

# **COORDINATED ENFORCEMENT PLAN**

## **A COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY JUVENILE JUSTICE PLAN** For the Charlottesville /Albemarle Juvenile Justice System

**July 25, 2000**

Prepared for the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee  
by Stillmeadow-Benchmark Associates, Inc.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC) was established by the Charlottesville / Albemarle Commission on Children and Families in September of 1998. Both jurisdictions had recognized the need for systemic improvements in juvenile justice services, most notably within a continuum of graduated sanctions with increased accountability for juvenile offenders. Funding to support these efforts was obtained through a Department of Criminal Justice Services grant.

Through a series of work sessions for the Committee and its work groups, action plans were developed in four priority areas: Barriers to Information Sharing, Risk and Needs Assessment, Evaluation and Juvenile Court System (Policies and Procedures). Specifically, the JJAC identified what they considered the most important issues within the system where short-term interventions (12 months) based on best practices and local research data would yield measurable results. These priority areas and action plans are the basis for the first Charlottesville / Albemarle Coordinated Enforcement Plan (comprehensive community juvenile justice plan). This brings the JJAC to the successful completion each of the objectives outlined in its original grant, including the following planning and development efforts:

- 1) **DEVELOPMENT OF THE JJAC AS THE LEAD JUVENILE JUSTICE PLANNING BODY (ACTING AS THE REGION'S JUVENILE CRIME ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE);**
- 2) **IDENTIFICATION OF BEST PRACTICES IN ASSESSMENT, INTERVENTION AND EVALUATION OF JUVENILE JUSTICE SERVICES, THROUGH LOCAL AND NATIONAL RESEARCH;**
- 3) **CREATION OF A PROFILE OF LOCAL JUVENILE OFFENDERS AND THE COURT SYSTEM, INCLUDING AN UPDATE ON MINORITY OVER-REPRESENTATION, TRENDS IN ARREST AND INTAKE, DIVERSIONS AND STATUS OFFENDERS, AND COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS OF LOCAL JUVENILE OFFENSE DATA;**
- 4) **COMPLETION OF AN INVENTORY OF EXISTING LOCAL JUVENILE JUSTICE SERVICES, AND A 'WALK-THROUGH' OF THE LOCAL SYSTEM FOR STAKEHOLDERS;**
- 5) **AN ASSESSMENT OF RISK AND NEED FACTORS IN RELATION TO JUVENILE COURT PLACEMENTS OVER THE PAST TWO YEARS;**
- 6) **IDENTIFICATION OF CURRENT INFORMATION SHARING PRACTICES AMONG EACH OF THE REGION'S JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM COMPONENTS (AS THE FIRST PHASE OF IDENTIFICATION AND REDUCTION OF BARRIERS);**
- 7) **DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE ENFORCEMENT PLAN (CEP), A STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE REGION'S JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM.**

The Charlottesville / Albemarle Comprehensive Enforcement Plan draws on the key elements of strategic planning, as well as the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's model for development of a Comprehensive Strategy. Rather than focus on a single agency or funding stream, the Committee brought all of the public and private providers within the juvenile justice system together in a long-term, structured planning process for the first time. The result is a common set of Visions (or broad, long-term goals for success) for key components of the juvenile justice system, along with strategies for achieving each of those visions through research into local and national practices, ongoing planning and the concentrated efforts of the four workgroups targeting each of the priority areas.

**VISION: Youth will receive earlier, more effective interventions through the free flow of information between juvenile justice and service agencies, reducing the duplication of effort, and eliminating unnecessary firewalls.**

### **PRIORITY AREA: Barriers to Information Sharing**

#### **OBJECTIVES**

- 1) Identify the current barriers to information sharing within the Charlottesville / Albemarle juvenile justice system.
- 2) Identify and implement best practices to reduce the identified barriers.

#### **ACTIONS TAKEN**

- The JJAC conducted stakeholder meetings, focus groups and structured interviews to identify issues and concerns within the regional JJ system.
- Funding was acquired through the Department of Criminal Justice Services to support research on existing information sharing processes through a survey of stakeholders. The research is now complete, and a report is available under separate cover.

**VISION: Recidivism is reduced through sanctions and services based on timely assessment of individual needs and level of risk to the community.**

### **PRIORITY AREA: Risk and Needs Assessment**

#### **OBJECTIVES**

- 1) Development of a (locally validated) risk / needs assessment instrument for use with court involved youth.

## Coordinated Enforcement Plan:

### Charlottesville /Albemarle Juvenile Justice System

4

- 2) Development of an assessment process which facilitates appropriate, cost-effective placements that reflect graduated responses to levels of risk and need.

#### **ACTIONS TAKEN**

- **The Risk Assessment Workgroup Reviewed existing risk / needs assessment tools in use nationally which provided data on the most meaningful outcome measures, as determined by consensus among stakeholders.**
- **The Workgroup and contract staff evaluated the current Department of Juvenile Justice Risk Assessment Tool for local use, which determined that a more detailed, need focused instrument is required.**
- **The Workgroup and staff are assessing the role of the Juvenile Court Assessment Center and the Court Services Unit in the risk / needs assessment process.**
- **JJAC members formed an ad hoc committee and assisted the Detention Commission in design of the new juvenile detention facility, to include an assessment center available 24 hours, on-site.**

**VISION: Decreased first time offenses and recidivism, achieved by basing program design and funding on measurable outcomes developed through community consensus.**

#### **PRIORITY AREA: Evaluation**

##### **OBJECTIVES**

- 1) To determine the perceived impact of the juvenile justice system on youth and their families.
- 2) To apply the outcome-based measurement process to selected juvenile justice providers.

In addition, the JJAC will develop a matrix or other structure that allows evaluation of sanctions / services at two levels: correspondence of assessed level of risk / need and selected placement, and the comparative outcomes of placements based on formal versus informal risk assessment methods.

##### **ACTIONS TAKEN**

- The JJAC expanded participation in Charlottesville's Outcome-Based Measurement initiative, recommending a process for agencies outside of city government to collaborate in resource allocation based on results.

- The Committee brought state-managed components of the juvenile court system together with City and County agencies for a joint planning process.

**VISION: The cost-effectiveness and productivity of the court system are increased through education and customer-service initiatives that create an effective collaboration between the court and its customers.**

## **PRIORITY AREA: The Juvenile Court System**

### **OBJECTIVES**

- 1) Orient juvenile court users as to the policies and procedures of the juvenile court system.

### **ACTIONS TAKEN**

- The Juvenile Court Service Workgroup has initiated the first local mechanism (and perhaps one of few in the country) for obtaining direct customer feedback in a court system.

*With the completion of this first comprehensive plan, the JJAC has determined a course of action for the next twelve months, and beyond, which will continue to move the range of independently functioning stakeholders towards a unified, collaborative structure for juvenile justice programming. The complete Comprehensive Enforcement Plan document includes further background on the projects undertaken by the JJAC, a detailed grid of activities related to developing and implementing the Plan, and a Narrative Timeline for implementation, along with Action Plans from each priority area Workgroup. Because a plan is a means, not an end, it is a living document that the Committee will review semi-annually and revise as necessary. A copy of the full CEP is available through the Office of the Juvenile Justice Coordinator.*

## Background

The Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC) was established by the Charlottesville / Albemarle Commission on Children and Families in September of 1998. Both jurisdictions had recognized the need for systemic improvements in juvenile justice services and obtained a Department of Criminal Justice Services grant to create the forum to address this need. The Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG), which is the source for Department of Criminal Justice Services Accountability Based Sanctions (ABS) grants, seeks the reduction of delinquency and recidivism through improvements in the juvenile justice system, including increased accountability for juvenile offenders, most notably within a continuum of graduated (increasingly restrictive) sanctions.

The JJAC recognized the need to approach such improvements systemically, determining early on that sanctions are a system of responses, neither punishment nor treatment alone, which include those items available to the court and those traditionally used by other public and private agencies. Systemic approaches have the greatest chance of success when each component of the system is an active participant in any proposed change. Bringing the stakeholders together during the first year of the ABS grant through a team development model has allowed a system agenda to develop in lieu of often competing agency agendas.

Staff have provided guidance and support since the Committee's inception through the Juvenile Justice Coordinator, Rory Carpenter, and the Director of the Commission, Saphira Baker, insuring management and administration of the DCJS grant, attending JJAC meetings, participating in planning efforts, and providing guidance for contract staff (including Stillmeadow-Benchmark Associates, Inc.).

## Initial Accomplishments

The JJAC has become the central planning body for development and implementation of a comprehensive juvenile justice system in the region, acting as the Juvenile Crime Enforcement Committee for the City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County. Bringing stakeholders and decision-makers together, the Committee identifies, addresses and resolves issues which would otherwise reduce the impact of sanctions and the ability of the system to intervene in delinquent behavior in a timely, effective manner. Through ongoing work sessions, two planning retreats, and the development of four targeted workgroups, the Committee was able to focus on critical areas and follow up on specific assignments and tasks as they developed. As of August 1999 five of the seven original grant objectives had been completed:

### **8) Development of the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee**

[In addition to the initial JJAC members, stakeholder participation was expanded to include the Clerk of the Court, children's rights advocates, and additional representatives of the local court and law enforcement agencies.]

**9) Completion of facilitation, research and support services through contract services, including:**

- A literature review of best practices (nationwide);
- Research and literature review of approaches to risk and needs assessment;
- Analysis of existing ABS efforts within Virginia through structured interviews with one or more staff in grant localities;
- Comparison of risk levels (as defined by the Department of Juvenile Justice Risk Assessment Tool) to outcomes and recidivism among adjudicated youth.
- Research into the existing barriers to information sharing among juvenile justice system agencies, and development of improved methodologies to reduce those barriers.

**10) Collection and analysis of local juvenile crime statistics:**

The most recent available juvenile justice statistics and reports have been collected<sup>1</sup>, including:

- Arrest data for Charlottesville and Albemarle, 1990-1997.
- Intake complaints by FIPS Code and resolution status, 1998.
- Review of cases diverted at Intake, 1998-99.
- Academic / School performance statistics for the City and County, including disciplinary incidents, drop out and graduation rates, criminal offenses, 98-99 school year.
- Department of Juvenile Justice intake and offense data (statewide), 1998.
- Measures of youth well-being at local, state and federal levels, 1998
- National offense / court data for comparison, 1997.

*As indicated in item 2, the following data is currently being collected and analyzed:*

- Outcomes and recidivism for adjudicated youth, 1997 and 1998. Comparison of outcomes to assessed level of risk, using the DJJ Risk Assessment Tool.
- Data maintained by each agency involved with youth in the juvenile justice system, including both electronic and paper files, and existing agreements to share data among agencies, including currently utilized releases.

**11) Completion of an inventory of existing local juvenile justice services:**

The Juvenile Justice Coordinator identified existing resources for youth involved in the juvenile justice system as part of the initial orientation of the JJAC. In addition, the Coordinator provided the committee with a 'walk-through' of the juvenile justice system as it operates in the Charlottesville /Albemarle region (SEE attached), defining key decision points and sanction options at each of those decision points.

---

<sup>1</sup> Due to differing collection periods and reporting, the most recent data can be as much as two years old. For example, state arrest data for 1998 was not available when the report was prepared.

## Coordinated Enforcement Plan:

### Charlottesville /Albemarle Juvenile Justice System

8

To update and provide detail for that overview, structured interviews were conducted with a full range of stakeholders over a two month period during the Spring of 1999, including line staff, supervisors, and agency heads, as well as the regional DJJ office. (SEE attached format). A focus group was then conducted with Probation Officers, in which they identified key services, roadblocks to using those services, and the critical unmet needs for local youth and their families.

Two JJAC Visioning Retreats were held, identifying the relationships among stakeholders and service components within the juvenile justice system and the critical pathways for service. The perceived strengths and weaknesses of system components, and the critical issues generated by those strengths and weaknesses, were then assigned to one or more work groups for action.

#### **12) Framing of a strategic plan for the juvenile justice system:**

Through a series of JJAC meetings and work sessions, the action plans [SEE Appendix A] were developed, and these are the basis for the Coordinated Enforcement Plan. This brings the JJAC to the successful completion of Objectives Six and Seven from the original grant (the focus of the second year continuation), with the addition of a third objective focused on development of an evaluation model for the local juvenile justice system.

In keeping with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's (OJJDP's) *Comprehensive Strategy* approach, development of a regional plan means finding the 'commons' for those limited resources, moving from parallel, independent institutions to an integrated, collaborative system. Rather than focus on the traditional reactive roles of the juvenile system alone, a comprehensive strategy seeks to:

- Strengthen the family;
- Support social institutions;
- Promote delinquency prevention;
- Generate a graduated structure of immediate, effective interventions; and
- Prevent recidivism among the most serious, violent and chronic offenders.

***The Workgroups described above are completing the remaining 3 goals of the grant:***

#### **13) Developing a strategic juvenile justice plan:**

At its January 2000 retreat and planning sessions, the JJAC determined four Priority Task Areas that serve as the focus of the region's first Comprehensive Juvenile Justice Plan. Each Priority Task represents an area where the full committee felt there is an opportunity for significant system-wide growth and improvement in juvenile justice, fulfilling the Committee's long-range vision: the reduction of delinquency and

## Coordinated Enforcement Plan:

### Charlottesville /Albemarle Juvenile Justice System

9

recidivism through improvements in the juvenile justice system, including increased accountability for juvenile offenders within a continuum of graduated, sanctions.

This document, along with the attached Action Plans from the four ongoing Committees, and the Coordinated Enforcement Plan grid (Exhibit One), constitute the region's first strategic juvenile justice plan, or Coordinated Enforcement Plan. Specifically, the JCAC identified what they considered the most important issues within the system where short-term interventions (12 months) based on best practices and local research data would yield measurable results. The following table identifies key components of the Committee's vision for youth and families in the community, and the Priority Areas they feel will help them realize that vision. An additional Priority Area, Research, was also identified, with data collection and analysis tasks incorporated into the work of each ongoing committee.

<b>PRIORITY AREA</b>	<b>VISION OF SUCCESS</b>
Barriers to Information Sharing	Earlier, more effective interventions result from the free flow of information between juvenile justice and service agencies, reducing the duplication of effort and eliminating unnecessary firewalls.
Risk and Needs Assessment	Recidivism is reduced through sanctions and services based on timely assessment of individual needs and level of risk to the community.
Evaluation	Optimal results, including decreased first time offenses and recidivism, are achieved by basing program design, and funding, on measurable outcomes developed through community consensus.
Court and Court Services Unit – Education of Court Users	Cost-effectiveness and productivity of the court system are increased through education and customer-service initiatives that create an effective collaboration between the court and its customers.

**14) Developing a system of guidelines for implementing Accountability-Based Sanctions:**

As indicated later in this document, and detailed in both the CEP grid and the Action Plans, the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (acting as the region's Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition) is currently developing a comprehensive model for Accountability-Based Sanctions. This includes a risk and needs assessment process and a matrix of services for high, medium and low risk youth (as determined by the assessment process).

**15) Developing an instrument to evaluate the local system of juvenile justice services and sanctions:**

The Evaluation Committee's work includes evaluating the local justice system, and revising both programs and system processes in response to the outcome data, as described in their Action Plan.

## **Strategic Planning Approach**

Every successful strategic planning initiative ultimately incorporates five key elements that can be applied to the task at hand:

*-- **Insuring Leadership and Commitment** – Acquiring local support by finding out what motivates the community; identifying 'sponsors' and confirming leadership support.*

Within the JJAC, the focus is on **ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**, assuring that a working team is established which provides ongoing leadership and oversight for the planning and the implementation processes. A number of community justice plans throughout the country have remained just that, plans, without continuing sponsorship and the accountability created by oversight. In fact, the membership of the JJAC was expanded to assure broad-based support, which is further insured by the sponsorship and oversight of the Commission on Children and Families.

*-- **Framing the Problem** – Defining and convening stakeholders to assess the community's risks and resources, including human resources.*

The JJAC has successfully focused on **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**, generating an unprecedented collaboration among all of those with an investment in the success of intervention efforts aimed at juvenile crime (as well as the ancillary role of prevention efforts). Many 'unspoken' issues and points of conflict were surfaced and openly discussed for the first time, outside of the context of an immediate crisis.

## Coordinated Enforcement Plan:

### Charlottesville /Albemarle Juvenile Justice System

11

*-- **Determining What Works** – Identifying promising approaches and research-proven models both inside and outside the community; identifying the existing range of sanctions and services, and the critical gaps in those services.*

The planning process, including the efforts of targeted JJAC work groups, has incorporated **BEST PRACTICES** from within the local systems, and from program research on a national scale, to provide a research base for decisions. Proven sanctions and services, as well as promising approaches, are being utilized as benchmarks for risk / needs assessment, evaluation, and the range of local sanctions and approaches.

*-- **Defining Success** – Combining research findings and local values to determine accepted and acceptable outcome measures.*

This is the **EVALUATION** component of the Charlottesville / Albemarle plan. To maintain support and momentum for any system change, it is essential to have both agreed-upon measures of success, and ongoing gauges of progress, that are universally supported. Without local consensus on what constitutes success, there is little impetus for system change, prioritization of funding, or support of particular service/sanctions, beyond the individual agendas of agencies.

*-- **Achieving Consensus** – Determining priorities and possibilities that meet the shared needs or ‘commons’ among stakeholders, and acting on shared vision, goals, and objectives.*

Creating a relatively seamless transition between planning and action requires that **IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN** occur in small segments throughout the planning process, rather than being seen as a separate activity. Putting the plan into action is where many (or even most) planning efforts break down, leading to frustration over repetition of the planning process without visible changes.

Exhibit One on the following page, *Development of a Coordinated Enforcement Plan*, frames the activities for each of the five elements discussed above in chronological order (of their initiation), and the following Narrative Timeline details approaches, methodology and a projected schedule for those events. The activities required of the JJAC’s ongoing Workgroups are also detailed in the attached Action Plans for each of those groups.

**THIS PAGE  
INTENTIONALLY  
LEFT BLANK**

# DEVELOPMENT OF A COMPREHENSIVE COORDINATED ENFORCEMENT PLAN

## Outline of the Juvenile Justice Planning and Implementation Process For the Charlottesville / Albemarle Region

**KEY:** Items in BLUE have been completed Items in RED type are underway Items in BLACK are outstanding tasks

*Responsible parties for items not designated for specific staff or workgroups are to be determined.*

<u>ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT</u> Ensuring Leadership & Commitment	<u>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</u> Framing the problem	BEST PRACTICES Determining What Works: Inside and Outside the System	<b>EVALUATION DESIGN</b> Defining Success	IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN Achieving Consensus: Priorities and Possibilities
Localities establish Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee.	JJAC identifies stakeholders in juvenile justice system.			
	JJAC and staff identify existing inventory of programs and services drawn from the existing OOH Workplan, VJC <sup>3</sup> A Plan, and local CSB Prevention Plan and Initiative.			
	Staff conduct 'walk-through' of juvenile justice system for stakeholders.			

Coordinated Enforcement Plan:

Charlottesville /Albemarle Juvenile Justice System

<p><u>ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT</u> Ensuring Leadership &amp; Commitment</p>	<p><u>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</u> Framing the problem</p>	<p>BEST PRACTICES Determining What Works: Inside and Outside the System</p>	<p><b>EVALUATION DESIGN</b> Defining Success</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN Achieving Consensus: Priorities and Possibilities</p>
<p>Contract staff conduct stakeholder meetings, focus groups and structured interviews to identify issues and concerns within regional JJ system.</p>				
		<p>Contract staff provide JJAC with research on best practices to guide Plan development.</p>		<p>Contract staff provide JJAC with review of current implementation and planning practices by Virginia ABS grantees.</p>
<p>JJAC determines priority issues and local juvenile justice system needs.</p>				<p>JJAC determines priority issues and local juvenile justice system needs.</p>
<p>Risk Assessment Workgroup forms and develops plan for implementation of regional risk and needs assessment process.</p>	<p>Workgroup determines existing risk / needs assessment tools which provide data on chosen outcome measures.</p>			

Coordinated Enforcement Plan:

Charlottesville /Albemarle Juvenile Justice System

<p><u>ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT</u> Ensuring Leadership &amp; Commitment</p>	<p><u>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</u> Framing the problem</p>	<p>BEST PRACTICES Determining What Works: Inside and Outside the System</p>	<p><b>EVALUATION DESIGN</b> Defining Success</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN Achieving Consensus: Priorities and Possibilities</p>
		<p>JJAC and contract staff design and implement evaluation of current DJJ Risk Assessment Tool</p>		
		<p><i>Workgroup reviews role of Juvenile Court Assessment Center in risk assessment.</i></p>		
<p>Strategic planning with JJAC, defining its role in objectives and action steps for each of its priority issues.</p>				<p>Strategic planning with JJAC.</p>
<p>Information Sharing Workgroup forms.  Evaluation Workgroup forms.  Juvenile Court System Workgroup forms.</p>	<p>Contract staff:  Research existing information sharing processes: survey of stakeholders.  <i>Research aftercare practices (national models). Review local use of aftercare / parole services.</i></p>			

Coordinated Enforcement Plan:

Charlottesville /Albemarle Juvenile Justice System

<p><u>ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT</u> Ensuring Leadership &amp; Commitment</p>	<p><u>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</u> Framing the problem</p>	<p>BEST PRACTICES Determining What Works: Inside and Outside the System</p>	<p><b>EVALUATION DESIGN</b> Defining Success</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN Achieving Consensus: Priorities and Possibilities</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;">→</p> <p>Staff report to JJAC on Aftercare issues and needs.</p>		<p><b>JJAC identifies aftercare needs and the role of the community in providing aftercare.</b></p>	<p>JJAC defines action steps to address aftercare needs.</p>
<p>JJAC and staff define their roles after completion of contract staff projects, develop sustainability plan for JJAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ resource development</li> <li>➤ membership and recruitment</li> <li>➤ relationship to CCF and others</li> </ul>				
				<p>Implement priority action steps for aftercare sanctions and services.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">→</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">→</p> <p>Contract staff and Information Sharing Workgroup report to JJAC on existing barriers to information sharing.</p>		<p>Workgroup and JJAC develop consensus on primary barriers.</p>	<p>JJAC defines action steps to address primary barriers, develop or adopt universal release.</p>

Coordinated Enforcement Plan:

Charlottesville /Albemarle Juvenile Justice System

<p><u>ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT</u> Ensuring Leadership &amp; Commitment</p>	<p><u>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</u> Framing the problem</p>	<p>BEST PRACTICES Determining What Works: Inside and Outside the System</p>	<p>EVALUATION DESIGN Defining Success</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN Achieving Consensus: Priorities and Possibilities</p>
	<p><b>Court System Workgroup surveys knowledge and educational needs of system stakeholders:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ citizens</li> <li>➤ providers</li> <li>➤ gatekeepers</li> </ul>	<p>JJAC updates program and service list, incorporates into service matrix.</p>		
			<p><b>Implement barrier reduction efforts: trial run with sample files.</b></p>	

Coordinated Enforcement Plan:

Charlottesville /Albemarle Juvenile Justice System

<p><u>ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT</u> Ensuring Leadership &amp; Commitment</p>	<p><u>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</u> Framing the problem</p>	<p>BEST PRACTICES Determining What Works: Inside and Outside the System</p>	<p><b>EVALUATION DESIGN</b> Defining Success</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN Achieving Consensus: Priorities and Possibilities</p>
		<p>Contract staff and RA Workgroup report to JJAC on local validity, reliability of DJJ assessment instrument:</p> <p>Agree on defining factors for risk and needs assessment of individuals.</p> <p>Adopt and revise assessment tool(s) and processes.</p>		
<p>→</p>		<p>Evaluation Workgroup and stakeholders review Graduated Sanction matrices currently in use.</p>	<p>The Workgroup completes a risk/needs/services matrix, identifying desired levels of intervention for high, medium and low levels of risk and need.</p>	<p>Staff implements revised assessment process.</p>
	<p>Court System Workgroup identifies educational priorities and strategies to reach stakeholders.</p>		<p>Staff and JJAC revise, implement barrier reduction efforts based on pilot.</p>	

Coordinated Enforcement Plan:

Charlottesville /Albemarle Juvenile Justice System

<p><u>ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT</u> Ensuring Leadership &amp; Commitment</p>	<p><u>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</u> Framing the problem</p>	<p>BEST PRACTICES Determining What Works: Inside and Outside the System</p>	<p><b>EVALUATION DESIGN</b> Defining Success</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN Achieving Consensus: Priorities and Possibilities</p>
<p>JJAC develops ongoing research agenda based on workgroups.</p>				<p>CS Workgroup Implement educational priorities.</p>
		<p>JJAC and workgroup provides feedback to Detention Commission on program / service design.</p> <p>Participate in hiring of Detention Superintendent.</p>		
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Achieve consensus on integration of lessons from barriers, education and assessment efforts into sanction matrix.</li> <li>2) Run pilot matrix as guideline for sanctioning each youth.</li> <li>3) Complete agreed upon minimum sample.</li> </ol>	

Coordinated Enforcement Plan:

Charlottesville /Albemarle Juvenile Justice System

<p><u>ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT</u> Ensuring Leadership &amp; Commitment</p>	<p><u>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</u> Framing the problem</p>	<p>BEST PRACTICES Determining What Works: Inside and Outside the System</p>	<p><b>EVALUATION DESIGN</b> Defining Success</p>	<p>IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN Achieving Consensus: Priorities and Possibilities</p>
			<p>Apply outcome data from pilot to ABS matrix, revise as appropriate.</p> <p>Incorporate risk/need assessment and use of sanction matrix into evaluation model.</p>	
<p>Revise and implement matrix ongoing, based on stakeholder feedback, results of pilot, and results of evaluation and best practices. Utilize the revised matrix as the framework for implementing the community's strategic planning.</p>				
<p>Maintain community feedback and involvement through regular stakeholder meetings. Review and update strategic planning, ongoing @ 6 month intervals.</p>	<p><b>Work groups continue, revise as needed: Risk / Needs Assessment, Barriers to Information Sharing, Evaluation, Juvenile Court System, Juvenile Detention Center development.</b></p>			

**THIS PAGE  
INTENTIONALLY  
LEFT BLANK**

## Activity Timeline and Narrative

*Note: Headings in **BLUE** on the Activity Timeline indicate completed activities. Headings in **RED** indicate activities currently underway, and headings in black indicated outstanding tasks.*

1998

### **Establish Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (local JCEC).**

Established as part of the FY 99 planning grant from the Department of Criminal Justice Services, the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JCAC) has become a guiding force for juvenile justice planning in the Charlottesville / Albemarle region, acting as the juvenile justice work group of the local Commission for Children and Families, and as a work group for the local Detention Commission (on facility and program design, as well as hiring).

1998

### **Identify Stakeholders in the local JJ system.**

Through the JJAC, both traditional juvenile justice professionals and those in the community with a stake in the effectiveness of the system were brought together. The membership of the Committee was reviewed after completing its first year, and expanded to include the Clerk of the Court, additional members of the Commonwealth Attorney's office and additional staff of both advocacy and direct service programs.

Fall-Winter  
1998

### **Identify existing inventory of programs and services.**

Rory Carpenter, the local Juvenile Justice Coordinator, who is also responsible for the coordination of VJCCCA programming, identified those sanctions and services routinely used by the justice system. Additional resources were identified by the Office On Youth Delinquency Prevention and Youth Development Work Plan, the work plans of the Commission on Children and Families, and the local Community Services Board.

### **Conduct 'walk-through' of juvenile justice system for stakeholders.**

Staff prepared a 'walk-through' of the juvenile justice system for the JJAC, identifying key decision points in determining the need for sanctions and applying those sanctions to youth involved with the local Court Services Unit at intake, the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court at adjudication and disposition, and the CSU parole and probation components.

March to May

### **Conduct stakeholder meetings, (citizen) focus groups and structured interviews**

1999

**to identify issues and concerns within the regional JJ system.**

In addition to convening the JJAC as stakeholders, consultants conducted a focus group for probation and parole staff, and structured interviews [SEE Appendix B] with a range of key players, including:

- School personnel, including principals and vice principals
- Each of the J and DR Court Judges
- The staff of the Juvenile Court Assessment Center
- Police Officers
- Social Services staff
- Private providers, including Community Attention Homes, Teens Give and Just Solutions
- Local defense attorneys
- The Regional Manager for the Department of Juvenile Justice
- Local defense attorneys
- The Public Defender's Office

The interviews and focus group allowed the JJAC to develop an initial consensus on key resources within the existing juvenile justice system, under-utilized resources and gaps in services. The interviews also served as the basis for a local definition of success for sanctions applied to court-involved youth, and pointed to perceived areas for improvement within the existing system.

Summer and  
Fall,  
1999

**Provide JJAC with research on best practices to guide plan development.**

**Provide JJAC with review of current implementation and planning practices by Virginia ABS grantees.**

A research report was completed by Stillmeadow-Benchmark Associates, to be used as a guide to the development of the Comprehensive Plan. Specific data included:

- Minority over-representation at arrest, intake and detention levels: minorities were arrested at a rate roughly double their representation in the overall population; once arrested, detention rates appear to be race neutral.
- The predominance of non-delinquent offenses in juvenile court cases: 67-70% of all cases do not involve a new delinquency, as opposed to an average of 40% statewide.
- A decrease in status offenses, in contrast to state and national trends.
- Best practices, to date, among ABS efforts within the state.
- The use and applicability of the DJJ sponsored Risk Assessment instrument, as compared to other risk and needs assessment instruments.

**Fall, Winter  
1999**

**The JJAC determines priority issues and local juvenile justice system needs.**

Working from a systems approach to identify critical issues in each of the system components, the critical issues were prioritized, and initial plans of action were developed among the prioritized issues.

**Winter, Spring  
2000**

**Risk Assessment Workgroup forms and develops plan for implementation of regional risk and needs assessment process:**

**Determines existing risk / needs assessment tools which provide data on chosen outcome measures;**

**Designs and implements evaluation of current DJJ risk assessment tool (for use locally);**

**Assesses role of JCAC in risk / needs assessment process.**

The work of this group includes: assessing the role of Juvenile Court Assessment Center in the Risk / Needs assessment process; reviewing assessment instruments and applicability to the local system; determining the point(s) at which the DJJ Assessment is utilized, beyond those mandated by the state, and recommend one or more instruments to the JJAC for implementation.

As an adjunct to this work, the JJAC approved research into the validity of the DJJ instrument within the Charlottesville /Albemarle system. Specifically, outcomes relative to those youth defined as 'high risk' are being compared to outcomes for youth defined as 'low risk', for calendar years 1997 and 1998, to determine whether the higher risk group actually presented a greater risk of reoffense or other threat to the community. As part of this process, the Workgroup received a report from the consultants on juvenile justice practice in other Virginia localities related to risk and needs assessment.

**Spring  
2000**

**Strategic planning with JJAC, defining its role in objectives and action steps for each of the previously identified priority issues.**

This was the second retreat/workshop for the JJAC, building on the priority issues previously identified, and moving the team to identify specific objectives and action steps for each of the priority area goals. In addition, the JJAC identified responsible parties (one or more) for completion of each action step.

Inserted into this process was an updated review of the juvenile justice system; utilizing the aforementioned 'walk-through' prepared by Rory Carpenter, the

Committee followed sample cases through the existing system, applying their knowledge of the available resources, methods of communication and information sharing (including barriers), best practices, and gaps in services. After the updated 'walk-through', the strategic plan outline was completed.

Spring 2000

**Evaluation Workgroup formed.**

**Juvenile Court System Workgroup formed**

A work group was formed to focus on issues related to the Court and Court Service Unit. The primary objective of this group is to educate both system participants and the public on the services of the CSU, and to provide a mechanism for addressing and resolving conflicts among the Court, the CSU and other system components.

**Information Sharing Committee formed:**

**Research existing information sharing processes: survey of stakeholders.**

A work group formed to develop new approaches to resolving barriers to information sharing among system components (e.g. between the schools and the Court Services Unit).

The objectives of this group include an assessment of the current barriers to sharing necessary case information, identification of existing record-keeping structures (both electronic and paper records), and identification of model "universal releases" that could be utilized on a system-wide basis. As part of this process, the Committee received information on releases utilized by other states and localities. Funding was acquired through the Department of Criminal Justice Services to support this effort and hire contract staff.

Begun July  
2000

**Research aftercare practices (including national models):**

**Review local use of aftercare / parole services.**

The need for aftercare services was identified through structured interviews and focus groups with local system stakeholders. Research will focus on resources, issues and needs, and possible strategies to address these issues based on working models (best practices). Of particular interest are the use of supervision and sanction in parole, and the application of assessment-based interventions.

Summer 2000  
and ongoing

**Identify aftercare needs and the role of the community in providing aftercare:**

**Report to JJAC on aftercare issues and needs;**

**Define action steps to address aftercare needs.**

The JJAC will need to determine priorities and strategies for action, including consideration of revised policies and procedures for access to programs, development of new programs and services, and the role of the risk assessment process and the Juvenile Court Assessment Center in post-confinement service planning.

**Define the role of the JJAC and staff after completion of contract staff projects:**

**Develop sustainability plan for JJAC;**

- resource development
- membership and recruitment
- relationship to CCF and others

The JJAC will no longer have ongoing consultant support after July 2000. Without outside facilitation, the Committee must become increasingly self-reliant in development of resources, maintaining and developing membership, and assuring continuing investment in their long-term goals and mission. The role and the availability of staff, including the Juvenile Justice Coordinator, are critical factors in determining the scope of the Committee's work, and in framing the responsibilities of JCAC members.

**Implement priority action steps for aftercare sanctions and services.**

**Define action steps to address (reduce or eliminate) primary barriers, including development or adoption of a universal release:**

**Report to JJAC on existing barriers to information sharing;**

**Develop consensus on primary barriers.**

Early in its work, the JJAC recognized that information sharing among agencies was a significant issue. Funding was requested and received from DCJS to carry out a concentrated effort to identify and break down 'firewalls' that prevent the necessary flow of information between agencies. Successful reduction of such 'firewalls' is essential to the success of the work of the Risk /Needs Assessment and Evaluation Committees. Because nearly all court-involved youth are also involved with one or more service providers, thorough assessment requires knowledge of prior

history, including services, and outcome evaluation requires first-hand reports on progress after a referral. In other words, there must be a continuum of information in order to individual needs and progress, and how the system works in relation to different sets of needs.

**Survey current knowledge and educational needs of system stakeholders:**

This is the first major task for the Juvenile Court System Workgroup, actually begun by the consultants (S-B A) as part of the first year of the project. Initial structured interviews and focus groups framed the issue in general terms (e.g., there is uneven knowledge among users of the court). The Workgroup is now seeking to identify specific gaps in knowledge and how best to address those gaps. Strategies will be targeted on the three main groups of juvenile justice stakeholders:

- Citizens (youth and their families, as well as victims)
- Providers (of services and sanctions)
- Gatekeepers (those who provide or facilitate access to the system, e.g. police)

Historically, citizens have been difficult to involve in the juvenile justice systems, except as clients, and the goal is to involve them as customers who can provide important additional insight.

**Implement barrier reduction efforts: trial run with sample files.**

In order to determine whether the barriers identified through research (survey), the Barriers to Information Sharing Workgroup will implement a pilot in which actual file sharing is tested through current cases. While the detailed methodology has not been finalized, the sharing of real files in real time will identify specific information agencies do not or will not share in practice, and will also identify technological barriers, such as incompatible software.

*From this point:*



**TIMING  
TO BE  
DETERMINED**

**The Committee will complete a risk / needs / services matrix, identifying desired levels of intervention for high/medium/low levels of risk and need:**

**Update program and service list (for later) incorporation into service matrix;**

**Report to JJAC on local validity, reliability of DJJ assessment instrument;**

**Agree on defining factors for risk and needs assessment of individuals;**

**TIMING  
TO BE  
DETERMINED**

**Adopt and revise assessment tool(s) and processes;**

**The Evaluation Committee and stakeholders will review Graduated Sanction matrices currently in use;**

**Implement revised assessment process.**

The completed matrix applies risk and needs assessment to determine appropriate sanctions and services for individual youth, and provides a consistent basis for evaluation (e.g., whether the sanction reduced recidivism and other risk behaviors for those appropriately placed youth). Interventions based on the matrix, and those based on other tools or measures, can also be compared.

**Identify educational priorities and strategies to reach stakeholders:**

**Implement educational priorities.**

The Court and CSU Committee will prioritize and complete action plans to fill the gaps in knowledge among users of the court. They will then implement one or more educational activities.

**TIMING  
TO BE  
DETERMINED**

**Revise, implement barriers reduction efforts based on pilot.**

Lesson learned from the pilot are used to refine the barrier reduction strategies and the universal release format for ongoing use.

**Provide feedback to Detention Commission on program / service design:**

**Participate in hiring of Detention Superintendent.**

The role of the JJAC as the region's central juvenile justice planning body has been further ratified by requests for consultation and opinion, including requests from the detention commission for feedback on programming, staff hiring and facility design.

**Achieve consensus on integration of lessons from barriers, education and assessment efforts into sanction matrix:**

**Run pilot matrix as guideline for sanctioning each youth;**

**Complete agreed upon minimum sample;**

**Apply outcome data from pilot to ABS matrix, revise as appropriate;**

**Incorporate risk/need assessment and use of sanction matrix into evaluation model;**

**TIMING  
TO BE  
DETERMINED**

This is the culmination of applying evaluation to the assessment model, and to the resulting services and sanctions. The same research and file review process that determined local validity of the DJJ risk assessment tool is used to determine the validity of the new local assessment process and the resulting outcomes of risk and needs based interventions.

**Revise and implement matrix ongoing, based on stakeholder feedback, results of pilot, results of evaluation and best practices:**

**Utilize the revised matrix as the framework for implementing the community's strategic planning. (see above)**

The community will utilize the revised matrix as the framework for implementing the community's strategic planning, integrating:

- Agreed upon values, including what constitutes 'success', priority risks and needs, the role of the community in juvenile justice;
- The resources available for responding to court involved youth, and the gaps in services/sanctions that need to be filled;
- Lessons learned in other states and communities, as well as those learned locally (best practices);
- Initial results from the evaluation model, and
- The community's vision for the future (as it relates to juvenile justice).

**Maintain community feedback and involvement through regular stakeholder meetings. Review and update strategic planning, ongoing at 6 month intervals.**

**Work groups continue, revise as needed: Risk / Needs Assessment, Barriers to Information Sharing, Evaluation, Court and CSU, Juvenile Detention Center development.**