2010	2012	2014	2015	
Community Indicators						
Children Receiving TANF (Welfare)			68692	59948	48899	-29%
Children receiving NJ SNAP (formerly food stamps)			395999	417044	415927	5%
Child abuse/neglect substantiations		9326	9250	11556		24%
Births to Teens (ages 10-19)	6398	5342	4794			-25%

Source: New Jersey Department of Human Services, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2014, and 2015.

DIVERSION DATA WORKSHEETS

NATURE & EXTENT OF DIVERTED CASES

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Table 1. Police Disposition of Juveniles Taken into Custody by Dispositions Type, 2012, 2014 and 2015

Disposition Type	2012		2014		2015		% Change in Number of Dispositions 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total Disposition	Number	% of Total Disposition	Number	% of Total Disposition	
Cases Handled Within Department & Released		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Referred to Juvenile Court or Probation Department		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Referred to Welfare Agency		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Referred to Other Police Agency		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Referred to Criminal or Adult Court		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
TOTAL POLICE DISPOSITION OF JUVENILES	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Uniform Crime Report (New Jersey), 2012, 2014 and 2015

FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION UNIT (FCIU)

Table 2. FCIU Caseload by Category, 2012, 2014 and 2015

Categories	2012		2014		2015		% Change in Number of Cases 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total Caseload	Number	% of Total Caseload	Number	% of Total Caseload	
Serious threat to the well-being/physical safety of juvenile		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Unauthorized absence by a juvenile for more than 24 hours		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Truancy		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Disorderly/Petty Disorderly Persons offense diverted to FCIU		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
TOTAL CASELOAD	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, 2012, 2014 and 2015.

Table 3. FCIU Petitions Filed by Petition Type, 2012, 2014 and 2015

Petition Types	2012		2014		2015		% Change in Number of Petitions Filed 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total Petitions Filed	Number	% of Total Petitions Filed	Number	% of Total Petitions Filed	
Juveniles/Family Crisis		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Out-of-Home		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
TOTAL PETITIONS FILED	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, 2012, 2014 and 2015.

Table 4. FCIU Referrals by Referral Type, 2012, 2014 and 2015*

Referrals Types	2012		2014		2015		% Change in Number of Petitions Filed 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total Referrals Filed	Number	% of Total Referrals Filed	Number	% of Total Referrals Filed	
Referrals made to DYFS		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Referrals made to Substance Abuse Program		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Referrals made to Other Outside Agencies		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
TOTAL REFERRALS	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System 2012 and 2013.

*multiple referrals for one case can be reported

Table 5. Total Referrals (New Filings) to Juvenile Court by Race/Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015

Race/Ethnicity	2012		2015		% Change 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total Referrals	Number	% of Total Referrals	
White		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other*		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Referrals	-	#DIV/0!	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

*See required Data and Methodology

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System 2012 and 2015.

Table 6. Total Referrals (New Filings) to Juvenile Court compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015

Race/Ethnicity	2012			2015			% Change 2012-2015
	Juvenile Arrests**	Referrals to Court	% of Arrests Referred to Court	Juvenile Arrests**	Referrals to Court	% of Arrests Referred to Court	
White	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other*	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

*** See required Data and Methodology

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System 2012 and 2015.

Table 7. Total Juvenile Cases Diverted by Race/Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015

Race/Ethnicity	2012		2015		% Change 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total Cases Diverted	Number	% of Total Cases Diverted	
White		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other*		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Cases	-	#DIV/0!	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System 2012 and 2015.

*See required Data and Methodology

Table 8. Total Juvenile Cases Diverted compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015

Race/Ethnicity	2012			2015			% Change 2012-2015
	Juvenile Arrests**	Cases Diverted	% of Arrests Diverted	Juvenile Arrests**	Cases Diverted	% of Arrests Diverted	
White	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other*	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System 2012 and 2015.

*** See required Data and Methodology

DETENTION DATA WORKSHEETS

Table 1. Juvenile Detention Admission by Race and Gender, 2012, 2014 and 2016.

Race	2012			2014			2016			% Change in Admissions by Race and Gender 2012-2016		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
White			-			-			-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black			-			-			-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic			-			-			-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other			-			-			-	#DIV/0!	0.0%	#DIV/0!
Total Admissions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Detention Statistics Report, 2012, 2014 and 2016.

Table 2. Juvenile Detention Admissions compared to Referrals to Court by Race/Ethnicity, 2012 and 2016

Race/Ethnicity	2012			2016			% Change 2012-2016		
	Referrals To Court	Detention Admissions	% of Referrals Admitted to Detention	Referrals To Court	Detention Admissions	% of Referrals Admitted to Detention	Referrals To Court	Detention Admissions	Detention Admissions
White	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other*	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2016

*See required Data and Methodology

Table 2. Juvenile Detention Population, 2012, 2014 and 2016

Categories	2012	2014	2016	% Change 2012-2015
Average Length of Stay				#DIV/0!
Average Daily Population				#DIV/0!
Approved Capacity				#DIV/0!
Percent of Approved Capacity				#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Detention Statistics Report, 2012, 2014 and 2015.

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		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Female		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Juveniles	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

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 Number	2015 Number	% Change in Dispositions 2012-2015
01 - JJC Committed			#DIV/0!
02 - Short-Term Commitment			#DIV/0!
03 - 14 - Probation*			#DIV/0!
Total	0	0	#DIV/0!

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		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other *		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

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

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

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	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other*	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Uniform Crime Report (New Jersey), 2012 and 2015

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

** See Required Data & Methodology Section

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		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
11 - 12		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
13 - 14		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
15 - 16		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
17		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
18 and over*		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

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

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

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		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other *		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, Relative Rate Index data, 2012 and 2015

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

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

Race/Ethnicity	2012			2015		
	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Probation Placements	% of Adjudications placed on Probation	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Probation Placements	% of Adjudications placed on Probation
White	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!
Black	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!
Hispanic	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!
Other*	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!
Total	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!

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		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other *		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

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		
	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Secure Placements	% of Adjudications resulted in Secure Confinement	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Secure Placements	% of Adjudications resulted in Secure Confinement
White	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!
Black	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!
Hispanic	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!
Other*	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!
Total	-	-	#DIV/0!	-	-	#DIV/0!

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

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

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		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other *		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015

* See Required Data & 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		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Residential		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Releases	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

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		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Weapons		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Property		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
CDS		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Public Order		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
VOP		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

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			0			0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black			0			0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic			0			0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other			0			0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Releases	0	0	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

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		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
15 - 16		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
17 - 18		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
19 and over		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 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	
Pinelands			#DIV/0!
Drug Treatment *			#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015

* See Required Data & Methodology

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	
White		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	0	0	#DIV/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*		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Recalled to Probation		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Releases	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Sources: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015

* See Required Data & 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					#DIV/0!

Sources: 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			0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black			0			0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic			0			0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other			0			0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Releases	0	0	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Sources: Juvenile Justice Commission, 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		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
15 - 16		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
17 - 18		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
19 and over		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Releases	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Sources: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015

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

Type	2012		2015		% Change in MSCO by Type 2012-2015
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Persons		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Weapons		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Property		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
CDS		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Public Order		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
VOP		#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015

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*			#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2012 and 2015

* See Required Data & Methodology