



Oregon Juvenile Department Directors' Association's Vision: Components of an Effective Juvenile Justice System in Oregon

County Juvenile Departments in Oregon consist of juvenile justice professions who are dedicated to promoting public safety through a reduction in juvenile crime, utilizing evidence-based practices, providing leadership that creates strategic direction, and ensuring a fair and equitable juvenile justice system. Collectively, the 36 county juvenile departments handle over 90% of juvenile delinquency referrals in the state of Oregon. The Oregon Juvenile Department Directors' Association (OJDDA) is committed to collaboration with other public safety entities, stakeholders, and citizens to design an effective and sustainable juvenile justice system that reflects the best investment of Oregon's limited resources. This document contains the OJDDA's vision and strategies for accomplishing that critical goal.

OJDDA Strategy Components:

- ✓ **The OJDDA recognizes the benefits to the citizens of Oregon and local communities from meaningful collaboration with OYA**
- ✓ **Promote data-driven decisions within the juvenile justice system**
- ✓ **Promote a risk-based juvenile justice system**
- ✓ **Continue improvements to the JJIS case plan to address youth risk to re-offend**
- ✓ **Continue development of statewide and local treatment partnerships and resources for juvenile offenders in the areas of mental health, substance abuse, family services**
- ✓ **Matching the distribution of juvenile justice funding streams with agencies which can provide more advocacy to the populations those funds are intended to serve**
- ✓ **Create efficiencies in discretionary bed utilization to achieve greater capacity**



The OJDDA Recognizes the Benefits to the Citizens of Oregon and Local Communities from Meaningful Collaboration with OYA

Background

The Oregon Youth Authority began as a separate state department utilizing a regional management system. Executive management staff were housed regionally across the state. They were actively involved in local juvenile justice planning, Local Public Safety Coordinating Committees, and local juvenile crime prevention planning. They were also involved in local planning efforts with providers of mental health, substance abuse, and other statewide services. Ongoing meetings were regularly scheduled with local juvenile department directors, local judges and local government. Co-management agreements were developed to create a continuum of local and state juvenile justice services. Unfortunately, the 2003 budget crisis resulted in reduction of these positions and created barriers to collaborative planning and problem solving.

Strategies to improve Oregon juvenile justice collaboration should include the following:

- Identify common vision and values toward strategic efforts
- Include OJDDA in OYA statewide decision making of the Juvenile Justice system
- Convene quarterly regionally-based planning and problem solving meetings with OYA, OJDDA and local partners. Provide opportunities to balance local public safety community concerns and needs with statewide public safety concerns
- Involve OJDDA in mapping services of close custody facilities
- Continue OJDDA and OYA collaboration in planning and implementation of the transition project
- Include OJDDA in the OYA Probation/Parole staffing analysis
- Include OJDDA in the OYA Youth Correctional Facility length of stay, risk reduction programming, and release decisions analysis.
- Develop joint prioritization of 2011-2013 legislative agenda for Juvenile Justice
- Conduct system mapping to prioritize needed services for 2011-2013 budget cycle
- Coordinate efforts to pursue federal funding similar to other states' juvenile justice services in areas of targeted case management, Title IV-E



Promote Data-Driven Decisions within the Juvenile Justice System

Background

Oregon's Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) is one of the most sophisticated juvenile information systems in the country. It is well developed and has ongoing quality reviews to assure integrity and viability. OJDDA and other county juvenile justice staff have been intricately involved in its development for assessments, case plans, and reports. The benefits of this system may be under-utilized in decision making around review of outcomes, allocation of resources, and determination of local capacity needs.

Strategies: OJDDA recommends greater utilization of data to promote juvenile justice planning and decision making. Below are possible strategies to accomplish this:

- Assure policy decisions to expand or decrease programs are based on data of actual risk and needs of youth
- Assure system planning such as capacity needs for close custody, residential and community-based service delivery are based on aggregate assessment of youth risk
- Assure analysis of unique needs of local communities and the matching of resources to those needs includes risk data
- Analyze services to determine variables proving to be effective at reducing youth risks to re-offend
- Track positive outcomes based on risk , interventions and other data elements
- Evaluate outcomes with consideration of risk, length of stay and dosage of treatment interventions



Promote a Risk-Based Juvenile Justice System

Background

The county juvenile departments began assessing referred youth for overall risk to re-offend in 2001 utilizing the Juvenile Crime Prevention tool. The Oregon Youth Authority began assessing youth for risk to re-offend using the Oregon Risk Needs Assessment tool in 2005. Both tools have been validated and are used in decision making for individual youth. Both tools have cut scores to classify overall risks to re-offend as low, moderate and high.

The use of these tools is well established, with ongoing training and supervision to promote data integrity and fidelity. OJDDA recommends that the juvenile justice system in Oregon move to a risk-based juvenile justice system which promotes daily decision making, development of local and state policies, allocation of resources, and program evaluations based on individual and aggregate assessment of risk.

Strategies

- Review and revise State and County policies to reflect risk-based decision making in provision of services to youth and families
- Conduct recidivism studies that reflect low, medium and high risk populations
- Conduct program evaluations and studies of efficacy based on risk population groups
- Develop standardized reports which reflect low, moderate and high risk populations
- Prioritize resource allocations based on risk populations
- Provide for a continuum of services across risk levels that considers the appropriate intervention, dosage, and length of stay given the risk level.
- Prioritize use of Discretionary Bed Allocations based on needs of the highest risk youth and chronic offenders
- Assure the juvenile justice system will accommodate the unique needs of local communities and lower risk youth



Continue improvements of JJIS case plan to address youth risk to re-offend

Background:

JJIS has developed a case plan that integrates risk assessment and plans focusing on criminogenic needs. Staff from various juvenile departments across the state have been trained in its utilization. OJDDA would like to promote continuous improvement areas of the case plan to evaluate overall effectiveness of services to diminish risk to re-offend

Strategies:

- Include provisions to document completion, non-completion of programs
- Include provisions to document completion and non-completion of services/interventions
- Develop JJIS reports to support local studies and research of progress in youth criminogenic need areas such as school, family, substance use and abuse, association with antisocial peers



Continue Development of Statewide and Local Treatment Partnerships and Resources for Juvenile Offenders in the Areas of Mental health, Substance Abuse, Family Services

Background:

The OYA mental health GAP analysis has shown over the years the high number of youth affected by a mental health diagnosis. Over the years, statewide services to youth with mental health problems have improved, yet significant gaps remain. Of particular concern are low risk youth under probation in local communities who are unable to remain at home. The unfortunate result is usually a placement in a correctional residential program or a close custody facility where the youth is at risk of harm by more sophisticated antisocial youth and the unfortunate exposure to high risk criminal thinking and behavior.

Many youth have significant substance abuse issues that require intensive treatment. Out-patient services seem to be more available in urban areas and difficult to access in rural settings. Also, there is a need for additional residential services for youth with significant substance abuse problems.

A recent recidivism study by OYA shows that younger youth (ages 12, 13, 14, 15,) have higher recidivism in one year of criminal referrals than older youth. This is disturbing and reflects the perceived need for more family-based interventions in both rural and urban settings. Several years ago, OYA promoted a special project of Functional Family Therapy. The sustainability of this project was difficult to maintain.

Strategies:

- Renew collaborative planning with OJDDA, OYA, State Mental Health and Alcohol and Drug services for juvenile justice youth in need of residential services to address mental health and substance abuse issues.
- Renew collaborative planning with OJDDA, OYA, State and local mental health to enhance in-home family-based services.
- Renew collaborative planning with OJDDA, OYA, State and local Drug and Alcohol services to stabilize funding, promote drug court options and increase residential capacity.



Matching the Distribution of Juvenile Justice Funding Streams with Agencies Which Can Provide More Advocacy to the Populations Those Funds are Intended to Serve

Background:

Currently the responsibility of the Juvenile Crime Prevention funds, the JCPAC, and JJAC are with the Oregon Commission on Children and Families. These functions were, at one time, with the Criminal Justice Commission, whose mission is “to improve efficiency and effectiveness of state and local criminal justice systems by providing a centralized and impartial forum for statewide policy development and planning.” At times, the process for counties to secure these funds can be disjointed and inefficient because of different focuses, priorities, mandates, or values.

Strategies:

- Transfer oversight and all the responsibilities associated with JCP funds, JCPAC, and JJAC to the Criminal Justice Commission. This will support the development of plans and policy that are comprehensive and public-safety oriented, and also will address local needs and business practices with an agency whose mission and values are consistent with the juvenile justice population. Greater consistency with the principles and values of Senate Bill 1 would be achieved. These plans would easily address the core federal mandates.



Create efficiencies in use of Discretionary Bed utilization to achieve greater capacity

Background:

The total number of total OYA close custody beds peaked at 1109 during the 1999-2001 biennium. Some of this was due to the growing of Measure 11 population from 1996 to 1999 of roughly 300 youth. In 2000 there were 620 discretionary beds available for the counties to use. The other beds were occupied by Department of Corrections youth and Public Safety Reserve youth. In 2003 there was a dramatic loss of 250 beds. This resulted in a drop of discretionary beds from the high of 620 to 369, a 40% reduction. Since that time, there has been a slow increase in overall available beds, but most of the growth has been with Department of Corrections youth, which is close to 400 at this time. The number of beds available to counties today is 430. The current Demand Forecast indicates a need of 250 additional beds. There are hundreds of youth who would be in close custody facilities if beds were available. The result of insufficient close custody beds for counties requires the county juvenile departments to manage a multitude of high risk youth and chronic offenders in local communities.

It is recognized that expansion of these beds is very costly and unlikely to occur with the fiscal situation looming in the future. Therefore, the only alternative is to examine ways to make the limited number of beds available to be utilized in the most efficient, effective and efficacious manner possible.

Strategies:

- Prioritize use of these beds to the highest risk youth and chronic offenders
- Consider legislation to allow second look for juvenile Measure 11 offenders.
- Monitor and reduce the length of stay of lower risk sex offenders. These offenders have historically been in close custody more than twice as long as higher risk offenders. Recidivism studies have shown that the lower risk sex-offending youth recidivate at very low rates compared to other youth offenders and, when they recidivate, the crime is usually a property offense.
- Create an agency institution review board that conducts formal reviews and monitors all low and moderate risk youth who are in close custody longer than one year.
- Consider short-term, intensive, specialized services for youth returning on revocations who have not committed new law violations (30-90 days). The focus would be on developing a more sophisticated relapse plan that addresses problems/barriers of previous release.
- Fund and contract for local secure treatment as an alternative to close custody treatment. These programs could be developed for lower risk youth, providing treatment and transition services closer to one's local community and family. Services could also be developed for youth at risk of revocation.