

A Review of Juvenile Justice Programs in New Mexico

Introduction:

Juvenile justice intervention programs describe a range of programs that are designed to prevent youth from entering the juvenile justice system and to provide alternatives to detention for youth that have escalated to the juvenile justice system.

The New Mexico Children, Youth and Families Department (CYFD) contracted the New Mexico Sentencing Commission (NMSC) to study juvenile justice programs funded by the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC) in six New Mexico counties. The four program types contracted for review are:

- Reception and Assessment Centers
- Restorative Justice Panels
- Girls Circles
- Day Reporting Centers

Additionally, NMSC has been contracted to review disproportionate minority contact efforts and how these efforts are being developed and implemented. As part of this study we completed this literature review. The purpose of this literature review is to report on best practices in the area of juvenile justice intervention programs, focused on the four distinct program types that are the subject of this review.

This literature review briefly and broadly reviews best practice strategies and programs and emerging strategies and programs, defines each program type, examines best practices for these program types, and identifies characteristics of the most effective programs. Objective research into the effectiveness of juvenile programming can help managers and policy makers make decisions that will, ideally, achieve the best results for the least cost. In recent years want of best practice model programs has caused an increase in monitoring programs for their effectiveness. In a recent review of available literature Greenwood (2008) identified 23 best practice delinquency-prevention program models and strategies, 2 emerging best practice models, 2 promising programs still under review, and 6 programs that are ineffective. The comparison list of programs and strategies can be found in Appendix A. Restorative justice programs were shown to be a best practice model when implemented correctly. Although girls circle programs were not specifically identified as a best practice program, the girls circle program model is designed to incorporate best practice strategies in their curriculum. Intensive supervision programs, such as day reporting centers, were proven ineffective in reducing recidivism, and were shown to be cost inefficient. Because Reception and Assessment Centers (RAC's) are not a form of treatment they were not part of the review

completed by Greenwood. RACs were proven effective in the services they provide to the community by Oldenettel and Wordes (2000).

Many state and county juvenile justice web sites refer to the need to study outcomes, particularly recidivism rates, as they apply to juvenile justice programs. Unfortunately, few outcome studies and program evaluations exist in academic and government literature. Many of those that do exist are limited by their research designs and have limited findings.

Programs:

Reception and Assessment Centers

Reception and Assessment Centers, also referred to as community or juvenile assessment centers, were developed in the early 1990s. RACs help improve communication, efficiency, collaboration, and cost-effectiveness between fragmented service delivery (Oldenettel & Wordes, 2000). Dembo et al. (2004) noted RACs are not juvenile treatment or diversion programs, instead they serve as a central dispatch, coordination and tracking point for already existing services for youth who may be involved in the juvenile justice system, or who may have needs in the areas of juvenile care, counseling, and justice. Assessment centers complete placement screenings, and gather information to provide to the courts in a centralized location. The integration of information in one centralized location allows for better-informed decision making for the placement and needs of the juvenile. RACs are designed to provide early intervention and prevention of juvenile delinquency.

The Sandoval County, New Mexico Reception and Assessment Center web site states its purpose is to:

- Provide intake services, juvenile justice risk assessments, crisis and case management intervention, mental health/psychosocial assessments when needed, and referral services
- Serve youth arrested by law enforcement for low level misdemeanor and felony offenses
- Serve as an early intervention opportunity by preventing the incarceration of youth that are in police custody for a non-detainable offense

The Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI), a project of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, lists reception and assessment centers as an important alternative to detention. The Sandoval County New Mexico reception center is listed among JDAI model centers. The Arapahoe County, Colorado Juvenile Assessment Center states its mission is to provide a coordinated, multi-agency, single entry site which contributes to the safety of youth, families, and the community through early intervention, comprehensive assessment and improved access to appropriate services. The Florida Department of Juvenile Justice lists over 15 RACs throughout the state. New Mexico has reception and assessment centers in Santa Fe, Sandoval, and Dona Ana counties.

Oldenettel and Wordes (2000) list and explain four key elements to community assessment centers that, when implemented properly, have the potential to positively impact the lives of youth, and divert them from the path of serious, violent, and chronic delinquency:

Single point of entry: RACs provide a 24-hour centralized point of intake and assessment for juveniles who have come, or are likely to come into contact with the juvenile justice system. RACs should ideally target two populations: juveniles at risk of involvement in delinquent activity and juveniles who have already committed delinquent acts. RACs should integrate both

preventative and early intervention activities with local police, social services, child welfare school, as well as community based family preservation programs. For communities where it is not practical to have a single physical point of entry, the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) recommends the use of a virtual point of entry where all youth receive the same assessment and case management procedures from different agencies at several locations.

Immediate and comprehensive assessments: OJJDP's Comprehensive Strategy stresses the importance of both risks and needs assessments at the single point of entry for juvenile offenders. Two types of assessments should be performed: A risk/custody assessment should be administered to determine the level of supervision that is appropriate or type of placement, and a needs assessment is designed to help identify the specific program interventions that should be delivered within the designated custody/supervision level. OJJDP recommends that assessments are comprehensive rather than in depth, and cover a wide range of subject areas including, but not limited to, substance abuse history, mental health issues, school programs, family relationships, and peer relations. The initial assessment would serve to identify potential problem areas with a particular juvenile. In addition, OJJDP recommends that RACs develop consistent policies, procedures and training. OJJDP recommends that RACs select appropriate assessment tools that identify juveniles risk and protective factors, are reliable, and have been validated for use with a target population. RACs must also keep in mind logistical limitations when selecting an assessment tool, including characteristics

of their youth population, the number of staff available to administer the assessment tool, the amount of time staff spends with each youth, and the purpose of the information obtained (i.e. screening, prescriptive, or diagnostic purposes).

Management information system (MIS): Through the use of an MIS, RACs manage and monitor youth, ensuring the provision of appropriate treatment and rehabilitation services, and avoiding duplication of services. At a minimum, OJJDP recommends that a RAC has an integrated database that manages information on the youth served. An integrated database should link data from multiple agencies regarding prior contact with other professionals and prior assessments, as well as monitor trends of its own operations and services.

Integrated case management: RAC staff use information from the assessment process and MIS to develop recommendations, facilitate access to services, conduct follow-ups, and periodically reassess youth.

Research findings of early assessments centers conclude that RACs are promising in intervening with youth exhibiting behavioral issues, and their families. However, because RACs vary in how they are implemented and how well they follow the four key elements the success of RACs varies from site to site (Rivers & Anwyl, 2000).

A 2004 report by the Cumberland County Juvenile Assessment Center showed apparent positive outcomes. However, this study did not include comparison groups, or control for variables other than participation in the assessment center process. Some of the reported outcomes included:

- 62% experienced a decrease in school maladjustment problems

-
- 84% experienced a decrease in clinical maladjustment problems
 - 54% experienced a decrease in personal maladjustment problems
 - 78% experienced a decrease in the emotional symptoms index

Silverthorn (2003) concluded, “RACs are able to provide effective and efficient treatment options for youth, resulting in better outcomes for youth and a greater cost-benefit for the state.” The Miami-Dade Juvenile Assessment Center is referred to by some as a model RAC (Silverthorn, 2003). However, this RAC uses a police-centered approach. The Miami Dade RAC is open 24 hours per day, seven days per week and processes over 15,000 youth per year. The unique aspect of the Miami-Dade RAC is the central point of booking and identification of juveniles who are arrested in Miami-Dade County. This enables law-enforcement officers to deliver juveniles to the RAC, and then return to duty, which to date has save hundreds of thousands of police man hours. RACs in New Mexico do not use the police-centered approach.

The limited studies of assessments centers generally report positive outcomes both as to behavioral changes in youth, and increased efficiencies for communities. However, because assessment centers vary widely in how they function, these findings are not generalizable. Both the Sandoval County, New Mexico and Miami-Dade centers are referred to in the literature as models and vary greatly in how they are designed, and operated. The Miami-Dade assessment center is a police-based drop off, and booking center. The Sandoval County assessment center is designed to follow the Annie E. Casey Foundation model of providing intake services, risk assessments, crisis intervention and case management, mental health/psychosocial assessments, and

referral services for pre- and post-arrested youth.

Restorative Justice Panels

Restorative justice is more than just an alternative to detention; it is designed to bring together offenders, victims, and others in the community for a healing of the broad range of harms caused by an offender. This could include restitution and apologies by the offender to victims and others affected by the crime, as well as an opportunity for offenders, the police, victims and others to work together to find the best possible outcome after the harm has been done. In some instances, offenders may still serve time in detention, and then participate in restorative justice panels during or after detention. While the net of those youth who participate in Restorative Justice panels may be wider than those who are formally adjudicated, there is literature that indicates this offender-victim-community communication helps offenders make changes necessary to avoid such behavior in the future. There is, however, scant objective recidivism data.

In recent years public dissatisfaction regarding prisons and the overall criminal justice system has prompted new practices to be utilized in order to rehabilitate the offender (Cohen, 2001). The victim, the offender and the community are all players in healing the wounds caused by the criminal act of the offender. After suffering the injustice to them, the victim needs to be recognized, responded to and their voices need to be heard.

Restorative Justice Panels are generally designed to incorporate victims and community members into the administration of justice. In addition to restorative justice panels, restorative programs take many different forms, including victim-offender mediation, community reparative boards, family group

conferencing, and circle sentencing (Rodriguez, 2007).

Restorative justice is based on the principles of control, deterrence, and reintegrative shaming. The control perspective holds that youth's involvement in delinquency is controlled by encouraging them through socialization to believe in the moral legitimacy of the law. The deterrence perspective holds that if the cost of offending relative to the benefits is greater, youth may be deterred from reoffending. Reintegrative shaming promotes the idea that people are generally deterred from committing crimes based on two informal forms of social control: fear of social disapproval and conscience (Rodriguez, 2007).

While the crimes eligible for Restorative Justice vary, the list from the Carver County, Minnesota Juvenile Restorative Justice program is illustrative (Farrell, 2010):

- Theft
- Shoplifting
- Burglary
- Damage to Property
- Vandalism
- Trespassing
- Arson
- Lower level assault

In restorative justice panels, an offending youth, his or her victim, and supporters of both the offender and victim are brought together with a trained facilitator to discuss the incident and the harm it has brought to the victim, and the group of supporters (McGarrell, 2001). The panel provides an opportunity for victims of crime to express how they have been harmed, and to directly question the offending youth. A key outcome of restorative justice is to ensure the offender takes responsibility for their actions.

Taking responsibility for behaviors requires that the offender:

- Understands how their behavior affected other human beings (not just the courts or officials)
- Acknowledges the behavior resulted from a choice that could have been made differently
- Acknowledges to all those affected that the behavior was harmful to others
- Takes action to repair the harm where possible
- Makes changes necessary to avoid such behavior in the future

In a restorative justice panel, actions to repair the harm can include providing financial restitution to victims, personal services to victims, community service, as well as written and verbal apologies to victims and other persons affected (OJJDP, December, 1998).

Formal standards designed to be used by practitioners and communities interested in developing restorative justice practices include (Skills for Justice, 2006):

- Practitioners must obtain and evaluate information on incidents for which restorative justice is appropriate
- Practitioners must assess risks in using restorative practice approaches
- Process and agree on a timetable and plan of action
- Assess, and advise on the risks of using restorative practice
- Establish effective relationships with potential participants
- Advise participants about the restorative process, and the options available within them
- Agree on a plan of action, and timetable
- Facilitate the restorative practice process
- Support and advise participants before and during the restorative practice process

- Form outcome agreements
- Evaluate, and report on outcomes of the restorative process

Although restorative justice programs have become increasingly popular, only a few programs in the United States have been studied. Rodriguez (2007) found that juveniles who participated in a restorative justice program were less likely to recidivate than juveniles who did not participate in a restorative justice program. Gender and prior offenses indirectly influenced recidivism in important ways. Females and offenders with minimal criminal history records exhibited the most success from participating in such programs (Rodriguez, 2007).

There is a vast amount of evidence proving restorative justice programs more effective than conventional criminal justice programs (Sherman & Strang, 2007). Restorative justice:

- Substantially reduces repeat offending for some offenders
- Doubles (or more than doubles) the offences brought to justice as diversion from incarceration
- Reduces victims' post-traumatic stress symptoms and related costs
- Provides both victims and offenders with more satisfaction with justice than other criminal justice programs
- Reduces victims' desire for violent revenge against their offenders
- Is more cost efficient than other criminal justice programs
- Reduces recidivism greater than prison for adults
- Reduces recidivism equal to or greater than incarceration for youths

A study of restorative justice programs in Boulder, Colorado schools found that of the

20 conferences held with students referred to restorative justice for harassment, fighting, theft, vandalism, arson, drugs, and truancy, 100 percent reached an agreement on how to repair the harm caused by the offending student (Ierley & Ivker, 2002).

Pranis (2003) conducted a review of 281 restorative justice cases from the Woodbury, Minnesota Police Department's Restorative Community Conferencing Program. Slightly over half (52.7%) of the offenders were first time offenders; the remaining offenders had prior records ranging from one prior to 25 priors. There were 84 cases with two or more priors. The review found recidivism rates under the conferencing program were 33.1% compared to 72.2% for juvenile cases the year before the conferencing program began. In addition the review found a change in the pattern of re-offending. Those who participated in the conferencing program did not re-offend as quickly, and tended to have a less serious subsequent offense when compared to those who re-offended without going through the conferencing program. By utilizing the conferencing program for most juvenile offenses in Woodbury, the Police Department reduced the number of cases it sent to the County Attorney's office, which proved to be a cost saving measure.

In summary, restorative justice programs are more effective with a larger number of positive outcomes than many other programs that have been implemented (Sherman & Strang, 2007).

Girls Circles

The Girls Circle Association was founded in 1996 as a support system to help young girls make healthy decisions. Girls Circle is a model that encourages girls to be themselves within a structured support group. The mission of girls circles is to instill self-confidence and improve girls' interpersonal relationships. The expectation is that these improved

relationships will, in turn, improve girls' current lives as well as their futures.

Roa et al., (2007) note the growing need for programs designed specifically for girls. Reasons noted for gender specific programs include findings that note the arrest rate for girls is growing faster than the arrest rate for boys, gender differences in academic achievement, differences in characteristics between incarcerated boys and girls, and differences in treatment for girls once they are in the juvenile justice system. A study comparing gender differences in psychological and familial risk factors found adjudicated girls had higher rates of clinically diagnosed major depression, post-traumatic stress disorder, separation anxiety, and disruptive disorders (Zahn et al., 2009). Also, adjudicated females are more likely to have experienced greater rates of physical, sexual, and emotional abuse than their male counterparts. Criminal justice systems are, for the most part, designed for males and neglect the gender specific needs of females (OJJDP, 1998). Slowly the focus is moving from a focus on males to an increased focus on female needs. This change is due to several factors including the increasing rate at which females are being arrested, and by new research coming out of the social science fields focusing on the unique differences and needs of females. In 1980 females made up 11 percent of the juvenile arrests for violent offences and in 2000 that percentage grew to 18. By 2004 the arrest rate for juvenile females arrested for violent offenses almost doubled growing to 30 percent (OJJDP, 2010). Girls circles are designed to respond to the need for female centered juvenile justice program.

The girls circle model is a structured support group designed for females 9-18 years of age. It is designed to empower girls to resist the interpersonal and social influences the

hinder growth and development by creating a safe environment with which girls can make positive connections, develop competence, and gain personal and collective strengths (Roa et al., 2007).

Girls circles are often held weekly for 1 or 1 ½ hours. A facilitator leads the group through a format of talking and listening to one another. Often the programming provides opportunities for personal expression through accompanying creative outlets, including activities such as role playing, drama, journaling, poetry, dance, drawing, collage and clay. Girls circles often incorporate gender specific themes that relate to the girls lives such as trust, friendships, body image, goals, sexuality, drugs, alcohol, tobacco, competition, and decisions (Roa et al., 2007).

Girls circles are relatively new and have been the subject of limited research. Much of this research has been sponsored by the Girls Circle Association and completed by the Ceres Policy Research Group. It would be beneficial to girl circle programs if more independent research were performed on the program's effectiveness as the majority of current research has been sponsored at least in part by the Girls Circle Association. Girls circles are rated as a promising approach in the Model Programs Guide of the OJJDP. According to the Girls Circle website: "Outcomes showed significant increases in self-efficacy, body image, and social connection. Promising programs display a strong theoretical base and have been demonstrated to prevent delinquency, and /or reduce or enhance risk and protective factors for delinquency using limited research and require further experimental study."

Results of a series of studies of girls circles found significant increases in body image scores, perceived social support, and level of self-efficacy. These results support the

hypothesis of the Girls Circle's curriculum (Roa et al., 2007). Unfortunately, there is no recidivism data reported in the Roa et al. (2007) study.

The most recent studies revealed significant improvement for girls in four long-term outcomes: self-harming behavior, alcohol use, attachment to school, and self-efficacy. Also found were significant improvements for middle school girls in four areas: self-efficacy, body image, social support, and increased resiliency through bonding to school (Sherman, 2005).

Sherman (2005) found several positive outcomes from girls circle participation. Girls circle participants reported an increase in six skills developed over the short-term:

- Finding things they have in common with a new person
- Trying to see beyond girls' reputations
- Telling adults what they need
- Feeling good about their body
- Picking friends that treat them the way they want to be treated
- Telling people how much they mean to them

Participants reported an improvement for four long-term outcomes:

- A decrease in self-harming behavior
- A decrease in rates of alcohol use
- An increase in attachment to school
- An increase in self-efficacy

Finally, a report on girls circles' success indicated that most girls benefit from treatment received from girls circles (Hossfeld & Tyrol, 2007). However, there was a difference between girls who had been held in an inpatient, juvenile detention center or other secured facility, and girls who never experience being held in these facilities.

Girls who had never been held in a facility improved greater than those who had been held in a facility at sometime in their lives.

Day Reporting Programs

Day reporting/treatment centers are highly structured, community-based, post-adjudication, nonresidential programs for serious juvenile offenders. The goal of day treatment is to provide intensive supervision to ensure community safety, and to provide a wide range of services to the offender to prevent future delinquent behavior (OJJDP, 2010). The intensive supervision is fulfilled by requiring the offender to report to the facility on a daily basis at specified times for a specified length of time.

Day reporting centers (DRCs) vary in how they are implemented. The DRC in Randolph County, North Dakota was implemented as a military-style boot camp program. In Sacramento, California a day treatment program provides education, vocational training, family and individual counseling, substance abuse counseling, anger management, gang awareness, parenting and life skills classes in an effort to reduce crime in the community.

While little research exists on juvenile day reporting centers, Austin et al. (2005) reported on findings from the Cook County, IL day reporting center. The program reported a success rate of 92 percent from December 1995 to August 2001. Cook County reported that the juvenile was successful if the youth was not rearrested while participating in the program, but did not report on recidivism levels post-release. The average length of participation for successful youth was 21 days. The program provides youth with educational and vocational programs, counseling, recreational activities, and life development workshops. Lectures on delinquency, local government, health issues, and effects of

alcohol and drugs were given. Workshops on conflict resolution, employment, and parenting skills were also presented.

Another study found mostly positive outcomes, but could not prove that the results were result of participating in the DRC program (Craddock, 2000). The study did find lower supervision costs associated for the rural DRC, saving \$1,893 in a one year period, and a greater prediction of cost savings for larger urban DRC programs.

Sullivan, et al. (2009) reported the results of a process and outcome evaluation of a series of new day reporting centers in New Jersey that began serving the majority of youth released from juvenile institutions starting in the Fall of 2005. The results showed that more emphasis on education and development of job applying skills needs to be placed on younger parolees.

Statistics on whether DRCs are effective in reducing recidivism differ depending on which program is under review. Craddock and Graham (2001) observed the recidivism rates of two different DRCs. One DRC appeared to successfully reduce recidivism for high risk offenders, while another reduced recidivism by only a small amount. DRCs are less costly than incarceration, and appear to reduce recidivism while the juvenile is involved in the program (Austin et al., 2005, Craddock, 2000). However, once individuals are released from some day reporting centers recidivism rates appear to rise to approximately the same level as individuals who did not participate in the program (Craddock & Graham, 2001, Greenwood, 2008). Other alternatives to detention programs are proven to have more consistent outcomes in reducing recidivism, and are better at reducing costs to the communities they serve (Greenwood, 2008).

Conclusion:

The current literature, while in its early stages for programs such as girls circles and day reporting centers, generally supports each of the respective juvenile justice programs that are the subject of this study. At the very minimum, these programs offer alternatives that in some instances have outcomes that are better than, and in most instances are less expensive than that of detention. The limited findings also show that in many instances alternative to detention produce more positive outcomes for youth than detention. Lipsey and Wilson (1998) claim that juvenile justice programs have a greater positive effect on youth convicted of serious and violent offences than youth convicted of minor offenses.

After the completion of this literature review, staff of the New Mexico Sentencing Commission and the UNM Institute for Social Research will develop measures for each of the types of programs reviewed. Measurements of study are very important not just for policy makers and senior administrative staff, but are very important to line staff take as they take their cues from the measures reported to them (OJJDP, December, 1998).

New Mexico is making strides in developing and piloting the programs and processes outlined above. Regular monitoring and analysis of data collected by these field-based programs will allow the Children, Youth, and Families Department to continue to hone this state's juvenile justice system. The good news is that there are programs and practices that can reduce offending among those involved in the criminal justice system. Unfortunately, as Lipsey and Cullen (2007) point out, not all of the programs available in our system reflect best-practices. We still have a lot to learn about how to take evidence-based practices and translate them into widely implemented programs while retaining the essential elements of effectiveness. ■

References

- Austin, J., Johnson, K. D., and Weitzer, R. (2005). Alternatives to the Secure Detention and Confinement of Juvenile Offenders. *OJJDP Juvenile Justice Bulletin*.
- Cohen, R. (2001). Forgiveness and Restorative Justice in Vermont. Retrieved on July 15, 2010 from the Planet Vermont Quarterly's official website: <http://planetvermont.com/pvq/v8n4/justice.html>
- Craddock, A. (2000). An Exploratory Analysis of Client Outcomes, Costs, and Benefits of Day Reporting Center. National Criminal Justice Reference Service.
- Craddock, A., and Graham, L. (2001). Recidivism as a Function of Day Reporting Center Participation. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. 34(1): 81-97.
- Cumberland County Juvenile Assessment Center. (2004). Cumberland Juvenile Assessment Center Evaluation Report.
- Dembo, R., Schmeidler, J., and Walters, W. (2004). Juvenile Assessment Centers: An innovative approach to identify and respond to youth with substance abuse and related problems, *Juvenile Justice: Policies, Programs and Services* (A. R. Roberts, Ed.). (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford.
- Farrell, M. (2010) Restorative Justice Program. Retrieved on July 15, 2010 from the Carver County Minnesota's official website: http://www.co.carver.mn.us/county_government/restorative_justice_program.asp
- Girls Circle. (2010). Retrieved on July 26, 2010 from the Girls Circle website: <http://www.girlscircle.com/research.aspx>
- Greenwood, P. (2008). Prevention and Intervention Programs for Juvenile Offenders. *The Future of Children*. 18(2): 185-210.
- Hossfeld, B., and Tyrol, K. (2007). Girls Circle: Promoting Resiliency in Girls Through Gender Responsive Groups. Presented at the 2007 National Conference on Safe Schools and Communities.
- Ierley, A. and Ivker, C. (2002). Restoring School Communities: Restorative Justice in Schools Program, Spring 2002 Report Card. Boulder, CO: School Mediation Center.
- Lipsey, M. W., and Wilson, D. B. (1998). Effective intervention for serious juvenile offenders: A synthesis of research. In R. Loeber & D. P. Farrington (Eds.), *Serious & Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions* (pp. 313-345). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Lipsey, M. W., and Cullen, F. T. (2007). The Effectiveness of Correctional Rehabilitation: A Review of Systematic Reviews. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*. 3: 297-320.
- McGarrell, E. (2001). *Restorative Justice Conferences as an Early Response to Young Offenders*. Retrieved on July 15, 2010 from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service's official website: http://www.ncjrs.gov/html/ojjdp/jjbul2001_8_2/contents.html
- Oldenettel, D., and Wordes, M. (2000). The Community Assessment Center Concept. *OJJDP Juvenile Justice Bulletin*.
- Parent, D.G. (1990). Day reporting centers for criminal offenders: A descriptive analysis of existing programs. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Parent, D. G., Byrne, J., Tsarfaty, V. Valade, L., and Esselman, J. (1995). Day Reporting Centers, Volume I. National Institute of Justice.
- Pranis, K. (2003). *Restorative Justice in Minnesota and the USA: Implementation and Outcomes*. Retrieved on July 14, 2010 from the United Nations Asia and Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders' website: http://www.unafei.or.jp/english/pdf/PDF_rms/no63/ch13.pdf
- Randolph County Government, North Dakota. (2004). *Juvenile Day Reporting Center*. Retrieved on July 14, 2010 from the Randolph County Government's official website: <http://www.co.randolph.nc.us/drc/ProjectPride.htm>
- Rivers, J. E., and Anwyl, R. S. (2000). Juvenile Assessment Centers: Strengths, Weaknesses, and Potential, *The Prison Journal*, 80(1): 96-113.
- Roa, J., Irvine, A., and Cervantez, K. (2007). Girls Circle National Research Project. *Ceres Policy Research*.

-
- Rodriguez, N. (2007). Restorative Justice at Work: Examining the Impact of Restorative Justice Resolutions on Juvenile Recidivism, *Crime & Delinquency*, 53(3): 355-379.
- Sherman, F. T. (2005). Detention Reform and Girls: Challenges and Solutions. The Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Sherman, L. W., and Strang, H. (2007). Restorative Justice: The Evidence. London: The Smith Institute.
- Silverthorn, B. (2003) Juvenile Assessment Centers. Southern Juvenile Defender Center, Emory University School of Law.
- Skills for Justice. (2006). *National Occupational Standards for Restorative Practice*. Retrieved on July 15, 2010 from the International Institute for Restorative Practices' official website: <http://www.iirp.org/pdf/National%20Occupational%20Standards%20for%20Restorative%20Practices%20Approved%20%28Skills%20for%20Justice%20-%20Nov%202006%29.pdf>
- Snyder, H. N., and Sickmund, M. (2006). Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 2006 National Report. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Stiegler, K., and Lever, N. (2008). Summary of Recognized Evidence-Based Programs Implemented by Expanded School Mental Health Programs. School Mental Health, University of Maryland School of Medicine.
- Sullivan, M, Margaryan, S, and McCann, E. (2009). Day Reporting Centers for Parolees from Juvenile Institutions: Implementation Issues and Preliminary Outcomes. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology.
- U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (December, 1998). Guide for Implementing the Balanced and Restorative Justice Model. *OJJDP Report*.
- U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (1998). *Guiding Principles for Promising Female Programming: An Inventory of Best Practices*. Retrieved on July 14, 2010 from the OJJDP's official website: <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.gov/pubs/principles/contents.html>
- U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2010). *Girls' Circle*. Retrieved on July 15, 2010 from the OJJDP's official website: http://www2.dsgonline.com/mpg/mpg_program_detail.aspx?ID=464&title=Girls%E2%80%99%20Circle
- U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (February, 2010). Girls' delinquency. *InFocus*.
- Wilson, D. B. (2009). Lessons Learned about Reducing Recidivism from Research on Correctional and Juvenile Delinquency Programs. George Mason University.
- Zahn, M. A., Day, J., Mihalic, S., and Tichavsky, L. (2009). Determining What Works for Girls in the Juvenile Justice System: A Summary of Evaluation Evidence. *Crime and Delinquency*, 55(2): 266-293.

Appendix A. Comparison of Strategies and Programs (Greenwood, 2008)

Custody Status	Strategy or Program Name	Evidence Based Status	Source of Evidence	Effect on Crime	Number of Studies	Program Cost per Youth	Criminal Justice System Savings	Benefits to Victims	Total Benefit to Cost Ratio
Institution	Aggression replacement training (ART)	Best Practice	Aos and others	-7.3%	4	\$897	\$6,659	\$8,897	17.3%
Institution	Boot camps in lieu of longer custody	Best Practice	Aos and others	0.0%	14	\$0	\$8,077	NA	NA
Institution	Sex offender therapy	Best Practice	Aos and others	-10.2%	5	\$33,000	\$8,377	\$32,000	1.2%
Group or Foster Home	Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC)	Best Practice	Blueprints, Aos, and others	-22.0%	3	\$6,945	\$33,000	\$52,000	12.2%
Probation	Functional Family Therapy (FFT)	Best Practice	Blueprints, Aos, and others	-15.9%	7	\$2,325	\$14,600	\$19,500	14.7%
Probation	Multisystemic Therapy (MST)	Best Practice	Blueprints, Aos, and others	-10.5%	10	\$4,264	\$9,600	\$12,900	5.3%
Diversion	Teen courts	Best Practice	Aos and others	-11.1%	5	\$936	\$4,238	\$5,900	10.8%
Diversion	Adolescent diversion project	Best Practice	Aos and others	-20.0%	6	\$1,913	\$18,000	\$24,000	22.0%
Diversion	Restorative justice	Best Practice	Aos and others	-8.7%	21	\$880	\$3,320	\$4,600	9.0%
Diversion	Drug court	Best Practice	Aos and others	-3.5%	15	\$2,777	\$3,200	\$4,200	2.7%
Prevention	Nurse family partnership – mothers	Best Practice	Aos and others	-56.2%	1	\$5,400	\$8,100	\$11,500	3.6%

Custody Status	Strategy or Program Name	Evidence Based Status	Source of Evidence	Effect on Crime	Number of Studies	Program Cost per Youth	Criminal Justice System Savings	Benefits to Victims	Total Benefit to Cost Ratio
Prevention	Nurse family partnership – child	Best Practice	Blueprints, Aos, and others	-16.4%	1	\$733	\$4,022	\$8,632	17.3%
Institution	Cognitive- behavioral therapy	Best Practice	Campbell Collaboration	-25.0%	58	NA	NA	NA	NA
Institution	Focus on high-risk youth and dynamic risk factors	Best Practice	Andrews	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Institution	Use of proven treatment methods appropriate for individual	Best Practice	Andrews	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Institution	Integrity of treatment implementation (fidelity)	Best Practice	Andrews, Lipsey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Institution	Longer duration of treatment	Best Practice	Lipsey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Institution	Well-established program	Best Practice	Lipsey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Institution	Counseling, psychotherapy	Best Practice	Aos and others	-18.9%	6	NA	\$17,300	\$23,000	NA
Institution	Education	Best Practice	Aos and others	-17.5%	3	NA	\$26,000	\$41,000	NA
Institution	Behavior modification programs	Best Practice	Aos and others	-8.0%	4	NA	\$12,000	\$19,000	NA
Diversion	Other family-based therapy programs	Best Practice	Blueprints, Aos, and others	-12.2%	12	NA	\$11,000	\$15,000	NA

Custody Status	Strategy or Program Name	Evidence Based Status	Source of Evidence	Effect on Crime	Number of Studies	Program Cost per Youth	Criminal Justice System Savings	Benefits to Victims	Total Benefit to Cost Ratio
Prevention	Pre-K education for low-income three- and four-year-olds	Best Practice	Aos and others	-14.2%	8	\$593	\$4,644	\$8,145	21.6%
Institution	Family integrated transitions (FIT)	Emerging Best Practice	Aos and others	-13.0%	1	\$9,700	\$19,500	\$30,700	5.2%
Diversion	Brief strategic family therapy (BSFT)	Emerging Best Practice	Blueprints	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Institution	Life skills education	Promising Practice	Aos and others	-2.7%	3	NA	\$4,100	\$6,400	NA
Diversion	Diversion with services vs. juvenile court	Promising Practice	Aos and others	-2.7%	20	NA	\$1,030	\$1,440	NA
Institution	Wilderness challenge	Ineffective	Aos and others	0.0%	9	\$3,000	\$0	\$0	0.0%
Parole	Surveillance oriented	Ineffective	Aos and others	0.0%	2	\$1,200	\$0	\$0	0.0%
Parole	Intensive supervision	Ineffective	Aos and others	0.0%	10	\$6,500	\$0	\$0	0.0%
Probation	Intensive supervision	Ineffective	Aos and others	0.0%	3	\$1,600	\$0	\$0	0.0%
Probation	Deterrence	Ineffective	Lipsey, Aos, and others	0.0%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Diversion	Diversion with services vs. simple release	Ineffective	Aos and others	0.0%	7	NA	\$0	\$0	NA