

NH JUVENILE COURT DIVERSION NETWORK

SECOND CHANCES FOR FIRST TIME OFFENDERS

www.NHCourtDiversion.org

STATE-BY-STATE JUVENILE COURT DIVERSION REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

On behalf of the New Hampshire Juvenile Court Diversion Network (NHJCDN), the Community Health Institute embarked on a review of juvenile diversion approaches and strategies being used in the United States. The resulting document is this State-by-State Diversion Review (SbS Review) which provides a summary of diversion structures in 51 local state government's (District of Columbia is included). The purpose of the SbS Review is to provide NH Stakeholders, NH Diversion programs, and community members, the best possible suggestions and information on how delinquency and diversion is offered in other states. The intent was to identify the overall structure of which state body is responsible for juvenile diversion, identify who manages diversion or Juvenile Justice Services in each state, and to guide NH in identifying desired practices for further development of Juvenile Diversion. This document is not finite, by any means, as diversion practices and standards are modified and adjusted to meet the growing needs of the youth, their families and the jurisdictions in which they live. Every effort has been made to find the most current information.

While it would be ideal to focus on all aspects of the Juvenile Justice System, it is important to keep in mind that this document describes juvenile delinquency and/or diversion only. We hope the reader will find the information included to be informative and that it offers each NH juvenile diversion stakeholder a true picture of nationwide diversion practices.

How to Read the State-by-State Review

The review, presented as a table that is organized alphabetically by state, begins by categorizing each state into a Centralized or Decentralized structure of Juvenile Justice. This was done in a manner that mirrors the classification structure created by the

National Center for Juvenile Justice and published in the State Juvenile Justice Profiles, 2006.

We then focused on finding information that would: 1) inform on each state's approach or model for juvenile delinquency or diversion; 2) identify how data is tracked and how (if) it was shared among stakeholders and agencies; 3) garner the most current information about the funding structure that exists to support diversion in each state; and 4) learn what agency or departments might house and manage the hands on work of diversion. The columns in the document table reflect these areas of research.

Terms and Categories:

State Classifications

How states structure diversion is an overall important piece of information in order to understand the oversight and responsibility of Diversion within a state or jurisdiction. There are three categories as state might fall within: Centralized; Decentralized State; or Combination.

Centralized States identify jurisdictions that house diversion under a state-executive agency. This means that this State-executive agency has across the board control over delinquency and probation, institutional and aftercare services. [12 states are centralized.]

Decentralized States are identified and characterized by local control of services. These states often share the responsibility of after-care services with multiple state agencies. [18 states use a decentralized approach.]

Combination States have a mixture of State control and Local run delinquency services. Some may have mostly State-operated systems, but with local control over certain areas, and in many

instances the state operates delinquency services, yet responsibility is divided between Executive and Judicial branches of government. [20 are designated as combination states].

The following tables provide a listing of the states and their respective classification.

| State Classification | | | |
|----------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| State | Centralized | Decentralized | Combination |
| Alabama | | ✓ | |
| Alaska | ✓ | | |
| Arizona | | ✓ | |
| Arkansas | | ✓ | |
| California | | ✓ | |
| Colorado | | ✓ | |
| Connecticut | | | ✓ |
| Delaware | ✓ | | |
| District of Columbia | | | ✓ |
| Florida | ✓ | | |
| Georgia | | | ✓ |
| Hawaii | | | ✓ |
| Idaho | | ✓ | |
| Illinois | | ✓ | |
| Indiana | | ✓ | |
| Iowa | | | ✓ |
| Kansas | | ✓ | |
| Kentucky | ✓ | | |
| Louisiana | | | ✓ |
| Maine | ✓ | | |
| Maryland | ✓ | | |
| Massachusetts | | | ✓ |
| Michigan | | ✓ | |
| Minnesota | | | ✓ |
| Mississippi | | | ✓ |
| Missouri | | | ✓ |
| Montana | | | ✓ |
| Nebraska | | | ✓ |
| Nevada | | ✓ | |
| New Hampshire | ✓ | | |
| New Jersey | | | ✓ |
| New Mexico | ✓ | | |
| New York | | ✓ | |
| North Carolina | ✓ | | |
| North Dakota | | | ✓ |

| | | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|
| Ohio | | ✓ | |
| Oklahoma | | | ✓ |
| Oregon | | ✓ | |
| Pennsylvania | | ✓ | |
| Rhode Island | ✓ | | |
| South Carolina | ✓ | | |
| South Dakota | | | ✓ |
| Tennessee | | | ✓ |
| Texas | | ✓ | |
| Utah | | | ✓ |
| Vermont | ✓ | | |
| Virginia | | | ✓ |
| Washington | | ✓ | |
| West Virginia | | | ✓ |
| Wisconsin | | ✓ | |
| Wyoming | | | ✓ |

SOURCE: National Center for Juvenile Justice. 2006. State Juvenile Justice Profiles. Pittsburgh, PA: NCJJ

Data Collection

Every effort was made to identify any system of data collection or tracking that may be employed. Included in this information is the use of any assessment or evaluation tools and data sharing of items such as intake/point of entry, family history, or arrest records, and any data rendered from the use of Risk or Needs Assessments. Further, CHI searched extensively to find strategies related to evaluating recidivism, but resources were inconsistent.

Funding Structure

In many instances the funding structure was not specified or we were unable to find a resource to verify how the diversion programs area funded and supported in a state. In these instances the cell reads “unknown.” Funding sources identified include: general funds; tobacco settlement funds; tax or other revenue streams; federal grants; direct billing to Medicaid or private insurance; or through multiple funding sources at the county or community-level. Many indicated they used a

combination of Federal and state funds and non-federal financial resources.

Authority and Managing Agent

This section documents how the state executes the hands-on practice of juvenile diversion. Where the diversion programs are housed and who has authority over their management varies between each state. Oversight and management is most often the duty of local government JPPO's, Community Agencies, or Family/Juvenile Court Probation Officers. Some states and jurisdictions contract diversion services, while others oversee the diversion contracts through community boards organized within the court system. This information is included in the final two columns of the 50 states document.

INNOVATIONS AND NOTEWORTHY PRACTICES

While doing this research, several states were using approaches and models that were noteworthy or innovative. These are practices (such as comprehensive data systems; funding solutions; or advanced and demonstrated evidence-based models) that NH may want to consider as it develops its own diversion infrastructure. Many of these practices were either co-implemented by the Model's for Change Workgroup, or were supported by OJJDP. The Juvenile Justice Information System, which stood out as an exemplary evidence-based practice in all of the researched literature is just one example of a practice that NH programs and stakeholders could look towards in identifying NH's unique needs. [These highlighted approaches or practices are marked in the grid with the word "Highlight" and shaded in grey.] Here are a few of the highlighted approaches:

Several states have advanced and highly evolved strategies for getting diversion funded and tracked. Many find funding from the Federal Government, then use those Title II and Title V grants to fund diversion locally. Many of the state's practices are innovative and may be a key avenue to explore in NH's own

evolution. For example, tracking systems similar to that of Kentucky, who created a statewide court case management system for the Judicial Branch. This court technology put KY on the innovation edge nationwide. Unlike states that maintain court data on a county-by-county basis, the Administrative Office of the Courts collects data from every county in Kentucky.

Nebraska Governor Dave Heineman signed into law Legislative Bill 561 and the hiring of a Director of Juvenile Diversion and a Director of Community-based Juvenile Services. The Diversion Director was tasked with creating a statewide steering committee to assist in regular strategic planning related to supporting, funding, monitoring, and evaluating the effectiveness of plans and programs receiving funds from the Community-Based Juvenile Services Aid Program, as well as provide best practice recommendation guidelines and procedures used to develop or expand local juvenile diversion programs.

In Ohio, RECLAIM Ohio is a fiscal incentive program to provide juvenile courts with the fiscal means to develop local community-based disposition programs or to contract with private and non-profit organizations to establish programs. Funds previously allocated to correctional institutions operated by the Department of Youth Services are instead pooled and distributed to counties. RECLAIM Ohio allocations are based on a four-year average of felony adjudications, with deductions for DYS and community based beds for correctional units. Each court receives credits based on the four-year average of felony adjudications, to use as needed.

Focused again on the need for data structure in NH, one could look and begin to research following in the footsteps of Pennsylvania or Oregon. Oregon tracks recidivism by way of the Juvenile Justice Information System. Annual Data & Evaluation reports are published by the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) Steering Committee. "This integrated; statewide electronic information system was developed in the 1990's to support

positive outcomes for youth offenders, 80% of whom are handled by county juvenile departments.” JJIS replaced various information systems that had previously prevented Oregon from tracking offenders across different agency lines. Also JJIS eliminated duplicate data among agencies and established a statewide standard for recording juvenile corrections info.

In 2010, the Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers and Juvenile Court Judges’ Commission (JCJC) staff decided that the “Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy” (JJSES) was desirable, to marry the gains of the previous years, and develop tactics to sustain and enhance those efforts. After some time, Pennsylvania and Banks County were selected by The Center for Juvenile Justice Reform at Georgetown University as one of four sites in the nation to participate in its Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project (JJSIP).

Lastly, and importantly, in 1998 RI developed a Statewide Juvenile Hearing board Coordinator Position, appointed by the Chief Judge of the Family Court. The coordinator provides education, training, data, and collection analysis and other misc. supports to the juvenile hearing boards, and teen courts found in most Rhode Island Cities and towns. Originally a pilot program, the Hearing Board Coordinator position proved to be an efficacious and needed function within the Family Court. NH may benefit greatly in researching such a position.

ACCESSING RESOURCES

Many of the resources used for this document are accessible for programs to find online. The last pages of the document lists the resources used, and it is important for the reader to note that the resources used have a breadth of deeper information regarding the subject of juvenile justice in each state.

It is the intent of the SbS Review document to provide the reader, stakeholders, and anyone looking to learn about the practices used for diversion an opportunity to compare these 51 jurisdictions.

DISCLAIMER: This document was developed to help inform the New Hampshire Juvenile Court Diversion Network. The information collected was taken from publicly available documents, websites and articles. We recognize that the sources used to generate this review may have since become redundant or updated as states and jurisdictions revise or enhance their juvenile diversion practices and policies.

NH JUVENILE COURT DIVERSION NETWORK

SECOND CHANCES FOR FIRST TIME OFFENDERS

WWW.NHCOURTDIVERSION.ORG

STATE-BY-STATE JUVENILE COURT DIVERSION REVIEW

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|
| <u>Alabama</u> ^[1] | <p>Decentralized State: Delinquency Services are organized at both the state and local level. A majority of AL, the Administrative Office of the Courts administers delinquency intake, community supervision, and in the other five counties juvenile courts administer services. It is statute and court rule that the intake officer can divert a case and any delinquent is eligible for informal adjustment, and is supervised by a juvenile officer. These informal adjustments include counseling, conferences, or placement with someone other than parents. Juvenile Probation officers or “intake officers” handle delinquency referrals. Officers can divert the case to informal adjustment, and any delinquent is eligible for informal adjustment. Also juveniles can have an outcome where the officer has simply dropped charges, or terminate the informal adjustment, and register conditions with the court.</p> | <p>In 2006 Alabama’s Administrative Office of the Courts developed the state’s Juvenile Justice Technology project. This project connected AOC’s central office, juvenile prosecutors, The Alabama Dept. of Youth Services detention, and local/county short-term juvenile offices to access case management from anywhere in the state, and share info.</p> | <p>The Alabama Department of Youth Services (DYS) began making diversion grants to local juvenile courts for the fiscal year that began October 2010. These grants were substantially increased in October 2011, and continued for 2012.</p> <p>Following the FY2011 pilot year, DYS opened the diversion grant application process to all of Alabama’s 67 counties. 37 grant applications were received. 47 counties participated in the process. DYS and the Annie E. Casey Group staff evaluated each of these applications against the risk and needs assessments conducted by the potential grantees. After intense budget negotiations to bring the total dollars requested in line with the projected available funds based upon the stated goal of reduced commitments, all programs that revised and resubmitted applications were funded. \$9.2 million in Diversion grants were made to the 37 programs serving 47 counties by the Department of Youth Services.</p> | <p>State and Local authorities, Administrative Office of the Courts.</p> | <p>District Courts, Juvenile Officers.</p> |
| <u>Alaska</u> | <p>Centralized State: A restorative justice approach to services and programming for juvenile offenders. The Division of Juvenile Justice also works to prevent crime by supporting competency and skill development programs for juveniles offering alternatives to law-breaking behavior.</p> | <p>Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI), and risk-assessment tools are used to determine the level of probation, and appropriate case management services youth may need. This has been implemented into DJJ’s statewide Juvenile Offender Management Information System (used for tracking and data).</p> | <p>Funded through the State of Alaska, OJJDP, and private sources. Youth Courts and community panels are members of United Youth Courts of Alaska, an association of member courts, which provides TA, training and funding for all statewide youth courts.</p> | <p>State of Alaska: Dept. of Health; Social Division of Juvenile Justice</p> | <p>The Social Division of Juvenile Justice; Probation Officers.</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| <u>Arizona</u> ^[1] | <p><u>Decentralized State:</u> Delinquency services are organized at both local and state level. The county has final say in structure and final responsibility to determine which offenses are eligible for diversion. This may be done in collaboration with juvenile court administration.</p> <p>Juvenile Diversion programs can be either a community based- alternative program operated by the county attorney or administered by the juvenile court. Diversion options include community work service, teen court, day supervision, substance abuse treatment, and counseling.</p> | <p>SPEP-Standardized Program Evaluation Tool, for implementing effectiveness in reducing recidivism/tracking recidivism.</p> | <p>The Joint Legislative Budget Committee included \$10,334,300 from the state General Fund for Juvenile Diversion Consequences in FY 2008-2009. This amount did not change from the previous year. The Fund consisted of diversion fees, county general fund appropriations, federal monies that are appropriated for community-based alternative programs, quarterly reimbursements from the Supreme Court for juveniles participating in county attorney community-based alternative programs, grants, gifts, and donations from any public or private source. The county board of supervisors may apply to the Internal Revenue Service so that donations to the Fund are tax deductible.</p> | <p>Juvenile Court Administration</p> | <p>Community Justice Boards</p> |
| <u>Arkansas</u> ^[2] | <p><u>Decentralized State:</u> Services organized at the state and local level. Prosecuting attorneys make diversion decisions after consulting with intake officers. Diversion options are non-judicial probation, court approved education, and court approved teen-court, and counseling or treatment.</p> <p>Arkansas does have a graduated sanction statute on the books, which establishes a service framework utilizing restorative justice services.</p> | <p>Risk assessment tools are used in Arkansas to predict the likelihood of future offenses, and the Youth Level Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) instrument in particular.</p> <p><u>Highlight:</u> A federal initiative is in planning stages to help youthful offenders with co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders so that they are diverted from the juvenile justice system to more appropriate community-based behavioral health services.</p> | <p>County Governments fund juvenile probation services that are operated under the administrative supervision of the local circuit court, Juvenile Division.</p> | <p>Juvenile Court</p> | <p>Service providers contracted by the Department of Youth Services.</p> |
| <u>California</u> ^[3] | <p><u>Decentralized State:</u> Delinquency services are offered at the state and local level. Similar to Traditional Diversion for Status Offenders. Informal supervision or diversion is decided by probation intake officers. Types available vary by county.</p> | <p>Legislation requires that California first approve any screening and tracking tools. Examples of mental health screening instruments for juveniles include the MAYSI-2 and the CAFAS (Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale). Two substance abuse measures that have been validated for screening substance abuse issues in adolescents are the SASSI-A2 (Substance Abuse Subtle Screening Inventory-Adolescent 2)¹⁰ and the CRAFFT¹¹ screening tool.</p> | <p>General fund and county payments support state delinquency institutions. (No info found relating specifically to diversion)</p> | <p>California Welfare and Institutions Section Code: Managed by county probations, County Attorney's.</p> | <p>County probation officers, county attorney's or community service org.</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| <u>Colorado</u> ^[1] | <p><u>Decentralized State:</u> Both state and local; Juvenile delinquency is the local district attorney's responsibility. Juvenile probation officers from local probation departments are responsible for local probation, which answer to the judge. Juvenile diversion programs are of traditional structure in Colorado. These are community-based alternatives to the formal court system for youth between the ages of 10-17, for any youth who have been taken into custody for misdemeanor or felony offenses. Diversion programs should concentrate on a basic Restorative Justice model.</p> | <p>In 2007 Co became a new MacArthur Models for Change Action Network which tested the MAYSI-2 as a screening tool, and for training on juvenile justice system wide protocol, which included procedure for system-wide communication and info sharing across agencies.</p> | <p>Eligibility & Requirements: The Colorado Children's Code establishes units of local government and non-governmental agencies as eligible agencies to receive these state funds. For 20 years Colorado appropriate general funds to help support diversion. In FY02-03 2,483,702 was vetoed for diversion and routed back to the General fund for the Budget Shortfall. In FY03-04 \$500,000 in Diversion funding was reinstated on a one-time basis, using Tobacco Settlement Funds instead of general funds. In FY06, the legislature again appropriate \$1,241,851 in funding to begin to make whole Diversion programming. In July 2008 23 programs in 17 jurisdictions were funded.</p> | <p>District Court Judge and Local District Attorneys are in 22 jurisdictions.</p> | <p>Juvenile Probation officers.</p> |
| <u>Connecticut</u> ^[1] | <p><u>Combination State:</u> The state operates most delinquency services. Police decide not to arrest and send to Juvenile Review Boards. Traditional Family Support Centers (FSA's) offer community-based treatment and other services for status-offending youth rather than probation supervision.</p> <p>Police may decide to or not to arrest and send to review boards. These city or town operated review boards are usually made up of Police Officers, Attorney's, School officials, Po's or Social Workers.</p> <p>Non-Traditional Diversion Experience also offered: Positive Youth Development Programs offer a Wilderness School. These are 1-8 day courses and team building experiences for youth.</p> | <p>According to testimony by Connecticut Voices for Children, as of Feb 2014, CTDCF does not track recidivism of its juvenile's offenders. "Without measuring recidivism, DCF is unable to evaluate its program and services are working" This testimony was found in support of H.B. 5040: An Act Concerning the Department of Children and Families and the Protection of Children.</p> | <p>The program, which receives federal funding through the Criminal Justice Council, offers juveniles with mental health problems who are charged with delinquency a chance to obtain treatment and avoid being found delinquent.</p> <p>Also CT has the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC) which is responsible for overseeing the distribution and use of federal juvenile justice funds. These funds support youth development programs and improvements to Connecticut's juvenile justice system: "The JJAC funds and initiates programs that provide young people with positive role models and opportunities to participate in recreational, cultural, and skill-development activities."</p> | <p>State of CT: Divided between judicial branch and executive. Superior Court for Juvenile matters. The Office of Alternative Sanctions; Court Support Services Diversion.</p> | <p>Municipality and City-operated review boards, and JPO's, or Youth Service Bureau's (YSB's address the needs of youth around child welfare, mental health and prevention only)</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| <u>Delaware</u> ^[1] | <u>Centralized State</u> : Single State Executive Agency administers services. Attorney's General office makes diversion decisions. Specialized programs, arbitration, teen court are offered. The Delaware Juvenile Drug Court Diversion Program, Mental Health Diversion courts, Family Courts, and the Court of Common Pleas also offer alternative ways to address this situation by offering treatment as an alternative to a criminal conviction. | Risk Assessment Instrument: Since 2006 this was fully implemented into the Family Courts. The RAI is an objective screening tool used to bring uniformity to detention, reduce inappropriate admissions etc. It is assumed that the court tracks recidivism numbers in conjunction with this. | Under the Department of Services for Children Youth and their families, Delaware is able to bill Medicaid, and insurance for such services as substance abuse treatment, counseling, etc. | Department of Services for Children, Youth, and Their Families, Division of Youth Rehabilitative Services. | Attorney General's Office, YMCA, and Child Mental Health |
| <u>District of Columbia</u> ^[1] | <u>Combination State</u> : Delinquency services are the responsibility of both the Executive and Judicial branches. D.C. offers a court adjustment process, which includes various diversion programs, substance abuse and treatment options, along with Child Guidance Clinic, and Youth Court. | Agencies were not on the same page regarding which data they access or share. In recent years, confidentiality laws between agencies have been relaxed; to help facilitate this however, agency behavior has not adjusted to this change. The Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, an independent DC agency, collects all data related to youth court involvement and conducts its own analyses. Agencies along the youth justice continuum are unclear as to which analyses are being conducted and how to access the necessary data to evaluate performance. No central DC government authority has leveraged data to evaluate the entire system. | For the past five years, the majority of Youth Court's funding came through the Justice Grants Administration for the Title II Formula Grant Program. This is administered by the District's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. However, given the lack of donors and grantors who fund programs supporting criminally inclined youth, funds were cut back substantially. | Director of Social Services recommends diversion to Attorney General Juvenile Section | Superior Courts; Social Services Division |
| <u>Florida</u> ^[1] | <u>Centralized State</u> : Florida Department of Juvenile Justice administers services. Traditional Diversion in the form of a Civil Citation, Probation or Conditional release, but the AG may offer Restorative Justice Boards. The Florida Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) civil citation initiative addresses youth behavior at his or her first encounter with the juvenile justice system and provides an alternative to arrest for that child. Every youth under the age of 18 charged with a crime in Florida is referred to the Department of Juvenile Justice. | Intake: Positive Achievement Change Tool (PACT) administers at intake structures the decision to divert youth from court. | Civil Citation programs are funded either through a Florida Department of Juvenile Justice grant, county juvenile justice dollars, the county Sheriff's Department budget, or through multiple funding sources at a community-based social service agency. The average range of funding per Civil Citation program is \$113,000 to \$137,000. The majority of programs have one full time employee though one program reports six employees working in various capacities. The average number of youth processed through a Civil Citation program is 503 with a substantial range of 40 to 1,600 youth. | Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Probation and Community Corrections Office, yet AG has final say. | Attorney General and Courts. Diversion executed by community stake holders/DJJ partners. Probation or Compliance Officer also manages cases depending on offense. |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| <u>Georgia</u> ^[1] | <p><u>Combination State</u>: Traditional Diversion program named Youth Diversion Program. Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice is a multi-faceted agency that serves offenders up to the age of 21. Youth Diversion programs are administered by County's, but overseen by the Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice.</p> | <p>The Governor's Office for Children and Families is responsible for ensuring that accurate juvenile crime data is collected and reported to the U.S. Department of Justice and the Georgia General Assembly.</p> <p>The Georgia Juvenile Justice Data Clearinghouse is the prime website for data and is accessible to the public. The GJJDC works with partner state agencies to collect and analyze this info. This is possible with use of data from the Council of Juvenile Court Judges, Department of Juvenile Justice, Georgia Bureau of Investigation, Georgia Public Defender Standards Council</p> | <p>The Governor's Office for Children and Families serves as the administrator of federal juvenile justice funds. The Governor's Office for Children and Families serves as the administrator of federal juvenile justice funds for the state and is responsible for ensuring that accurate juvenile crime data is collected and reported. Working with partner state agencies, we collect and analyze this important information. Because of this partnership, the Governor's Office is able to continue to draw down millions of dollars in federal funds each year that are used to support juvenile court projects in 159 counties throughout Georgia.</p> | Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice/Court | Youth Diversion Program's in each County |
| <u>Hawaii</u> ^[4] | <p><u>Combination State</u>: Family Courts in Hawaii have exclusive juvenile jurisdiction. Hawaii divides their 4 different counties' to serve as divisions (4 different islands), where some come into contact with the Family Court, some do not.</p> <p>The Legislature established the Office of Youth Services (OYS) in 1989 to provide and coordinate a continuum of services and programs for youth-at-risk in every county, to prevent Delinquency and to reduce the incidence of recidivism. Although a core responsibility of the OYS is to manage and operate the State's only Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility (HYCF), the agency places great emphasis on providing and supporting "front end" prevention, Diversion and intervention services.</p> <p>The OYS provided intervention case advocacy services to youth whose unhealthy, risky behaviors placed them at-risk for initial or further penetration into the juvenile justice system. In FY 2012, approximately 200 youth were served by the four OYS-funded providers statewide.</p> | <p>Hawaii's Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) is a statewide information system that combines juvenile offender information from the police, prosecutors, Family Court, and the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility for use by the participating agencies in tracking juvenile offenders. The JJIS is also the repository for statewide information on runaway and missing children.</p> <p>Information in the JJIS includes juveniles' first exposure to the justice system and extends through prosecution, adjudication, and incarceration. With this comprehensive information, agencies can track juvenile offenders through the justice system and make informed decisions that balance community safety with the objective of restoring as many juveniles as possible to productive citizenship.</p> <p>The JJIS is used by police officers, probation officers, judges, prosecutors, and correctional workers who need to know the status of individual juveniles at any time or point in the juvenile justice process. The JJIS provides background information on arrest and court data, demographic data, programs and social services provided.</p> | <p>Utilizing federal and state funds and non-federal financial resources to address crime problems and criminal justice system issues; This enables the Attorney General to facilitate and coordinate efforts to improve the criminal justice system and to encourage community partnerships in addressing crime.</p> <p>Four OYS-funded providers identified and engaged youth and their family members to provide attendant care services, to conduct intake and assessment, to assist in creating a youth/family-driven service plan, to support youth/family in accessing services, and to provide follow-up to ensure services were properly provided.</p> | Attorney General's Office: Crime Prevention and Justice Division, through OYS | County |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------------------|--|
| <u>Idaho</u> ⁽¹⁾ | <p>Decentralized State: Juvenile Corrections District Liaisons work with Idaho's 44 counties to connect the Department with community stakeholders including elected officials, judges, prosecutors and public defenders, law enforcement, education, contract providers, juvenile probation/detention administrators and advocacy groups. District Liaisons provide important technical assistance to county juvenile justice staff who apply for, and use funds available through Juvenile Justice Planning/Grants Administration.</p> | <p>Counties provide annual reporting of financial and statistical data to the District Liaisons.</p> | <p>The Grants Section oversees community-based programs including the Community Incentive Program, the Mental Health Program, and the Re-Entry Program.</p> <p>The state of Idaho provides funding to the counties to assist them in meeting their responsibilities under the Idaho Juvenile Corrections Act. District Liaisons with the Idaho Department of Juvenile Correction assist the counties with the utilization and reporting of these funds.</p> <p>State funding the counties receive come from a state dedicated tax and general funds and are distributed on a quarterly basis. These funds can only be used for juvenile services and cannot be used to supplant existing county funding. The funding sources are: Juvenile Correction Act Funds – are general fund dollars and are distributed quarterly by the Department based upon the percentage of 10- to 17-year-olds in that county as compared to the counties in the rest of the state.</p> <p>Tobacco Tax Funds – are dedicated tax dollars that are passed on to the counties through the Department. These funds are distributed quarterly based upon the county population as a whole compared to the rest of the state. Authorization of these funds can be located in Idaho Code §63-2552(a) and §63-2506. Lottery Funds – are dedicated tax dollars that are distributed directly to the counties.</p> | <p>Juvenile Corrections</p> | <p>County contract providers or juvenile probation departments</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <p>Illinois^[5-12]</p> | <p><u>Decentralized State:</u> “Traditional Diversion” in that Police handle diversion in one of several ways: 1) Street corner adjustment: A warning; 2) A station adjustment: informal station adjustment means the youth is taken to police station and warned to improve his behavior; formal station adjustment means police call a parent and make a record. Police then set rules for the youth to follow and if not followed, the case can go to juvenile court; 3) Police diversion: The state’s Attorney can decide to handle the case with a probation adjustment. A probation adjustment gives youth a chance to avoid juvenile court.</p> <p><u>Highlight:</u> Cook County (Chicago), under the department of Community Services, and the Chicago Area Project (CAP) offers “Juvenile Justice Diversion Project” (JJDP) – a court alternative diversion program in partnership with the Cook County State’s Attorney Office and Probation Screeners. “The program provides youth an opportunity to participate in positive and constructive activities that integrate them into programs designed to provide advocacy, educational enhancement, leadership development and community service opportunities in their own communities.” The CAP offers many more services and programs than just Diversion, with 32 affiliates statewide. A major overhaul of the Juvenile Justice System took place in 1999 when Public Act 907590 (The Juvenile Justice Reform Act) took effect. This act adopted a balanced and restorative justice (BARJ) model, which intends to balance the needs of the offender with the needs of the victim. Many of the provisions included focus on procedural change within the juvenile justice system; some of the provisions focus on the need for community engagement as well as planning on the local level. Article VI (705 ILCS 405/6712) of this act encourages counties, or groups of counties, to establish Juvenile Justice Councils (JJC). Further, the Illinois Balanced and Restorative Justice organization identifies 12 counties’ which offer restorative practices either in school or at the community level for at-risk youth.</p> | <p>With Models for Change support, Ogle County’s Juvenile Justice Council has opened lines of communications with the seven different law enforcement agencies and 11 school districts in the county, gathered and distributed data about juveniles in contact with law enforcement agencies, and developed a strong and successful model of local governance and planning. records in the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system maintained by the Illinois State Police (ISP). Criminal records of juveniles, however, have historically been only sparsely available, due to underreporting of information by police and other criminal justice agencies.</p> <p>Following arrest, some juveniles receive non-judicial probation adjustments. The law as of 2000 required that these non-judicial probation adjustments be reported to ISP by probation departments as another type of arrest outcome. The reporting of juvenile misdemeanor arrests is voluntary. If station adjustment reporting is possible only as part of the criminal history record arrest report, some police may forego reporting the station adjustments of those misdemeanor arrests. Despite supporting the need to track a juvenile’s accumulation of station adjustments, they could also feel the seriousness of a misdemeanor offense does not justify fingerprinting the juvenile and creating a permanent or at least long-standing criminal record on that youth. Another problem is that station adjustments can also be issued by police for status offenses such as running away, curfew violations, truancy, and underage drinking. Although police may wish to report the station adjustment to ISP, the 2000 act is silent over whether the originating arrest is reportable.</p> | <p><u>Highlight:</u> Redeploy Illinois Program.</p> <p>This program is designed to provide services to youth between 13 and 18 who are at high risk of being committed to the Department of Corrections. A fiscal incentive is provided to counties to provide services to youth within their home communities by building a continuum of care. Counties link youth to with needed services and supports within the home community, as indicated through an individualized needs assessment.</p> <p>Otherwise Police funded.</p> | <p>State’s Attorney</p> | <p>Police/ and Probation officers</p> |
|---|--|---|--|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---|-------------------------------|--|
| <u>Indiana</u> ⁽¹⁾ | <p>Decentralized State: Informal adjustments, i.e. formal court contract for diversion happens at the county level. Contract is with family for these informal adjustments, but can also be made by the judge. Each judge reviews the contract for first time offenders and or misdemeanors. Prosecutors' offices, community-based programs, youth services bureaus or juvenile court can run diversion programs. Juvenile Courts are not housed under the State, they are County run. Usually these are 90 day contracts according to their needs. First time offenders.</p> <p>In January 2010, the Juvenile Division opened the family and Youth Intervention Program in Marion County, which provides intake and referral services to status and low-level misdemeanor offenders. This 24/7 program diverts youth away from the formal juvenile justice system while providing referrals to community-based services to help meet the needs of the youth and families.</p> <p>In order to be eligible for the program, offense types are limited to: Status offense, B or C misdemeanor offense, Shoplifting/Theft as a D Felony, or interfamily dispute with no physical injury. Also the youth cannot currently be active with the court and can have no prior felony adjudication.</p> | <p>Quest Case Management supervision, Prosecutors, PD's, 12 jurisdictions use this. Other counties use Odyssey System; Basic Case Management. Not shared over county lines. NCIC's, Interstate Compact thru quest to get any and all info. IYAS state approved tools similar OYAS. Diversion tool, detention risk tool, JDAI, MAYSI began becoming used within the last year. After screening intake, kids are entered into FYIP, and screened for the Reception Center, Reception center in Marion county takes status offenses, smaller misdemeanors, and JDI state initiative.</p> | <p>County's Ultimately fund Informal Adjustments. User fees also fund informal adjustment. FYIP. Reception Centers funded by a federal grant in Indianapolis and Marion County (Similar to Albuquerque, though the Annie E. Casey Initiative. SAMSHA grant through state mental health approach currently in process. Local DCS, JAG Grant.</p> | <p>County Juvenile Courts</p> | <p>Individual Counties; Probation officers</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|------------------------|---|
| <u>Iowa</u> ^[13] | <p><u>Combination State</u>: The state of Iowa administers most delinquency, yet responsibility is split between state and judicial branches. The Iowa Judicial branch Juvenile Court, administers Diversion. Traditional diversion through “informal agreements” including restitution, community service for lesser offenses. Polk, Marshal, and Woodbury Counties have teen drug courts, and 2 counties have peer review courts.</p> | <p>In the last decade, Iowa researchers and specialists have tracked data from each decision point in several juvenile justice systems around the state, in an effort to identify and address racial and ethnic disparities. They also developed a resource center to provide intensive technical assistance to locations struggling with racial and ethnic disparities.</p> <p>The Iowa Juvenile Justice Warehouse track data for the state. The JDW is managed by the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning (CJJP), Iowa Department of Human Rights.</p> <p>The Justice Data Warehouse (JDW) is a central repository of key criminal and juvenile justice information from the Iowa Court Information System (ICIS) and information from the Iowa Correctional Offender Network (ICON) system.</p> | <p>The Iowa Division of State and Juvenile Justice Planning (CJJP) administers federal and state grant programs to fund local and state projects to prevent juvenile crime, provide services to juvenile offenders and otherwise improve Iowa's juvenile justice system. Annually, this funding is made available through competitive and allocation grant application procedures. The Juvenile Justice Advisory Council (JJAC) is appointed by the Governor to oversee Iowa's use of a federal juvenile justice formula grant and to develop plans for system improvements.</p> | Not yet found | County; Juvenile Court Officers through informal agreement. |
| <u>Kansas</u> ^[1] | <p><u>Decentralized State</u>: Services are mostly organized at the local level, with the state providing support for statewide network of community-based resources. Local prosecutors or the district court have the authority for developing detailed decision-making guidelines, and program options with intake and assessment centers. Immediate intervention at the local level often includes truancy and youth court.</p> | <p>Finney County: Youth Services does Alcohol/Drug Safety Action Program (ADSAP), Crossroads Assessments (SAQ), and Domestic Violence Assessment (DVI). Also Finney County offers a \$125 Back-On-Track Assessment with in every program offered by Youth Services is required. The youth complete an assessment to determine risk and protective factors. Those youth that are not court ordered to be on a program but participate in one of our first time offender programs will complete the Back-On-Track assessment. This assessment measures risk in several areas, such as, school, family, peer relations, drug and alcohol usage, and anti-social behavior.</p> | <p>Kansas funds comprehensive strategy and graduated sanctions programs. JJA works with county employees who are organized into distinct service areas-core programming, immediate intervention programs.</p> | District Courts | Intake and Assessment Centers |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| Kentucky ^[2, 14, 15] | <u>Centralized State</u> : State executive branch provides delinquency services: The Department of Juvenile Services, within the Administrative Office of the Courts. Traditional, yet non-traditional. Options vary depending on offense, but include standard community service, restitution, and counseling/substance counseling, yet also offers theatre-based group (In partnership with a University), tree planting/reclamation programs, and programs which collect offenders collect goods for those in war-zones. | The statewide court case management system for the Judicial Branch has put Kentucky on the cutting edge of court technology nationwide. <u>Highlight</u> : Unlike states that maintain court data on a county-by-county basis, the Administrative Office of the Courts collects data from every county in Kentucky | The Kentucky Court of Justice is one of the commonwealth's finest achievements and has earned a national reputation for many of its initiatives, including Family Court, Drug Court, judicial center facilities, judicial education, pretrial services, and diversity awareness. Its statewide case management system has put Kentucky on the cutting edge of court tracking technology. | Administrative Office of the Courts. | Community-based programs or Court Designated workers. |
| Louisiana ^[16-19] | <u>Combination State</u> : Traditional diversion types offered but due to the varied programs some can be offered, and some do not offer due to lack of program resources to manage the process. Diversion programs for minor drug offenders and teen courts are common examples of diversion operated by local prosecutors or law-enforcement. | Louisiana uses UCR Online web-based system that was built to securely manage and report Louisiana's crime statistics. The system collects and all UCR report information from every agency across the state and compile it into one secure database. | Title II and Title V Block Grants. The award for federal fiscal year 2009 was \$837,000. Based on the Commission's formula, these funds were divided among the eight local law enforcement districts. | Louisiana Youth Services, Office of Youth Development | Court-designated agencies. |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| <u>Maine</u> ^[20, 21] | <p><u>Centralized State</u>: The Department of Corrections, Division of Juvenile Services administers diversion through 4 regional community offices. Law enforcement or Juvenile Community Corrections Officers refer cases to community diversion programs in which restorative justice trained volunteers, who meet with the team, offender and victim. Restorative Justice focus.</p> | <p>The Maine Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) operates as a collaborative service of the USM Muskie School of Public Service and the Maine Department of Corrections. The SAC is supported by the Bureau of Justice Statistics and is guided by an Advisory Group of policy makers from the Maine Administrative Office of the Courts, Maine Department of Public Safety, Maine Department of Corrections, and Maine Juvenile Justice Advisory Group. The SAC collects, analyzes, and disseminates justice data and reports to legislators, justice practitioners, policy makers, community service providers, students, and the general public. The Maine SAC website is located at: http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/justiceresearch/technicalassistance.html#EVAL</p> <p>Crime and arrests from the Maine DPS's Crime in Maine get published annually. Recidivism data from the Maine DOC's Corrections Information System (CORIS) is tracked.</p> <p>Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) data is tracked via Maine Juvenile Justice Advisory Group and Maine DOC and US OJJDP's Easy Access to Juvenile Populations.</p> | <p>State funding</p> | <p>Department of Corrections, Division of Youth Services.</p> | <p>Community Resolution Teams</p> |
| <u>Maryland</u> ^[22] | <p><u>Centralized State</u>: The Maryland Department of Juvenile Services administers delinquency, probation etc. State is divided into 5 regions to facilitate delivery, and each area covers several counties, and is overseen by an area director. Informal community supervision is the most common diversion approach for low-risk youth. Baltimore city is facilitating conferences as part of a court diversion program for juvenile non-violent and first-time felony offenders.</p> | <p>The Department of Juvenile Services developed the Treatment Service Plan (TSP), essentially TSP serves as case management guide for service referral and youth accountability. TSP format contains elements of documenting services. Also, the TSP captures data pertaining to assessments, violations, and sanctions.</p> | <p>Federal funds are used to assist the State and units of local governments improve programs relating to juvenile delinquency and the juvenile justice system. Efforts are usually in the areas of increasing capacity and development of education, training, research, prevention, diversion, treatment, accountability based sanctions, and rehabilitation.</p> <p>Currently, these funds are being used to fund the Juvenile Council supported Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Reduction Project. The only eligible applicants are entity designated by the lead elected official in the five targeted jurisdictions - Baltimore City, and Baltimore, Anne Arundel, Montgomery and Prince George's counties, or Local Management Boards.</p> | <p>DJS through Area Director Managers</p> | <p>Juvenile Counselors or Community Programs</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| <u>Massachusetts</u> ^[1] | <u>Combination State</u> : The operation of diversion programs reflects regional differences that impact intake, also. Clerk-magistrates can divert youth into informal settlements. Diversion criteria are not housed in any statute and vary by agency operating the program; but usually includes restitution and community service. District Attorney's may also operate a number of diversion programs, to help them comply with a 'Community based juvenile justice program' statute. | The state operates most delinquency services for youth in Massachusetts. Responsibility is divided between the state judicial and state executive branches. The State Court's Juvenile Court Department administers intake, predisposition investigations, probation supervision, and some aftercare. The Department of Youth Services administers secure detention, residential commitment facilities, and a range of community corrections programs. Aftercare is administered by the Department of Youth Services for youth returning to the community from placement. | The expansion of the youthful diversion program to include Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket was funded through a grant of approximately \$63,000 from the Massachusetts Executive Office of Public Safety. | State Judicial and Executive branches. District Attorney's, Local courts, and Department of Youth Services | Local Prosecutor, juvenile probation or Department of Youth Services, District attorney's office. |
| <u>Michigan</u> ^[2, 15] | <u>Decentralized State</u> : Delinquency services are provided by local county, private providers and the state. Service provided by local and private providers, and the state. The Bureau of Juvenile Justice provides support for juvenile offenders and promotes safe communities by focusing on the following goals: Safe Communities through Early Intervention, Diversion and Prevention at the Community Level.. | Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI), Data Collection and Analysis. Complete and Consistent Continuum of Available Services and Treatment. | Evidence-Based Principles/Outcome Driven Funding Through the Child Care Fund. In Oakland County the division of Youth Assistance is implementing diversion through tri-sponsorship: The Circuit Court-Family Division is one sponsoring group. The local School districts make up the second group of partners, and the municipalities make up the third. . Each local YA program is co-sponsored by the court, the school district, and the municipalities. Over 80 branches of governments and school district sponsor and support YA. The courts provide the staffing for each local Youth Assistance program. The other local sponsors provide the office, and necessary clerical support to operate the counseling and community organizing components of the program. | State Department of Human Services: Bureau of Juvenile Justice. | Community boards, communities including schools, service clubs, faith communities, and businesses. |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|---|---|---|--|-----------------------------|---|
| <u>Minnesota</u> ^[2, 15, 23] | <p>Combination State: Delinquency Services are mostly organized at the local level. Local autonomy produces several different scenarios, and eligibility requirements vary from county to county. Juvenile are classified as “Petty Offenders are diverted from court processing, and every county attorney’s office, by statute, must establish a pretrial diversion program.</p> <p>Highlights are a peer court diversion program in Dakota county is an alternative sentencing program for first-time offenders, and second time property crime offenders.</p> | <p>Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument (MAYSI); Personal Experience Screening Questionnaire (PESQ); Problem Oriented Screening Instrument for Teenagers (POSIT); and Youth Level of Service Inventory (YLSI)</p> | <p>The Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee & the Office of Justice Programs and the Minnesota Department of Public Safety funds Title II grants and seeks bidders through an RFP process.</p> <p>According to a 2012 report, in 80 percent of counties, diversion is funded wholly or in part by provisions within the operating budgets of probation or corrections, and county attorneys. Almost half of counties support diversion through supervision or user fees. State and federal grants round out the top three funding sources for diversion in Minnesota.</p> | County Attorney’s Office | County Attorneys, Community-based agencies, and local courts. |
| <u>Mississippi</u> ^[2, 15] | <p>Combination State: A single state executive department, the Dept. of Health and Human Services, Division of Youth Services administers diversion services, including diversion. Statute outlines how youth court intake can handle delinquency referrals. Program options available to the counselors at intake are community-based intensive supervision services, as well as Volunteer Services Program referral networks for services in the community.</p> | <p>Youth services counselors, working for Dept. of Human Services, Division of Youth Services develop social histories for disposition of cases. The social history must include an investigation of the youth’s personal and family history and environment, and identify a specific plan of care</p> | State Funding | Division of Youth Services. | Youth Court, under Division of Youth Services. Community-based intensive supervision programs, Volunteers Services Program for referrals of services managed by the state’s youth service counselors. |
| <u>Missouri</u> ^[24] | <p>Combination State: Delinquency services are organized at both the state and local levels in Missouri. Local courts administer probation services through a Juvenile Office in each of the states 45 judicial circuits, except in 10 largest counties.</p> | <p>Statewide effort to promote graduated sanctions has created the Missouri Juvenile Offender Classification System to manage juvenile delinquents and status offenders. The classification strategy assesses juveniles according to their level of risk for future delinquency and uses a classification matrix.</p> | <p>Missouri Department of Social Services. Juvenile Court Diversion was implemented in the 1970’s as a grant-in-aid program to encourage development of services to youth at the local level while diverting at-risk youth from being committed to the DYS. Approximately \$4 million was expended in FY 2005 for Juvenile Court Diversion Programs. Updated info was not found.</p> | Not yet found | Deputy Juvenile Officers working for the circuits Juvenile Office can place youth on administrative supervision. ¹¹ Teen Courts managing delinquency. |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Montana^[1] | <p><u>Combination State</u>: Delinquency services are organized at mostly state level, however counties or regions administer detention facilities. District Courts are general jurisdiction trial courts, and they administer state-funded juvenile probation thru 22 judicial districts. Youth Court Probation officers are responsible for intake screening, investigation, and probation supervision.</p> <p>Youth Court Probation Officers can divert cases that meet criteria from consent adjustments without petition. These can extend no longer than 6 months and include restitution, house arrest, probation, or up to three days in detention.</p> <p>Of interest is a Graduated Sanctions Demonstration Site in Missoula County. This court has focused on securing professional training and providing programs for special needs offenders, specifically Native American and female offenders. The Indian Center provides Native American Counselors on site to work with youth. Drug and alcohol evaluation and assessment services are available.</p> | <p>Juvenile Delinquency Intervention Act requires Youth Courts to use a risk assessment instrument, and Montana’s Youth Court Officers are using Back On Track, a risk assessment instrument. Department of Corrections uses the Youth One Level of Service/ Case Management Inventory.</p> | <p>Montana’s governor-appointed Youth Justice Advisory Council (YJC) administers Title II funding according to the following priorities: Native American programs; delinquency prevention; alternatives to detention; disproportionate minority contact; diversion; and juvenile justice system improvement. These funds are distributed via RFP.</p> | <p>State District Courts; Youth Courts.</p> | <p>Private Companies, County Agencies, or the State Government.</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nebraska ^[25] | <p>Combination State: With exception of detention, the state operates delinquency services in Nebraska. Responsibility is divided between the judicial and executive branches.</p> <p>Highlight: After the passage of law, the position of Juvenile Diversion Program Administrator was established within the Nebraska Crime Commission. The Diversion Administrator is tasked with assisting in creating and maintaining juvenile pretrial diversion programs to divert juveniles away from the judicial system and into community-based services. That process includes creating a statewide steering committee to assist in regular strategic planning related to supporting, funding, monitoring, and evaluating the effectiveness of plans and programs receiving funds from the Community-Based Juvenile Services Aid Program, as well as provide best practice recommendation guidelines and procedures used to develop or expand local juvenile diversion programs.</p> <p>As of the 2013 Legislative Session, 52 of the 93 counties in Nebraska reported having a juvenile diversion program.</p> | <p>Juvenile Data Integration Project: A data sharing information system created by the Nebraska Crime Commission’s Juvenile Information Sharing project strategic plan.</p> | <p>In May 2013, Nebraska Governor Dave Heineman signed into law Legislative Bill 561, a major reform bill aimed at improving the juvenile justice system in the state. The law significantly shifted the supervision of all juvenile offenders in the community from the Department of Health and Human Services to the Office of Probation Administration in the Nebraska Supreme Court, which specifically placed a renewed emphasis on diversion through community-based programs.. Legislative Bill 561 provides \$14.5 million from 2013-2015 to fund implementation and further development of juvenile justice services. Included in this was the hiring of a Director of Juvenile Diversion and a Director of Community-based Juvenile Services to help coordinate juvenile justice diversion services under the Nebraska Crime Commission.</p> | <p>County Attorneys; City Boards.</p> | <p>Non-profit community based programs, or informal diversion programs run by the county attorneys.</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| <u>Nevada</u> ^[26] | <p><u>Decentralized State:</u> Delinquency services are organized both at the state and local level. Intake workers or probation officers (depending on the county) in the assessment units can recommend to the district attorney that diversion be the option. Juveniles who voluntarily admit to being delinquent may consent to being placed on informal supervision. Informal supervision may not exceed 180 days.</p> <p><u>Highlight:</u> Clark County (Las Vegas) has participated in a national graduated sanctions project that the office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention awarded to the Juvenile Sanctions Division. The Juvenile Justice Services has initiated a resource allocation program to reduce the detention population and allow personnel to focus on community-based services.</p> | <p>Detention Centers have adopted a standardized assessment tool, developed by Silver State Detention Association for screening admissions. Statute requires screening juveniles in detention mental health and substance abuse problems. Washoe County Dept. of Youth Services uses a modified version of the Nevada Association of Juvenile Justice Administrators community probation placement at intake. Clark County (Las Vegas) Juvenile services, uses the Service Assessment System as their screening tool. Rural counties vary their use of risk/needs assessment instruments at intake.</p> | <p>Formula grants, Title II Grants, Title V grants and Juvenile Accountability Block Grants.</p> <p>The Juvenile Justice Commission distributes funds to counties to promote and support their efforts under Title II grants to maintain compliance with the core requirements of the JJDP Act.</p> <p>In an attempt to thwart underage drinking, the Juvenile Justice Programs Office coordinates activities designed to reduce the availability and consumption of alcoholic beverages by minors. The program includes sub-grants to community groups to design and implement local prevention projects, and sub-grants to law enforcement entities to implement enforcement activities. Established in 1998 the Juvenile Justice Programs Office coordinates sub-grants to units of local government to implement accountability based projects in twelve federally defined purposes areas.</p> <p>The state of Nevada also received funding for projects in the purpose areas. Core Block Grant Programs include the Development of community service/restitution programs, Drug Courts Funding of additional juvenile Court Masters. Lastly, a recent grant project was awarded from the United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance with the intent to develop strategies to initiate and enhance planning for gender-specific programs to address the needs of females in the juvenile justice system, as well as at-risk young women around the State of Nevada.</p> | <p>District Juvenile Courts, except Clark County. Division of Child and Family Services, Clark County.</p> | <p>Intake and probation officers in the probation department. Clark, Washoe and rural counties run their own programs.</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;"><u>New Hampshire</u>^[1]</p> | <p><u>Centralized State</u>: Division for Juvenile Justice Services, within DHHS is the state executive agency responsible for delinquency services. Traditional Community-based diversion. RSA 169:-B:10 provides that Police, JPPO's and prosecutors can refer a juvenile to any court-approved diversion program rather than file a formal petition, subject only to local administrative judge.</p> | <p>NH uses a detention risk-screening instrument (RAI) to ensure that only appropriate youth are detained. Officers screen using this for pre-trial detention.</p> <p>Juvenile records are kept in books and files separate from all other court records and are withheld from public inspection. The records can be accessed in a database known as "NH Bridges" which is used by the Department of Juvenile Justice and the Department of Children, Family and Youth Services.</p> | <p>Funding and referral sources. Often Municipalities, grant-funding, or incentive funds from the State.</p> | <p>State/Executive and Local Funding.</p> | <p>Community-Based diversion Sites, Local Police, and JPPO's.</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|---|
| <u>New Jersey</u> ^[27, 28] | <p>Combination State: The state operates most delinquency services for youth in New Jersey. However, responsibility is divided between the state judicial and state and executive branches. A law enforcement officer may take a youth into custody when there is probable cause to believe that the youth is delinquent. In lieu of signing a delinquency complaint, the officer may divert the case through a station house adjustment; a diversionary program that the police department administers locally within the municipality. This program may simply consist of a meeting with a juvenile officer, the youth, and the parents/guardian; or it may be more structured to include sanctions. Also JCCs or Juvenile Conference Committees are another diversion option. JCC's are diversion procedures established by the state and used only in first and second time offenses. These are comprised of community residents appointed by the courts to review certain delinquency complaints.</p> <p>The development and enhancement of a local community-based continuum is achieved through a combination effort between the state and its 21 counties through county youth services commissions. The county youth services commissions were created to analyze the individual and unique needs of youth in their communities and to develop programs specifically for local youth.</p> <p>The Juvenile Justice Commission Court Liaisons act as the bridge between the Family Court and the Juvenile Justice Commission. In this role, Court Liaisons are responsible for diverting juveniles from the Juvenile Justice Commission to community-based programs when deemed appropriate by the courts.</p> | None Found | <p>Juvenile Accountability Block Grants (JABG) Both county and municipal level governments the opportunity to hold juveniles increasingly accountable for delinquent behaviors through Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalitions (JCECs) and the allocation of funding across priority purpose areas. Additionally, the State maintains a share of JABG funding for Information Technology improvements and the provision of substance abuse assessment services.</p> <p>New Jersey has a large resource; The Commission's Grants Management Office. The Grant's Management Office is responsible for seeking grant funds that address the needs of juveniles under the Commission's jurisdiction and support the Commission's mission. The Grants Management Office researches funding sources and reviews grant announcements to identify those that coincide with the needs of the Commission not supported by the state budget. Funds are sought via proposal/budget development and submission for a variety of initiatives inclusive of staff training, education programs, workforce development programs, parenting programs, mentoring programs, substance abuse education and residential treatment, restorative justice projects, transitional programs, aftercare step-up programs, mental health programs, sex offender programs, bullet proof vests, drug testing and capital projects. The Grants Management Office in conjunction with the Education, Operations and Fiscal Offices, monitors program implementation /operations and expenditures.</p> | State Judicial and State Executive branches. | Administrative Office of the Courts Family Division. Managed by Youth Services Commission Court Liaisons. |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| New Mexico ^[29] | <p>Centralized State: The state operates most delinquency services for youth in New Mexico. By statute during the preliminary inquiry on a delinquency complaint, Juvenile Probation/Parole officers from the New Mexico CYFD may refer youth to an appropriate agency and adjustment conferences may be held instead of filing a petition. If the juvenile completes the agreed upon conditions and no new charges are filed against the juvenile, the pending petition is dismissed. Juvenile Probation and Patrol officers have the ability to informally dispose of up to three misdemeanor charges brought against youth within two years.</p> | <p>The New Mexico Criminal and Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council developed the New Mexico Juvenile Justice Program Inventory, an online searchable database for programs for juveniles referred. Users can obtain the following : Program name, contact info, description, eligibility, ages served, capacity, funding sources</p> | <p>As of 2010 the New Mexico Children’s Department contracted a study New Mexico Sentencing Commission (NMSC) to study juvenile justice programs funded by the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC) in six New Mexico counties. In July 2010 this contract was renewed to include three additional counties and an additional program type (Intensive Community Monitoring).The programs being studied receive funding from the N.M. Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC).JJAC advocates for the prevention of delinquency, alternatives to secure detention, improvement of the juvenile justice system, and the development of a continuum of graduated sanctions for juveniles in local communities. JJAC allocates federal and state grant funds to communities for these purposes.</p> | <p>New Mexico Children, Youth, and Families Department- (CYFD) Juvenile Justice Services</p> | <p>Department of Juvenile Justice Services</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| <u>New York</u> ^[2, 15, 30] | <p><u>Decentralized State:</u> Delinquency Services are organized at both state and local level in NY. County commissions/boards or private agencies contracted by individual counties. 58 county probation departments in 62 counties investigate and supervise juveniles. State law establishes the circumstances that may require obtaining the constant of the presentment agency (prosecutor or District Attorney), the court and/or the victim or complainant before a case may be adjusted. The family Court Act authorizes probation departments to determine eligibility and suitability for adjustment services for all delinquency complaints. Adjustment services vary from County to County, depending on available resources, but may include probation monitoring, intensive preventative services, counseling, and mediation. Diversion may last for up to 60 days for delinquency cases and may be extended for 60 days with court approval.</p> <p>During intake, the intake officer at the county probation department interviews all concerned parties, including the arresting officer, the complainant, the parents, and the juvenile to determine the case should be adjusted.</p> | <p>Youth Assessment Screening Instrument was customized and enhanced for New York State's use during juvenile intake investigation and supervision in juvenile delinquency in PINS cases. The YASI in Microsoft Access synthesizes multiple pieces of assessment info through a roll-up function & provides a profile of the client that can be easily shared on paper. The YASI Project is one of three phases of implementation in 46 jurisdictions throughout the state. Aggregate YASI data is available to county probation directors and other state and local policy makers for quality assurance, data analysis, local planning and program evaluation.</p> | <p>New York's Delinquency Prevention Grant Program is supported by federal funds awarded to the Division of Criminal Justice Services under Title V of the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. New York's funding allocation was raised to \$2.4 million in 1999. The Division of Criminal Justice Services administers federal funds to local programs that target youth 7 - 15 years old.</p> <p>New York's Delinquency Prevention Program focuses on the risk and protective factors shown to be related to juvenile delinquency. Using this approach, communities first identify the risk factors that contribute to their delinquency problems.</p> | Executive and Local Jurisdictions | Private Agencies, Local Counties |
| <u>North Carolina</u> ^[31] | <p><u>Centralized State:</u> The NC Department of Public Safety, Division of Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice, administers delinquency services, encompassing delinquency intake screening, detention facilities, and probation supervision. By Statute, unless the offense requires a petition, such as murder, first or second degree rape, or first-degree burglary, the intake counselor may divert the juvenile. Available diversion programs include restitution, community service, victim-offender mediation, and teen courts. The maximum time a juvenile can be on diversion status is six months.</p> | <p>The North Carolina Juvenile Online Information Network (NC-JOIN) is a statewide client-based data-tracking system. A juvenile court counselor can enter one of three options into NC-JOIN for outcome measures of juveniles who are diverted: Successful, Unsuccessful and Other. The "Other" category applies to juveniles who do not successfully complete their diversion program but their non-completion may not be due to any fault of their own (i.e., family moved and closure is appropriate, complainant does not want to pursue program completion, medical/mental health issues prevent completion).</p> <p>Juvenile court counselors prepare social histories and risk assessments for every juvenile who goes through intake.</p> | <p>North Carolina General Funds appropriated by the General Assembly.</p> <p>These funds support and monitor more than 500 community-based programs statewide via 100 county Juvenile Crime Prevention Councils.</p> | State/Executive | Juvenile Court Counselors and Community-Based programs. |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| <u>North Dakota</u>^[1] | <p>Combination State: The state operates most delinquency services for youth in North Dakota. However, responsibility is divided between the state judicial and state executive branches.</p> <p>Restorative justice programming, specifically Juvenile Accountability Conferencing was initiated in N. Dakota in 1999. Juvenile Accountability Conferencing has been utilized on a statewide basis primarily by the Juvenile Court as an intervention for misdemeanor offenders while fulfilling concerns of the victims and communities. Recidivism is measured based on the number of youth who are rearrested or seen at Juvenile Court for a new delinquent offense occurring six months after program completion. Based on most recent data 90% of Juveniles completing Juvenile Accountability Conferencing did not reoffend.</p> <p>The Juvenile Court has three options for processing juvenile referrals, 1.) Diversion to appropriate programs and services; 2.) Informal Adjustment; or 3.) Petition or formal adjudication. Juvenile Court at any level is based on Balanced and Restorative Justice with three principles of 1. Accountability, 2. Competency, 3. Community Protection. If the case is diverted, the court may refer the juvenile to alcohol and drug programs, individual/family counseling, cognitive restructuring programs, and teen court, or other restorative justice conferencing.</p> | <p>Juvenile delinquency officers perform delinquency/unruly intake screening.</p> | <p>The Supreme Court Administers Office funds and administers juvenile probation services, including delinquency intake screening, predisposition investigation, and probation supervision through 7 judicial districts</p> | <p>State Judicial Branch: Juvenile Court</p> | <p>Court Officer, TEEN Court, or Juvenile Accountability Conferencing.</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|---------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| Ohio ^[1] | <p><u>Decentralized State:</u> Delinquency services are organized at both the state level and local level in Ohio. Either the county executive or juvenile court judge administers intake screening and probation services.</p> <p>Juvenile procedure states that in all appropriate places, (this is determined by informal screening) formal action should be avoided and other community resources utilized to ameliorate situations brought to the court's attention. Often those referred to Diversion programs are those at risk of expulsion or first-time misdemeanors offenders. Diversion options vary by county, but include community service, truancy education, mediation and unofficial probation.</p> <p>In Cuyohoga County juvenile diversion is managed by a County Juvenile Justice Commission, The Commission meets at least once a month to hear cases referred by the Division of Police. A Magistrate presides over the hearings, and the Commission decides what types of diversion program suit each juvenile. Some Ohio counties use Teen courts.</p> | <p>Graduated Sanctions Demonstration Site; In Montgomery County, the County Juvenile Court is/was participating in a national graduated sanctions project that the OJJDP awarded to the Juvenile Sanctions Division of the National Council of Juvenile Justice and Family Court Judges. The court had adopted a strength-based case management model and implemented a gender-specific, non-residential self-esteem program and a residential unit for female offenders in its Center for Adolescent Services.</p> <p>Risk Assessments are also used as data by the counties/prosecutors in getting juveniles and their families to the most appropriate community programs.</p> | <p><u>Highlight:</u> RECLAIM Ohio is a fiscal incentive program to provide juvenile courts with the fiscal means to develop local community-based disposition programs or to contract with private and non-profit organizations to establish these programs. Funds previously allocated to correctional institutions operated by the Department of Youth Services are instead pooled and distributed to counties.</p> <p>RECLAIM Ohio allocations are based on a four-year average of felony adjudications, with deductions for DYS and community based beds for correctional units. Each court receives credits based on the four-year average of felony adjudications, to use as needed.</p> | <p>Courts of Common pleas. 10 of 88 counties have separate juvenile court divisions.</p> | <p>Prosecutors or intake officers.</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| Oklahoma^[1] | <p><u>Combination State</u>: delinquency services are organized by both the state and county level in Oklahoma. Generally District Courts in each county exercise jurisdiction over delinquency proceedings. Oklahoma offers graduated sanctions and organizes the service system at the local level through Community Councils. Councils are guided by the Office of Juvenile Affairs, which has a statute requirement to develop graduated sanctions as an option for local prosecutors to defer filings for first time offenders. Also, Parental Responsibility attempts to hold parents responsible for the support of youth.</p> <p>Diversion, under statute in OK, delinquency proceedings can be delayed for 180 days for any youth that has not been previously adjudicated, as long as they submit a guilty plea and the youth and parent agree to participate in a court-approved program. The court must dismiss the case with prejudice at the conclusion of the deferral period if the youth presents satisfactory evidence that he or she has successfully completed. Graduated Sanctions and Teen Court are both Identified in OK Juvenile Code, specifically as Diversion Options.</p> | <p>Oklahoma has established an automated information system that tracks juvenile offenders. A court order is not necessary to share the information between participating juvenile justice agencies. Agencies with access to this information are enumerated by statute and any disclosure is limited. Arrest data regarding juveniles is maintained and distributed to participating agencies through the Juvenile Justice Information System, a part of the Juvenile Offender Tracking Program. This system tracks juvenile offenders from arrest through closure of a case. The program was implemented to establish “an accurate and accessible database with information on juvenile offenders readily available” to law enforcement, district attorney’s juvenile courts, and others who require such information. This information is gathered by and shared with agencies that make up the juvenile justice system, including courts, the office of the District Attorneys, juvenile bureaus, the Office of Juvenile Affairs, state and local law enforcement agencies, and private or public agencies providing services to juveniles.</p> | <p>The Councils receive financial support through a combination of federal pass through moneys and parental responsibility funds.</p> | <p>Office of Juvenile Affairs</p> | <p>Private or Non-profit organizations designated as Youth Service Orgs.</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|-----------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Oregon ^[1] | <p>Decentralized State: Delinquency Services are organized at both the state and local levels. County Juvenile Departments in each of Oregon's 36 counties.</p> <p>Highlight: The Juvenile Crime Prevention Programs only 4% of non-offender youth participating in JCP programs through community providers committed criminal offences in the 12 months following their participation. JCP offenders also had a lower rate of re-offending than the statewide population of juvenile offenders.</p> <p>Following a review of the police report, a county juvenile department may refer a youth to an authorized diversion program, as long as they enter into a voluntary contract. Accountability contracts must be completed within one year, at an authorized diversion program.</p> | <p>County intake staffs receive delinquency referrals and screen them to determine whether to proceed formally or informally. In some places the County Attorney's office is involved. An example of their screening tool is the RAI.</p> <p>Oregon also tracks recidivism by way of the Juvenile Justice Information System. Annual Data & Evaluation reports are published by the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) Steering Committee. "This integrated; statewide electronic information system was developed in the 1990's to support positive outcomes for youth offenders, 80% of whom are handled by county juvenile departments." JJIS replaced various information systems that had previously prevented Oregon from tracking offenders across different agency lines. Also JJIS eliminated duplicate data among agencies and established a statewide standard for recording juvenile corrections info.</p> | Statutory funding by County | Circuit and county courts. | State authorized diversion programs. |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|---|---|---|---|------------------------|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">Pennsylvania^[32]</p> | <p><u>Decentralized State:</u> Juvenile intake, probation supervision are organized at the county level and fall under the administrative authority of the juvenile court judge.</p> <p><u>Highlight:</u> PA was chosen for 1st state to participate in the Model's for Change Project, a system-wide reform change project. New Juvenile Court Rules were created by the Committee of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court recently released governing delinquency cases. These new rules establish uniform practice and procedure for courts of common pleas. Two main revisions to the rules are introduction of the term "written allegation" and also changes the types of cases that the juvenile court masters may hear.</p> <p>Lastly, Pennsylvania is participating in a graduated sanctions project that ODJDP awarded to the Juvenile Sanctions Division of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.</p> <p>In PA police, juvenile probation officers, or prosecutors divert less serious juvenile offenders from the formal judicial process to diversion programs. Diversion programs offer youth the ability to reach community-based dispute resolution programs, youth-aid panels, offense-specifics education shoplifting, fire, drug etc.) as well as competency developing programs.</p> | <p>Lancaster County collects data with the Level One data collection tool. Also, the state made changes to its state juvenile justice data system to disaggregate race and ethnicity in its data collection.</p> <p>In 2010, the Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers and Juvenile Court Judges' Commission (JCJC) staff decided that the "Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy" (JJSES) was needed, to consolidate the gains of the previous five years "under one roof" and develop strategies to sustain and enhance those efforts. One year later, the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform at Georgetown University selected Berks County and the State of PA as one of four sites in the nation to participate in its Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project (JJSIP). Included in this, was use of assessments to guide case decisions by applying actuarial and statistically valid tools. Pennsylvania's objective is to incorporate "lessons learned" from Berks County's participation in JJSIP into the statewide Juvenile Justice System Enhancement Strategy. This strategy included data system improvement including the MAYSI and the YLS/CMI. When it was determined the YLS/CMI did not meet the needs of Pennsylvania's juvenile justice system, (which is based on the balanced and Restorative Justice model). A standardized, goal-focused, and strength-based case plan was under development as of 2012.</p> | <p>The Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency awards grants of federal and state funds to help local governments and non-profit organizations throughout the commonwealth to prevent and reduce crime, improve the justice systems and help victims of crime.</p> | <p>Juvenile Courts</p> | <p>Police Departments, Prosecutors Office.</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|------------------------------|---|
| Rhode Island ^[33] | <p><u>Centralized State:</u> The state intake operates most delinquency services for youth in RI. The state’s 10 Intake Units perform delinquency intake screening and conduct predisposition investigations.</p> <p>Statute established community-based diversion programs providing outreach and advocacy services to youth between 9-17 years of age. Youth can be delinquent or at-risk.</p> <p>The Youth Diversionary Project is designed to prevent delinquency and strengthen families with children again, aged 9 through 17 who have ben adjudicated for a first offense and who are at risk for truancy and running away from home. Services are provided through six private community-based agencies.</p> <p><u>Highlight:</u> In 1998 RI developed a Statewide Juvenile Hearing board Coordinator Position, appointed by the Chief Judge of the Family Court. The coordinator provides education, training, data, and collection analysis and other supports to the juvenile hearing boards, and teen courts found in most Rhode Island Cities and towns. Originally a pilot programs, the Hearing Board Coordinator positions has proved to be a successful and necessary function within the Family Court.</p> | <p>The State Justice Statistics (SJS) program for Statistical Analysis Centers (SAC) is administered by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) of the United States Department of Justice. The purpose of the program is to provide partial support to state governments for the establishment and operation of Statistical Analysis Centers to collect, analyze, and report statistics on crime and justice to federal, state, and local levels of government, as well as to share state-level information nationally.</p> <p>The Statistical Analysis Center of the Public Safety Grant Administration Office has performed a critical role in providing decision-makers with information on crime and the criminal justice system. The issues addressed by the Statistical Analysis Center span the entire criminal justice system and include juvenile delinquency, violent crime, property crime, and systems improvement issues.</p> | <p>The Rhode Island Justice Commission (RIJC) has administered JJDPA for Rhode Island since 1975.</p> <p>Since then, approximately \$28 million in JJDPA grant funds have been distributed to state, city, town and community groups for delinquency prevention, youth development projects and system reform efforts. Funding recommendations are developed by the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC), the permanent subcommittee of the RIJC, and then approved by the RIJC Policy Board.</p> <p>Additionally, In 2008, Rhode Island received \$600,000 through the JJDPA formula grant, \$48,360 in federal funds for community-based juvenile delinquency prevention through Title V of JJDPA and \$310,900 through the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG). The purpose of JAIBG funding is to assist states in developing programs and systems of accountability-based sanctions that hold youth responsible for their offenses and restore the bond between offenders and victimized communities. Yet as of 2012, substantial reduction in federal grant program dollars some of the elements of our past plans have had to be adjusted to accommodate declining funding revenue.</p> <p>Juvenile Formula grants, Juvenile Accountability Block Grants, Title V Grants, and sub-grants continue through the RI Public Safety Grant Administration Office.</p> | Family Court of Rhode Island | Juvenile Hearing Boards, Teen Courts. Community based-agencies. |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|--|--|---|--|--------------------------------|---|
| <u>South Carolina</u> ^[2, 15] | <p><u>Centralized State:</u> A single state executive department, the Department of Juvenile Justice, administers most services to delinquents in SC. DJJ’s Community Services Division administers prevention, some detention, intake, evaluation and community-based support services through 43 counties.</p> <p>The attorney who prosecutes delinquency cases in family court decides to divert the case. Diversion efforts in SC target low-risk youth. Most juvenile circuits offer arbitration, which is the SC’s largest diversion program. This program is run through the solicitor’s office, and uses trained volunteers as arbitrators. Other options are behavioral contracts and law-related education.</p> <p>Also, the Teen After-School Center (TASC) program has 24 sites around the state, and DJJ has implemented these programs thru partnerships with the Legislative Black Caucus, the AME church, the Children’s law office, Clemson University, The state Department of Education and local youth organizations, TASC offers tutoring, mentoring and skill development, for teens after school hrs.</p> <p>Also, The CHOICES program is available in eight counties, and it is currently DJJ’s goal to implement the curriculum statewide. This program relies on the restorative justice model</p> | <p>South Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice was selected to participate in “The Performance Measures for the Juvenile Justice System, as one of only four national demonstration sites in the country. SC. For this they created and tested “The juvenile justice system report card, with the intent of building core sets of juvenile performance measures for potential use nationwide. Also, NC DJJ has been recognized as a national leader in Performance-based Standards.</p> <p>As for intake screening, SC DJJ intake worker receives referrals and screens them for legal sufficiency. The intake worker makes recommendations, and risk assessments and needs assessments guide DJJ’s recommendation.</p> | State Agency: Fully State funded. | Department of Juvenile Justice | Community Services Division, Solicitors office. |
| <u>South Dakota</u> ^[1] | <p><u>Combination State:</u> The state of SD operates most delinquency services, but the responsibility is divided between the state court and the state executive branches. The Unified Judicial System’s Court Services Department, through seven judicial districts.</p> <p>By statute a state’s attorney must conduct a preliminary investigation to determine whether further action should be taken after receiving a delinquency referral. The attorney then decides whether to divert to a court-approved program. Informal action from court diversion happens outside the court system. Informal adjustment cannot exceed 3 months in length.</p> | In 2003 SD Complied with the Federal JJDP Act, re: sight and sound separation of juveniles, with adult inmates. This qualified SD for more than ½ million dollars in federal grants. | Formula grants, Block Grants, Title V Grants, Juvenile Accountability Block Grants | Circuit Courts | Court approved Juvenile Diversion Programs |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|---------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| <u>Tennessee</u> ^[1] | <p>Combination State: Delinquency is organized at the state and local levels. The Tennessee department of Children’s Services (DCS) administers probation in 91 counties, and aftercare services in all 95 counties. Juvenile courts in Davidson (Nashville), Hamilton (Chattanooga), Knox (Knoxville), and Shelby (Memphis) administer their own probation departments.</p> <p>According to statute, County Youth Services Officers/Probation officers can divert cases through informal adjustment. The case must be within the court’s jurisdiction, in the public’s best interest, youth’s best interest, and be consented to by the youth’s parent, and the youth. Informal adjustment cannot exceed 3 mos. Unless extended by the court.</p> <p>Eighty-one general session courts and 17 Private Act juvenile courts (courts established by legislation in certain counties) have jurisdiction over delinquency proceedings.</p> | <p>During juvenile proceedings, the juvenile court records are open to the juvenile court; police officers and law enforcement agencies; probation departments; courts officers and professional staff; officers of public institutions or agencies to which the child is committed; and counsel involved in the proceedings. The records are also open to any other person, agency, or institution with a legitimate interest in the proceeding with the permission of the court. If the youth complies with the court order, obeys the rules of diversion set by DCS, and commits no other offenses during that time; the court will release the youth from diversion and expunge the charges from the youth’s record.</p> | Not yet found | Delinquency Jurisdiction Courts | County Youth Service Officers |
| <u>Texas</u> ^[1] | <p>Decentralized State: Delinquency services are organized at both the state and local level. Depending on the county, juvenile probation departments or the prosecuting attorney is responsible for delinquency intake screening. By statute every county has a Juvenile Board that oversees juvenile justice system operations in that county. Juvenile boards are comprised of all district court judges and county court judges. Juvenile Boards Act as governing bodies of juvenile probation.</p> <p>There are two types of informal processing in Texas; Supervisory caution, and deferred prosecution. In supervisory caution cases, the probation department.</p> <p>STAR program provides short-term services to pre-adjudicated youth 7-9, as well as 10-16 who commit misdemeanors or could not be adjudicated delinquent. STAR offers outreach, crisis intervention, counseling, skills training for parents, and emergency services.</p> | <p>In 1995, the Texas Legislature made extensive changes in the Juvenile Justice System. These changes substantially changed the Family Code that outlined and previously defined the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS). The Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS), Texas Youth Commission (TYC), Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (TJPC), Criminal Justice Police Council (CJPC), and juvenile courts created a comprehensive tracking system that includes relevant data for agencies responsible for the arrest, prosecution, adjudication and correction of juvenile offenders. This system also provides usable data to support analyses by juvenile justice policymakers and planners.</p> <p>Upon arrest or intake, Law enforcement officers and juvenile justice personnel will collect information as prescribed by the Juvenile Justice Information System. The information will be forwarded to the Juvenile Justice Information System unless the child is not referred to the juvenile court within ten days.</p> | State Funded | Juvenile Board | Law Enforcement, Juvenile Probation Departments, Municipal Courts, or Justice of the Peace. |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| <u>Utah</u> ^[1] | <p>Combination State: Utah operates most delinquency services for youth, but responsibility is divided between executive and judicial branches.</p> <p>Juvenile probation officers can divert cases from court through “non-judicial adjustment.” In this instance, a petition is never filed and the juvenile probation officer handles the case without a court appearance. State probation standards limit the types of cases eligible for non-judicial process to first or second referrals for minor offenses, generally class B or lesser offenses. The services to available to support diversion with intervention vary by community. Non-judicial adjustments are limited to 90 days without court authorization.</p> <p>Youth courts are also another diversion option for Utah schools and law enforcement. Over 40 youth courts exist across the state.</p> | <p>Utah’s Case Management Model; The State Juvenile Court and Department of Human Services, Div. of Juvenile Justice developed a statewide Utah Juvenile Justice Case Management Model based on Functional Family Probation Resource Services. FFP/RS is a subset of case management skills based on Functional Family Therapy. The State Juvenile Court, and JJS implemented a Protective and Risk assessment tool with research supported designed into the updated information system that the two agencies share.</p> <p>Court and agencies Record Exchange (CARE) is a state launched web-based juvenile justice information sharing system in Nov 2005. The system is shared by Juvenile Court (probation) and the Division of Juvenile Justice Services. The system automates functions previously performed by hand and adds functionality for increasing duties of the juvenile court. CARE also supports Utah’s Case management Model by integrating the Model’s Protective and Risk Assessment Instrument.</p> | <p>Youth Court is sponsored by a local government, school, or law enforcement entity.</p> | <p>Juvenile Courts</p> | <p>Juvenile Probation Officers</p> |
| <u>Vermont</u> ^[1, 34, 35] | <p>Centralized State: The Family Services Division, Dept. for Children and Families.</p> <p>By Statute, The Attorney General must develop a juvenile court diversion project. The state’s attorney develops the criteria for deciding what types of offenses and offenders will be eligible for diversion and retains final discretion. Options include community service, restitution, and counseling. Windsor County offers youth court for 13-18yr olds.</p> | <p>Vermont keeps electronic court records through the Vermont Case Access System (VCAS), a judicial branch warehouse.[36] The case management system is named VTADS2. Information maintained in the database includes the charge, court appearance dates, detention status, warrants, motion practice, dispositions, court orders, detention stays, and commitment duration.</p> | <p>Funding from Vermont’s Attorney General to provide services to Non-profit programs.</p> | <p>Family Services Division Department for Children and Families</p> | <p>Non-profit organizations in each county.</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| Virginia ^[2, 15] | <p>Combination State: Delinquency services are both State and local level in VA. District Courts or “Juvenile and Domestic Relations Courts” exercise jurisdiction over delinquency proceedings. Juvenile and Domestic Relations courts are limited to jurisdictional trail courts. The Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) operates 31 Court Service Units (CSU) and supports the three locally operated CSUs.</p> <p>Intake officers, working for CSU’s decide whether to divert a case through informal resolution. Informal diversion is probation supervision without formal court action. Examples include referral to services, brief informal supervision. Juveniles are eligible for diversion if they are not alleged to have committed a felony, or have had no prior informal offense. The intake officer’s powers are commensurate to that of a judge, and they must develop a plan, which may include restitution, and community service. The juvenile and parents must agree to the plan. Informal supervision is limited to 90 days.</p> | <p>The Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice tracks re-arrest, reconviction and re-incarceration for 12 months after release from a juvenile correctional center.</p> <p>Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice utilizes an electronic data management system. DJJ’s electronic data management system is comprised of modules covering the full range of direct care and community-based activities.</p> | Fully Court/State Funded | Department of Juvenile Justice | Court Service Units |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|---------------------------|--|-----------------|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Washington ^[1] | <p><u>Decentralized State:</u> Delinquency Services are organized at both state and local level. Local courts admin probation except in Clallam, Skagit and Whatcom counties where allowed by statute the courts have transferred this responsibility to the county legislative authority.</p> <p>Statue regulated diversion. Most diversion programs are operated within probation departments' diversion units. After a prosecutor refers a case to the juvenile courts diversion until, the general procedure involves a diversion intake with the juvenile and parents, where juvenile decides court, or diversion. Diversion units are made up of citizen and volunteer, and act as Community Accountability Boards members to determine terms and conditions. Community Accountability Boards offer restitution, counseling, and education, mediation, and victim/offender reconciliation programs. There are alternatives for juveniles referred for possession of alcohol and drugs, seminars for juvenile referred for shoplifting.</p> | | <p>The legislation requires state funds for local juvenile courts to be administered as a "block grant."2A block grant is a sum of money distributed to a court with general provisions, resulting in local flexibility in how funds are spent.</p> <p>"Categorical grants," Washington's previous Mechanism for distributing state funds to juvenile courts, have more restrictive provisions. Title II and Title V funding.</p> <p>In 2012, the Washington State Partnership Council on Juvenile Justice has allocated Formula Grant funds in the 2012 three-year plan to the following nine federal program areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives to Detention • American Indian Pass-Through Allocation • Compliance Monitoring • Delinquency Prevention • Disproportionate Minority Contact – DMC • Juvenile Justice System Improvement • Planning & Admin Allocation • State Advisory Group Allocation (TA.) <p>Funding for programs directly comes from local county Juvenile Service departments, some through park and rec departments and through local government programs.</p> <p><u>Highlight:</u> Also of interest was a RFQQ Released for Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) Statewide Coordinator in Washington State.</p> | Probation Department's Diversion Unit | Community Accountability Boards |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| West Virginia ^[36, 37] | <p>Combination State: The state operates most delinquency services for youth in West Virginia, but state judicial and executive branches share responsibility.</p> <p>Depending on the judicial court, juvenile probation or prosecuting attorney’s office may decide to take informal action on the case. These dispositions include informal adjustment counseling, referral to counseling, and teen court programs.</p> <p>The Fourth Circuit (Wood and Wirt Counties) offers several diversion programs including the “Peace Program” with emphasis on anger control and empathy and the S.O.B.E.R. program to combat underage drinking. Other courts offer mentoring, community service, and anti-shoplifting programs.</p> <p>Also, The Juvenile Drug Court program seeks to divert non-violent juvenile offenders exhibiting alcohol or substance abuse behavior from the traditional juvenile court process to an intensive individualized treatment process. The goal is to reduce future court involvement for these youths. As of October 2013, there are fifteen (15) operating JDC programs comprising sixteen (16) Courts in Cabell, Wayne, Logan, Mercer, Putnam, Boone, Lincoln, Hancock/Brooke, Monongalia, Randolph, Kanawha, Jefferson, Harrison, Wood, Greenbrier, and McDowell counties. There is also a JDC in the planning stage for Raleigh County.</p> | <p>The West Virginia Juvenile Justice Database (JJDB) houses all juvenile probation statistical data for the state. Collection of data for evaluation of the juvenile drug courts began in the fall of 2009 and is also housed and synced with the West Virginia Juvenile Justice Database. Data for all youth referred to any operational juvenile drug court is collected uniformly across the state in a new evaluation database.</p> | <p>In 1999, the first drug court in West Virginia was piloted in Sixth Judicial Circuit (Cabell County) through U.S. Department of Justice grant funds and U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Service Administration treatment funds.</p> <p>Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention Juvenile Accountability Grant was awarded by the WV Division of Criminal Justice Services to the Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia in Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Program will fund accountability-based initiatives focused on both offenders and the juvenile justice system. West Virginia also receives Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Grant Programs under Title II funding and Title V funding.</p> | <p>Services in WV are coordinated by the Supreme Court of Appeals, Administrative Office, Division of Probation Services and are locally administered through the Circuit Courts.</p> | <p>Teen Courts Referral Counselors, or Probation Departments.</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|----------------------------------|---|--|---|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| Wisconsin ^[38] | <p><u>Decentralized State</u>: Delinquency services are organized at the local level in Wisconsin with social service departments providing community supervision for probation or aftercare.</p> <p><u>Highlight</u>: Wraparound Milwaukee, Wisconsin's largest urban county implemented wraparound Milwaukee. This innovative program funding strategy uses mental health "wrap around" services to reduce the placement of youth with serious emotional and behavioral health problems in residential treatment.</p> <p>Diversion from court, referred to as "deferred prosecution" or informal disposition in WI, is an agreement between the intake worker and the youth, and parents. Statute provides for deferring prosecution by agreement, and a deferred prosecution agreement can be entered when an intake worker determines that filing a petition and taking the case to court serves neither the youth nor public interest. The statute also provides specific guidelines for provisions, and limits it to no more than one yr. Agreements may be individual, family, or group counseling curfews, school attendance, alcohol and drug assessments, outpatient treatment community service and a range of other local services to meet the goals of justice code. Wisconsin offers a teen court network. Teen courts normally hear the cases of juveniles between the ages of 12 and 17 who have committed one non-violent offense or who are minor repeat offenders. Teen courts can vary greatly, anything from three to five-person teen tribunals that recommend sentencing, to a more formal court process where bailiffs, clerks, attorney's and jurors are all volunteer teens and the judge is an adult, usually a municipal or circuit court judge, law enforcement officer, attorney or other community member.</p> | <p>As of a 2010 survey, only thirteen of twenty seven counties executing diversion track diversion data.</p> | <p>Wraparound Milwaukee was implemented in 1995 with a 15 million, 6-yr federal grant which helped to encourage collaboration between the public agencies for child welfare, mental health, Medicaid and juvenile justice. The local Children's Court Center and juvenile probation are primary partners in the program. In 2004 57% of Wraparound Milwaukee enrollees entered the program on delinquency referrals, and 57% of wraparound funding came from funding streams directed at delinquents and status offenders.</p> <p>Teen courts in Wisconsin are funded through county human services departments, county boards, school districts, the United Way, the Office of Justice Assistance, and private donations. Several also receive in-kind assistance of space from county courthouses and other city and county facilities. In addition, some courts charge a small fee for their services, while others hold annual fundraisers.</p> <p>Often teen courts require hiring a coordinator to train and manage volunteers, assist with intake, and process cases. The budget for these programs ranges from \$20,000 to \$60,000 annually.</p> | <p>Courts and Prosecutors.</p> | <p>Intake workers.</p> |

| State | Approach/Model | Data Collection | Funding Structure | Authority Housed Under | Managed By |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| Wyoming ^[39, 40] | <p>Centralized State: With exception of secure detention and limited local probation services for youth in Wyoming. The district/ county attorney's office is responsible for youth in Wyoming. The district county attorney's office is responsible for delinquency intake screening.</p> <p>Juvenile Drug Courts are an available option in Wyoming. There are 17 drug courts, at least 4 of which are juvenile.</p> <p>First time offenders or those charged with minor offenses may be diverted to such programs as teen court, community services, and counseling. Diversion programs may be run by the Department of Family Services, the Division of Family Services, the Juvenile Court, or a prosecutor's office. Wyoming youth came up with, and lobbied for the idea of Teen Courts, during a Youth Summit held by the Wyoming Bar Association. The Teen Court legislation passed in 1996.</p> | <p>When a youth is cited and released, a copy of the citation is sent to the county/district attorney's office. This gives county prosecuting attorneys an opportunity to spot patterns, suspected repeat offenders, etc. and influence court selection according to appropriate services staffed by different courts.</p> <p>As of a 2010 report, Wyoming had implemented a statewide PACT Assessment and created legislation authorizing central review of juvenile charges and citations. Division of Family Services was receiving field assistance in staffing Single Point of Entry and staffing diversion programs. Community juvenile service boards were identified as a recommendation to identify facilities for central intake and identify community services and providers that can offer support programs (including data support and assessment within these programs).</p> | <p>The Campbell County Diversion Program is funded by the County Attorney's Office for two full-time diversion officer positions and splits the cost of a part-time administrative assistant with the City of Gillette. The City of Gillette and the county split the cost of the Community Service director based on the tickets issued. The Safe and Healthy Schools grant funds two full-time diversion officer positions also.</p> <p>The Juvenile Justice Council receives operational funds and serves as the State Advisory Group (SAG) under the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP). Per Wyoming Statute, members must have training, experience and special knowledge concerning the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency and administration of juvenile justice. The SACJJ is required to make recommendation for an equitable funding formula for distribution of funds to community juvenile service boards. Seventeen county efforts were funded with money from the non-participating grant award. Counties were awarded Title V Community Prevention funding counties.</p> | <p>District/County Attorneys/ Department of Family Services</p> | <p>Division of Juvenile Services, Juvenile Court or Prosecutors</p> |

RESOURCES AND CITATIONS:

1. Griffin, P., King, Melanie,, "National Overviews." *State Juvenile Justice Profiles*. . 2006, National Center for Juvenile Justice.: Pittsburg, PA:.
2. National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice, *Improving Diversion Policies and Programs for Justice-Involved Youth with Co-occurring Mental and Substance Use Disorders*, in *An Integrated Policy Academy/Action Network Initiative*. 2013: Alexandria, VA.
3. Models for Change Juvenile Diversion Workgroup. *Juvenile Diversion Guidebook* 2011. Washington D.C. .
4. State of Hawaii. *Juvenile Justice Information System*. 2014 [cited 2014 July 2]; Available from: <http://ag.hawaii.gov/cpia/>.
5. Chicago Area Project. *Programs: Juvenile Justice*. 2014 [cited 2014 July 11]; Available from: <http://www.chicagoareaproject.org/programs/cat/juvenile-justice>.
6. Illinois Association of Juvenile Justice Councils. *Illinois Initiatives*. 2014 [cited 2014 July 3]; Available from: <http://www.iajjc.org/index.php>.
7. Illinois Balanced and Restorative Justice. *Data and Evaluation*. 2014 [cited 2014 July 7]; Available from: <http://www.ibarji.org/findus.asp>.
8. Illinois Department of Health and Human Services. *Replay Illinois*. 2014 [cited 2014 July]; Available from: <http://www.dhs.state.il.us/page.aspx?item=31991>.
9. Jacobs, L., Bray, J. , *Ogle County's Juvenile Justice Council*, in *Models for Change: Systems Change in Juvenile Justice, Inovation Brief,,* The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Editor. 2013: Chicago, IL.
10. Juvenile Justice in Illinois, *The Role of the Illinois State Bar Association*,. Illinois Bar Journal, , 2011. **Vol. 99**,(173).
11. State of Illinois, *Phone Conversation on Juvenile Diversion*, S. Moeckel, Editor. 2014.
12. The Illinois Balanced and Restorative Justice Project. *What's Happening in Illinois*. 2014 [cited 2014 July]; Available from: <http://www.ibarji.org/findus.asp>.
13. Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning. *About CJJP*. 2014 [cited 2014 July 7]; Available from: http://www.humanrights.iowa.gov/cjip/about_cjip/index.html.
14. Kentucky Court of Justice. *Family and Juvenile Justice*. 2014 [cited 2014 July 7]; Available from: <http://courts.ky.gov/aoc/Pages/default.aspx>.
15. The MacArthur Foundation, *SAMHSA-MacArthur Select States for Initiative to Aid Youth with Behavioral Health Needs*. 2014: The MacArthur Foundation.
16. Jindal, B., The Louisiana Legislature,, *Louisiana Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Advisory Board*. 2010: Baton Rouge, LA.
17. State of Louisiana. *Title V*. 2008 [cited 2014 July 7]; Available from: <http://lcle.la.gov/programs/titlev.asp>.
18. State of Louisiana. *Stakeholders*. 2014 [cited 2014 July 8]; Available from: <http://www.louisianajuvenilejustice.la.gov/index.cfm?md=misc&tmp=aboutStkAdvisBoard>.
19. Technology Engineers, *UCR Online*. 2008: Baton Rouge, Louisiana
20. Noreus, B., G. Shaler, and G. D., *Maine Juvenile Justice Data Book*. 2012, Maine Statistical Analysis Center: Portland, ME.
21. University of Southern Maine, *The Maine Juvenile Justice Task Force: An Integrated Approach to Transforming Maine's Juvenile Justice System*. 2010, Muskie School of Public Service: Portland, ME.
22. State of Maryland Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prvention. *Juvenile Justice Delinquency Program*. 2014 [cited 2014 July 8]; Available from: <http://www.goccp.maryland.gov/grants/program-details.php?id=14>.
23. Swayze, D., & Buskovick, B., *Minnesota Juvenile Diversion: A Summary of Statewide Practices and Programming, Executive Summary*. 2012, Office of Justice Programs.
24. Missouri Department of Social Services. *Division of Youth Services*. 2014 [cited 2014 July 8]; Available from: <http://dss.mo.gov/dys/faq/juv.html>.
25. The Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, *Diversion In Nebraska: FY 2012/2013 Annual Report to the Governor & Nebraska Legislature*. 2014, Nebraska Crime Commision: Omaha, NE.
26. Nevada Department of Health and Human Services. *Nevada Division of Child and Family Services, Grant Programs*. 2007 [cited 2014 July 8]; Available from: http://www.dcfs.state.nv.us/DCFS_JJS_GrantsProgram.htm.
27. State of New Jersey, *New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) 2011 Annual Data Report*. 2012.
28. The State of New Jersey; Department of Law and Public Safety. *Juvenile Justice Commision; Prevention and Early Intervention Index Page*. 2014 [cited 2014 July 8]; Available from: http://www.nj.gov/oag/jic/localized_programs.html#about.
29. David E. Scussel, *Analysis of the Impact of Juvenile Justice Programming in Nine New Mexico Counties*. 2012, New Mexico Children, Youth and Families Department: Albuquerque, NM. p. 47.

30. New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. *New York State Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Program*, . 2014 [cited 2014 July 8]; Available from: <http://www.criminaljustice.ny.gov/ofpa/juvelprevfactsheet.htm>.
31. Division of Juvenile Justice, *Juvenile Diversion in North Carolina*. 2013, North Carolina Department of Public Safety: Raleigh, NC. Available from: <http://www.ncdps.gov/div/JJ/DJJ-DiversionReport-final-web.pdf>.
32. Pennsylvania Department of Juvenile Justice, *Pennsylvania's Juvenile Justice Enhancement Strategy*. 2012, Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD): Harrisburg, PA.
33. State of Rhode Island State Advisory Group on Juvenile Justice, *Rhode Island 2012-2015 Three Year Plan* 2011: Providence, RI.
34. State of Vermont. *Family Services Division Policies*. 2014 [cited 2014 July 10]; Available from: <http://dcf.vermont.gov/fsd/policies#Juvenile>.
35. Vermont Association Of Court Diversion Programs. *Vermont Court Diversion; Overview*. 2012 [cited 2014 July 10]; Available from: <http://vtcourtdiversion.org/>.
36. State of West Virginia. *West Virginia Division of Justice and Community Services*. 2014 [cited 2014 July 9]; Available from: <http://www.djcs.wv.gov/grant-programs/jabg/Pages/default.aspx>.
37. Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia, A.O., *Juvenile Probation in WV*. 2008-2009, WV Division of Criminal Justice Services: Charleston, WV.
38. Small, S., Reynolds, A., O'Connor, C., and Cooney, S., *What Works, Wisconsin. What Science Tells Us about Cost-Effective Programs for Juvenile Delinquency Prevention*. 2005, University of Wisconsin–Madison Schools of Human Ecology and Social Work,: Madison, WI.
39. County of Campbell Wyoming. *Juvenile Diversion*. 2014 [cited 2014 July 2014]; Available from: <http://www.ccgov.net/141/Juvenile-Diversion>, .
40. State of Wyoming, *Report to Joint Appropriations Interim Committee and Joint Judiciary Interim Committee*, in *Senate File 0066* D.o.F. Services, Editor. 2008, Wyoming Community Juvenile Services Boards: Cheyenne, WY.