

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.

In 2012 there were 3 youth, 2 White and 1 Hispanic probationers admitted to JJC Residential programs and in 2015 there was one (1) White admitted to a JJC Residential, a decrease of -66.7%.

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	White	1
2	Black	0
3	Hispanic	0
4	Other	0

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

Ranking of Releases by Race/Ethnicity, 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Group	% Change	Number
1	White	-50.0%	-1
2	Hispanic	-100%	-1
3	Black	0	0
4	Other	0	0

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

From 2012 to 2015 there was a decrease of -2 fewer probationers admitted to JJC residential programs. There were no youth of color admitted in 2015.

JUVENILES RELEASED TO PROBATION REENTRY SUPERVISION

PROBATIONERS RELEASED IN 2015

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

In 2015 there were 2 probationers released, 1 from a day program and 1 from residential. In 2012 there were 4 probationers released, 2 from a day program and 2 from residential.

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

The nature of probationers released from JJC Residential and Day Programs in 2015 were 1 Black Male, and 1 Hispanic male, both between the ages of 15-16.

- **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	VOP	3	37.5%
2	Property	2	25%
3	Persons	2	25%
4	Public Order	1	12.5%
5	Weapons	0	0
6	CDS	0	0

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

In 2015 there were zero (0) probationers released from Specialized Programs.

SUMMARY OF THE NATURE OF PROBATIONERS RELEASED IN 2015

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

Ocean has very few probationers released from JJC Residential or day programs, however of the small numbers (2) of probationers released they are male, black or Hispanic between the ages of 15-16 years old.

CHANGE IN PROBATIONERS RELEASED BETWEEN 2014 and 2015

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

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

The overall change in the number of juvenile probationers released between 2012 and 2015 was -50%, or 2 probationers. In 2012 there were 2 probationers released from a Day program and 2 probationers released from Residential program, and in 2015 there was 1 probationer released from each type of program.

- **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	Black	100%	+1
2	White	-100%	-2
3	Hispanic	-50%	-1
4	Other	0	0

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

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

Ranking of Juvenile Probationers Released by Age Between 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Age	% Change	Number
1	15-16	100%	+1
2	17-18	-100%	-3
3	14 and under	0	0
4	19 and over	0	0

- 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	VOP	300%	+3
2	Property	200%	+2
3	Public Order	100%	+1
4	Persons	-33.3%	-1
5	Weapons	0	0
6	CDS	0	0

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.

There were 2 probationers released from Pinelands in 2012, and no probationers released from Drug programs in 2012. In 2015 there were no probationers released from either program.

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.

In 2012 there was 3 males (1 hispanc and 2 white), and 1 Hispanic female probationers released from JJC residential & Day Programs. In 2015 there were only male probationers released, 1 Black and 1 Hispainc.

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.

In 2012 there were 10 committed juveniles to JJC, 7 white, 0 Black, and 3 Hispanic. In 2015, there were 7 committed juveniles to JJC, 4 White, 1 Black, and 2 Hispanic, for an overall decrease of -30% between 2012 and 2015. There was a -42.9% decrease in Whites (-3), a 100% increase in blacks (+1), and a -33.3% decrease in Hispanics (-1) in 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.

In 2015, there were a total of 13 committed juveniles released, 6 released to Parole, and 7 Recalled to Probation.

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

The nature of committed juveniles in 2015 in terms of race, gender and age were; 5 White males and 1 White female, 3 Black males, and 4 Hispanic males, 1 was between the ages 15-16, 2 were between the ages of 17-18, and 10 were 19 and over.

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

Committed Juveniles Ranking of Offenses by Type for 2015			
Rank	Offense Type	Number	Percent
1	Persons	9	36%
2	VOP	5	20%
3	Property	4	16%
4	CDS	4	16%
5	Public Order	3	12%

6	Weapons	0	0
---	---------	---	---

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

There were 2 committed 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.

The average length of stay of committed juveniles released in 2015 was 11.9 months.

SUMMARY OF THE NATURE OF COMMITTED JUVENILES RELEASED IN 2015

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

The nature of juveniles released to Parole in 2015 is that they were male and over 19 years old. There are too few to make any other generalizations.

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.

There were 13 committed juveniles released in 2012 and in 2015. However 2015 saw a 600% increase in youth recalled to probation with an increase of +6 youth and Juveniles released to Parole saw a -50% decrease with -6 fewer youth than in 2012.

➤ **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	Hispanic	100%	+2
2	Black	-25%	-1
3	White	-14.3%	-1
4	Other	0	0



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

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

Ranking of Committed Juveniles Released by Age, 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Age	% Change	Number
1	15-16	100%	+1
2	19 and over	66.7%	+4
3	17-18	-71.4%	-5
4	Other	0	0

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

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

Committed Juveniles Ranking of Offenses by Type: Offenses Experiencing an Increase Between 2012 and 2015			
Rank	Offense Type	% Change	Number
1	Property	300%	+3
2	Public Order	300%	+3
3	Persons	125%	+5
4	CDS	100%	+2
5	VOP	66.7%	+2
6	Weapons	0	0

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

In 2012 there were 3 committed youth with a sex offense charge in their current history, in 2015 there were 2.

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.

The average LOS of committed youth in 2012 was 10.29 months, and 11.9 months in 2015. This is a 15.6% increase from 2012 to 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 10, Cells G5 and H5 (which provides information on committed juveniles released by gender), describe how the nature of committed juvenile releases has changed between 2012 and 2015.

The nature of committed juveniles released between 2012 and 2015 has barely changed in that there were 13 youth released each year, 12 males and 1 female each year. The only change is that the number of white males released in 2015 decreased by 2 for a total of 5, and there was 1 white female released in 2015. In 2012 and 2015 the number of Blacks remained at 3 males and decreased in the female category from 1 to 0. The Hispanic males saw a slight increase of 4 males released in 2015 compared to 2 in 2012. The Other category remained at zero juveniles released in either year.

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.

No Jams Data for Reentry youth

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.

No Jams Data for Reentry youth

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	n/a		1	n/a	
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.

No Jams Data for Reentry youth

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	n/a		1	n/a	
2			2		
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		
8			8		
9			9		
10			10		

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

No Jams Data for Reentry youth

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	n/a		1	n/a	
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.

No Jams Data for Reentry youth

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.

Ocean County sends very few youth to the JJC and receives very few back. In 2015, 2 probation youth were released; 1 from day programs and 1 from residential programs. Ocean County reentry caseload has decreased immensely with parole stating many of the parolees reentering the community are 19 and older. Likewise Parole reported most reentry youth are being linked to CMO through Performcare prior to release, therefore YSC services for reentry youth have not been utilized. We will continue to provide availability to Reentry for all the same services we provide to all youth in our system.

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 changed 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?

JAMS data not available for analysis.

However, with the small number of reentry youth in Ocean County, and most of those youth being 19 and older, it would stand to reason that the YSC could focus on assisting these reentry youth with aging out services, and entering into the adult system of care when applicable. Additionally the YSC requests in its competitive contracts that program providers are able to serve the older reentry population that are still on juvenile probation and/or parole. There are some restrictions with substance abuse services and funding, however mentoring, in-home counseling and anger management counseling are all viable options for our reentry youth if the need arises.

Other Data Reviewed for Extent and Nature of Need – Reentry

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

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

No additional data was used for reentry.

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
Currently there is no gap in services that can be identified		Ocean has Disposition services that are available to all reentry youth, if needed. The number of youth returning to the community is relatively small, and the average age of youth returning is 19 and over. While the YSC disposition services serve youth up to age 21, Parole officers find it challenging to have youth engage in services that aren't a condition of the parole certification. If an when a need arises for an Ocean youth, Parole can bring those needs to the MDT and the YSC will do everything possible to meet those needs.

Comments:

YAP received a JJDP Reentry grant for Monmouth and Ocean to provide work readiness and job placement for reentry youth.

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:

All services are available to all youth, including a mentor program that is capable of providing minority mentors to minority youth. The Ocean County Juvenile Justice Mental Health Task Force, along with the Ocean County Juvenile Parole Officer, Transition Specialist and Re-Entry Coordinator from the JJC, identified transitional living for reentry youth as a huge need for them. The YSC Needs Assessment data indicates an older population of reentry youth, most of whom are 18-19 years old returning to the community. While for the most part, transition of services from the juvenile system to the adult system are minimal, one of the most challenging obstacles for reentry youth is housing. There is a Transitional Living facility in Ocean County but admission to it would depend on the charges of the youth coming into Reentry.