



Analysis of the Impact of Juvenile Justice Programming in Nine New Mexico Counties

Prepared by:
New Mexico Sentencing Commission
David E. Scussel, BA

Prepared for:
New Mexico Children, Youth and
Families Department

NEW MEXICO SENTENCING COMMISSION

May 2012

INTRODUCTION

In July 2009 the New Mexico Children, Youth and Families Department (CYFD) contracted with the New Mexico Sentencing Commission (NMSC) to study juvenile justice programs funded by the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC) in six New Mexico counties. In July 2010 this contract was renewed to include three additional counties and an additional program type (Intensive Community Monitoring).

The purpose of this particular research task is to analyze the impact of juvenile justice programming in the nine selected New Mexico counties have on the juvenile justice system, and to study and report on how these programs contribute to the understanding of law enforcement and juvenile justice system factors, which perpetuate Disproportionate Minority Contact in New Mexico. Table 1 organizes the programs targeted in this research by county.

Table 1. Sites Targeted for Interviews

Program	County
Day Reporting Center	Colfax, Lea, Sandoval, Santa Fe & Taos
DMC Reduction	Dona Ana, Santa Fe & Taos
Girls Circle	Chaves & Taos
Intensive Community Monitoring	Rio Arriba, Santa Fe & Taos
Reception and Assessment Centers	Bernalillo, Dona Ana, Sandoval & Santa Fe
Restorative Justice Panel	Chaves, Grant, Sandoval & Santa Fe

The programs being studied receive funding from the N.M. Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC). The Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee (JJAC) is appointed by the Governor and is advisory to CYFD (Children Youth and Families Department), the Governor and the Legislature. JJAC is created by state statute Section 9-2A-16 NMSA 1978, and carries out responsibilities under the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPAct) as well as the state Juvenile Continuum Act.

JJAC advocates for the prevention of delinquency, alternatives to secure detention, improvement of the juvenile justice system, and the development of a continuum of graduated sanctions for juveniles in local communities. JJAC allocates federal and state grant funds to communities for these purposes. JJAC has supported the development of seventeen regional Juvenile Justice Continuum boards serving nineteen counties to plan strategies and develop programs that serve juvenile justice youth locally. These boards help implement best practice programs to prevent youth from getting into trouble in the first place and to provide local sanctions and services that divert youth from commitment to state facilities.

The Juvenile Justice Regional Continuum Board program has been developed through federal and state funding assistance from the State advisory group JJAC in recent years in many local communities and judicial districts. The Continuum program model involves a formal partnership among the following required partners: one or more units of local or tribal government, the children's court, the district attorney, the public defender, local law enforcement agencies, the public schools, and other entities including private non-profit organizations, the business community, and religious organizations. A formal memorandum of understanding must be

executed by the participating entities, and a Juvenile Continuum Board is created to conduct the business for the Continuum. The purpose is to develop and implement a continuum of services from prevention to intervention and graduated sanctions for juveniles arrested and referred to juvenile probation, or at risk of such referral. The Juvenile Continuum Boards and their participating partners must conduct planning, assess needs, and design a continuum of services for these youth. The Juvenile Continuum Boards generally do not directly implement or operate programs.

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

Report Organization

This report contains several sections including the introduction, the methodology section, a summary of the literature review completed in 2010, an overview of the file review results, an analysis of each program and the DMC questions, and a discussion and conclusion section.

METHODOLOGY

The study was completed in four phases. The completion of each phase is important in helping us better understand how the juvenile justice intervention programs included in this research work, serve juveniles, and prevent further contact with the criminal justice system. Collectively the completion of the four phases tells us more than any phase by itself.

Phase One Methodology

Phase one focused on completing a literature review of the program types under review to determine best practices. A literature review of Intensive Community Monitoring programs was completed when this program type was added to the study in 2010 (NMSC, 2010b). The completion of phase one provided us useful information that describes in general how these projects should operate and what components they should include. Importantly, we found that in general there is a limited body of literature on these programs and even less literature that has assessed the effectiveness of these programs.

Phase Two Methodology

Phase two focused on interviewing program administrators of the various programs in the different counties on how their programs operate from their perspective. Nineteen program sites were visited. The interviews were conducted in two waves. Wave one interviews were conducted between May 20, 2010 and June 15, 2010, and wave two interviews between January 12, 2011 and April 25, 2011. The method used in wave two was similar to wave one with two important differences. First, the decision was made to add a section to the interview that covered disproportionate minority contact and second the interviews were audio recorded. In one case during wave two a site originally visited during wave one was revisited in order to ask questions regarding DMC and to request additional program information. Table 2 further breaks out Table 1 and lists the sites visited by wave.

Table 2. Wave in which Sites were Visited during Phase 2

County	Program					
	Day Reporting Center	DMC Reduction	Girls Circle	Intensive Community Monitoring	Reception & Assessment Center	Restorative Justice Panel
Bernalillo					Wave 1	
Chaves			Wave 1			Wave 1
Colfax	Wave 2					
Dona Ana		Wave 1			Wave 1	
Grant						Wave 2
Lea	Wave 2					
Rio Arriba				Wave 2		
Sandoval	Wave 1				Wave 1 & 2	Wave 1
Santa Fe	Wave 1	Wave 1		Wave 2	**	Wave 2
Taos	Wave 1	*	Wave 1	Wave 2		

* Because the programs was no longer funded by JJAC an interview was not conducted

** Interview was never scheduled because the provider never retuned NMSC's phone calls or emails

The phase two visits were designed as a first step to gather information on the programs with the intent of reporting how the programs operate, according to administrative staff, compared to national standards or best practices found in the phase one literature review. Repeated attempts via email and phone mail messages were made to schedule interviews with all the programs. Ultimately, one site was not scheduled for an interview.

Phase Three Methodology

Phase three consisted of interviewing line staff that provided direct services to the juveniles to document how the programs operate from their perspective. Because some of the programs selected for review were small and had few staff members, in some cases the administrator was the lone program staff, it was not always possible to interview additional program staff. Out of the 19 programs interviewed during phase two, 10 programs were deemed appropriate to revisit and interview line staff members. Programs were deemed appropriate for phase three interviews based upon the number of staff involved in running the program and if the administrator interviewed during phase two was not a line staff member as well. One of the 10 programs visited during phase three had 2 sites which were visited for interviews, bringing the total sites interviewed to 11.

The purpose of interviewing line staff members as well as administrative staff was to enhance and expand the information gathered during the phase two interviews. We expected, for the most part, the administrators' and line staff members' interviews would agree with each other on how the programs functioned with occasional discrepancies between the administrators and the line staff members on how the programs function. This report encompasses both interviews and summarizes the functioning of the programs into a whole. In the few cases where a discrepancy occurs between an administrator's interview and a line staff personnel's interview, the discrepancy is noted.

Table 3 displays the sites visited for phase three interviews.

Table 3. Sites were Visited in Phase Three

County	Program					
	Day Reporting Center	DMC Reduction	Girls Circle	Intensive Community Monitoring	Reception & Assessment Center	Restorative Justice Panel
Bernalillo					Phase 3	
Chaves						
Colfax	Phase 3					
Dona Ana					Phase 3	
Grant						Phase 3
Lea	Phase 3					
Rio Arriba						
Sandoval	Phase 3				Phase 3*	
Santa Fe	Phase 3	Phase 3				
Taos			Phase 3			

* 2 site locations were interviewed

Phase Four Methodology

Phase four consisted of a review of program client records. During phase two all of the administrators conveyed they felt their programs were successful in the services they provided to juveniles. The purpose of phase four was to provide client level information that would inform our understanding of how the various programs operate and serve clients. This includes information on how clients are referred, the services they receive, and how clients progress through the different programs and discharge. Due to the number of sites, funding, and travel requirements we decided to sample a relatively small number of files from phase four sites. Each site visited for file review was asked to provide a minimum of 10 discharged client files. We requested discharged files so we could track clients from referral to intake and through release from the visited sites. The file review was designed to collect information in the client files which included client demographic information (age, race/ethnicity, gender, city living in, and parent/guardian currently living with), grade in school, intake date, referral source, subsequent referral, recent criminal data, discharge status, and any program service dates with what services were offered on those dates.

Data collection of phases three and four were combined into the same visit. Of the 11 sites interviewed during phase three, 8 provided files for review. Three of the programs did not keep client records; therefore those sites did not have any client files available for review. As in phase three, 2 site locations visited were part of the same program.

Table 4. Sites Visited in Phase Four

County	Program					
	Day Reporting Center	DMC Reduction	Girls Circle	Intensive Community Monitoring	Reception & Assessment Center	Restorative Justice Panel
Bernalillo					Phase 4	
Chaves						
Colfax	Phase 4					
Dona Ana					Phase 4	
Grant						
Lea	Phase 4					
Rio Arriba						
Sandoval	Phase 4				Phase 4*	
Santa Fe	Phase 4					
Taos						

* File reviews were performed at 2 site locations

BEST PRACTICE LITERATURE REVIEW

This section briefly reports best practice literature that was more completely described in the NMSC literature review (NMSC 2010b).

Day Reporting Centers

Day treatment facilities originated in Great Britain in the 1970s. By 1995 there were at least 114 programs in the United States spread across 22 states. In its 2010 Model Programs Guide, the Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Programs (OJJDP) defines day reporting centers as “highly structured, community-based, post-adjudication, nonresidential programs for serious juvenile offenders.” OJJDP further stated that 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. 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.

Disproportionate Minority Contact Data Collection and Programs

Since approximately 2006, several counties in New Mexico have received funding through the Juvenile Justice Advisory Council and Children, Youth, and Families Department to collect data and develop programs designed to address the issue of Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC). Counties began this process by determining what DMC contact points should be addressed in their county through best practices models, assessment and data analysis.

Much of that baseline work is still being done, even as counties work to develop, study, fund and improve alternatives to detention. The goal is to reduce the number of minority youth having contact with the juvenile justice system.

As part of this project, we looked at DMC initiatives in Santa Fe and Dona Ana Counties. DMC efforts in these counties look very different: Dona Ana has made efforts in the area of DMC data collection. Santa Fe is now focusing on disparities, including socio-economic factors and other

risk factors at the “street” and “neighborhood” level rather than at race or ethnicity alone. We were unable to schedule a visit in Taos to discuss DMC efforts in Taos County.

Girls Circles

The Girls Circle Association (Girls Circle) was founded in 1996 as a support system to help young girls make healthy decisions, to encourage girls to be themselves within a structured support group and to instill self-confidence and improve girls’ interpersonal relationships. The expected outcome is that these improved relationships will, in turn, improve girls’ current lives as well as their futures.

Much of the current literature supports the concept that gender-specific programming for girls is an important aspect of the juvenile justice system. One research study noted that gender-specific programming for girls aims to help girls already in trouble, while preventing future delinquency among girls who are at risk. (Hossfeld, B., and Tyrol, K., 2007).

Girls Circle encourages girls to be themselves within a structured support group and is designed for girls between the ages of 9-18. The Girls Circle model includes a structured support group for girls in a specific format designed to increase positive connection, personal and collective strengths, and competence in girls.

Girls Circles are held on a weekly basis for 1 to 1 ½ hours. A facilitator leads the group through a format of talking and listening to one another. Often the programming provides an opportunity 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 decision-making.

Girls Circle Inc. is the primary source for Girls Circle information, training, research and standards. Outside Girls Circle Inc., there is little research about the program. The most recent studies on Girls Circles revealed a statistically significant improvement for girls in four long-term outcomes: 1) self-harming behavior, 2) alcohol use, 3) attachment to school, and 4) self-efficacy. And statistically significant improvement for middle school girls in four areas: 1) self-efficacy, 2) body image, 3) social support, and 4) increased resiliency through bonding to school. (Roa, J., Irvine, A., and Cervantez, K., 2007).

In terms of keeping girls out of juvenile detention when possible, a study by Hossfeld and Tyrol (2007) reported on Girls Circles success, and indicated: “There were very few differences across subpopulations of girls. This indicates that most groups of girls benefit equally from participating in a Girls Circle. We did find that girls held in juvenile detention, residential treatment or another secure facility did improve, but not as much as girls who had never had these experiences.”

Intensive Community Monitoring Programs:

Intensive Community Monitoring (ICM) programs can be run as either a post-adjudication program (i.e. intensive supervised probation) or as an alternative to detention (Austin et al., 2005). The ICMs ran in the State of New Mexico are alternatives to detention. Although there is not a defined best practice ICM model in existence yet, a study by Sheldon (1999) revealed a successful alternative to detention ICM model being implemented in San Francisco, CA.

The ICM model in San Francisco is called the Detention Diversion Advocacy Program (DDAP). DDAP's concept is disposition case advocacy. A youth waiting adjudication who is currently or likely to be held in detention and deemed as high risk for engaging in subsequent delinquent behavior can be referred to DDAP by the city's public defender's office, probation department, other community agencies, or by their parents. Case managers have daily contact with their youth and meet face to face a minimum of 3 times per week in the community. Case managers provide supervision and support to their clients and the clients' families. While youth are provided with community based services such as tutoring, substance abuse counseling, family counseling and behavioral monitoring; the parents/guardians are provided with services that include employment assistance, substance abuse treatment, day care and linkage to income support programs such as food stamps.

An evaluation of the DDAP program performed for the U.S. Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) (Sheldon, 1999) compared 271 DDAP client records to a comparison group of 271 San Francisco Department of Juvenile Probation (SFDJP) client records through chi-square statistical analysis. The DDAP client records consisted of 1993 and 1994 client referral records. The SFDJP client records were chosen through systematic sampling techniques (a detailed description of the sampling techniques was not provided in the report). The evaluation of the DDAP program revealed that although the DDAP group was originally deemed at higher risk to commit subsequent crimes on a risk assessment scale, the recidivism rate for the DDAP group was almost half that of the comparison group (DDAP's group recidivism rate was 34% and the comparison group's recidivism rate was 60%).

Reception and Assessment Centers

RACs offer screening, mental health and psychosocial assessment, and referral to outside counseling, health and treatment services. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) (2000), lists 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:

- 1) Single point of entry.
- 2) Immediate and comprehensive assessments.
- 3) Management information system (MIS).
- 4) Integrated case management.

The studies of assessments centers discussed in the literature review generally note positive outcomes regarding both behavioral changes in youth and increased efficiencies for communities. Our review of the literature also found assessment centers vary widely in how they function. For example, both the Sandoval County, New Mexico and Miami-Dade centers are referred to as "models". However, the Miami-Dade assessment center is a police-based drop off and booking center whereas the Sandoval County New Mexico assessment center follows the Annie E. Casey Foundation model of providing intake services, a risk assessment, crisis and case management, mental health/psychosocial assessment and referral services for pre-arrested and post-arrested youth.

Restorative Justice Panels

Restorative justice is more than just an alternative to detention, and like many of the programs preliminarily reviewed in this report, more often than not serves as a pre-juvenile probation, pre-court alternative. Restorative justice 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. In most cases, this includes restitution and some form of apology by the offender to the victim and others affected by the crime, as well as an opportunity for the offender, police, victim and others to work together to find the best possible outcome.

While the “net” of those youth who participate in Restorative Justice panels may be wider than those who are formally adjudicated, current literature indicates this offender-victim-community communication helps the offender make changes necessary to avoid such behavior in the future. As with many of these relatively recently-implemented juvenile justice alternatives, there is little objective outcome recidivism data.

A key outcome of restorative justice is to ensure offenders takes responsibility for their actions. Taking responsibility requires that offenders:

- Understand how their behavior affected other human beings (not just the courts or officials)
- Acknowledge the behavior resulted from a choice that could have been made differently.
- Acknowledge to all those affected that the behavior was harmful to others.
- Take action to repair the harm when possible.
- Make changes necessary to avoid such behavior in the future.

In 2006, Skills for Justice, the standards-setting body for justice in Great Britain, published formal standards designed to be used by practitioners and communities interested in developing restorative justice practices (See *National Occupational Standards for Restorative Practice*). The standards include the following:

1. Practitioners must obtain and evaluate information on incidents for which restorative justice is appropriate.
2. Practitioners must assess risks in using restorative practice approaches
3. Process and agree on a timetable and plan of action.
4. Assess and advise on the risks in using restorative practice.
5. Establish effective relationships with potential participants.
6. Advise participants about the restorative process and the options available within them.
7. Agree on a plan of action and timetable.
8. Facilitate the restorative practice process.
9. Support and advise participants before and during the restorative practice process.
10. Form outcome agreements.
11. Evaluate and report on outcomes of the restorative process.

FILE REVIEWS

The purpose of phase four was to provide client level information that would inform our understanding of how the various programs operate and serve clients. The expectation was the phase 2 and 3 interviews would give us an overall view of how the programs run and the file

review would confirm how the programs run and what services were offered to clients. From the file review we expected to be able to paint a picture of how clients were referred to the program, how clients were assessed for types of services within the program, what services the clients received while in the program, where the clients were referred to if a subsequent referral was made by the program, and if clients were being discharged as successfully completing the program or not and what deemed a successful discharge.

Upon completing the file review it was evident the files across most of programs lacked information needed to confirm how the programs were operating compared to the interviews. In general the file review was not helpful in describing how the different program operated and their process. The file review added very little substance to this report. This was an unexpected finding.

Following is an overall summary of information collected from the file review. Program site specific file reviews will be summarized in the ‘Interview’ section of this report by specific site for the programs whose files contained sufficient information

File Review Summary

As stated in the methodology section due to the number of sites, funding, and travel requirements we decided to sample a relatively small number of files from phase four sites. In order efficiently utilize the sources provided to us for the study we combined travel for phase three and four into the same trip. All 11 programs visited for phase three interviews were asked to provide a minimum of 10 discharged client files. We requested discharged files so we could track clients from referral to intake and through release from the visited sites. Eight of the 11 programs provided files for us to review. The program types visited for the combined phase three/four visit included DRCs, DMC Reduction Programs, Girls Circles, RACs, and Restorative Justice Programs. The DMC Reduction Program in Santa Fe County, the Girls Circle in Taos County, and the Restorative Justice Program in Grant County could not provide us with client files. Santa Fe County did provide aggregate data regarding the number of youth served and outcome information. Individual client files are not kept by either the Girls Circles Program in Taos County or the Restorative Justice Program in Grant County.

All files reviewed were provided by Day Reporting Centers, and Referral and Assessment Centers. A total of 80 files were reviewed from 8 different programs. Two different Sandoval County RAC sites were visited during phases 3 and 4 for a total of 9 sites being visited for the file review. Table 5 displays the number of files reviewed by program site.

Table 5. Number of Files Reviewed by Program

Program	Number of Files Reviewed	Percent
Bernalillo County RAC	10	12.5%
Colfax County DRC	9	11.3%
Dona Ana County RAC	15	18.8%
Lea County DRC	10	12.5%
Sandoval County DRC	10	12.5%

Sandoval County RAC	10	12.5%
Sandoval County RAC at BHS	6	7.5%
Santa Fe County DRC	10	12.5%

The majority of clients served were males. Table 6 reports the gender of the clients. Six files were missing this information.

Table 6. Gender

Gender	Number of Youth	Percent
Male	54	67.5%
Female	20	25.0%
Missing	6	7.5%

Hispanics were the most served population by the programs. Table 7 shows the race/ ethnicity of the clients served by the programs. Thirteen files did not contain information on the clients' race/ethnicity.

Table 7. Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Number of Youth	Percent
White	11	13.8%
African American	6	7.5%
American Indian	7	8.8%
Hispanic	40	50.0%
Multiracial/ethnic	3	3.8%
Missing	13	16.3%

The average age served was 15. The average grade attended in school was the 9th grade (Note: Fifteen files did not contain information on the clients' current grade level in school).

The majority of clients live with only one biological parent. Table 8 reports the client's living arrangement. Thirty-six files were missing this information.

Table 8. Living With

	Number of Youth	Percent
Living w/both biological parents	12	15.0%
Living w/one biological	26	32.5%

Living w/relative(s) other than biological parents	4	5.0%
Living w/foster parent	1	1.3%
Living in a shelter	1	1.3%
Missing	36	45.0%

The majority of referrals to the programs came from law enforcement and the local schools. Ten of the files did not indicate who originally referred the client to the program for services. Table 9 reports the referral source that originally referred clients to the programs for services.

Table 9. Referral Source

	Number of Youth	Percent
School	19	23.8%
Parent or Family	1	1.3%
Law Enforcement	28	35.0%
CYFD (i.e. JPO)	14	17.5%
Court System	5	6.3%
Other	1	1.3%
Self	2	2.5%
Missing	10	12.5%

Clients spent a median of 30 days in the programs. We report the median as the range for the duration clients spent in the some of the programs was between 1 and 179 days which inflated the average number of days and pulled the data in the direction of the larger number of days attended. Reporting the median helps us to avoid this inflated skew. Table 10 displays the median number of days clients spent in the selected programs.

Table 10. Days Spent in Program

Program	Median Days in Program
Bernalillo County RAC	2
Dona Ana County RAC	35
Sandoval BHS RAC	30
Sandoval DRC	11
Sandoval RAC	29
Santa Fe county DRC	35
YRC/Lea DRC	23

Table 11 summarizes where clients were referred to if they were referred out of the program to another program (this occurs most notably in RACs). If a client was referred out for another service, the majority of clients were referred for counseling. Although the table displays 41 files were missing this information it should be noted not all clients needed to be referred to another program and it was not necessarily an absolute for a program to refer a client out for another service.

Table 11. Destination of Out Referral from Program

	Number of Youth	Percent
Safe House (Shelter for Juveniles)	8	10.0
CYFD (i.e. JPO)	5	6.3
Counseling	17	21.3
Substance Abuse Treatment	2	2.5
Other	7	8.8
Missing	41	51.3

The majority of the clients were discharged from their program in 2011. Discharged files were requested for the file review; however 6 files we received from providers were still active in the programs. Interestingly, 11 (13.8%) of the files reviewed did not contain information on when the client was discharged from the program. Table 12 reports the year clients were discharged from their programs or if the clients were still active in their program.

Table 12. Year Discharged from Program

	Number of Youth	Percent
2010	5	6.3%
2011	58	72.5%
Still Active	6	7.5%
Missing	11	13.8

A slight majority of the client files were discharged successfully. Nineteen files did not contain information stating whether or not the client discharged as successful or unsuccessful. Table 13 reports the discharge status of the clients.

Table 13. Discharge Status

	Number of Youth	Percent
Completed successfully	42	52.5%

Unsuccessful	6	7.5%
Refused services	2	2.5%
Absconded	5	6.3%
Still in program	6	7.5%
Missing	19	23.8%

With few exceptions, the files lacked information regarding the services received by the clients while in their specific programs. For example: Of the 80 files only 46 reported an intake had taken place. As stated previously, all files reviewed were provided by Day Reporting Centers, and Referral and Assessment Centers. Due to the programming differences between DRCs and RACs and the services provided by the programs are split into two different tables, one for the RACs and one for the DRCs.

Expected services provided by RACs included an intake, referral and discharge. The Dona Ana County and Sandoval County RACs provided services above and beyond what is expected by also following up with every client, although expected services (intake, referral and discharge) provided by these two programs were not consistently recorded across all client files. Table 14 displays service counts provided to clients by the RACs in total as well as for the individual RAC sites.

Table 14. Service Counts for RACs

Service	Total for all RACs	Bernalillo County RAC	Dona Ana County RAC	Sandoval County BHS RAC	Sandoval County RAC
In referral accepted by program	10	10	0	0	0
Intake	25	10	5	5	5
Out referral from program	20	0	12	3	5
Follow up meeting	55	0	11	17	27
Follow up meeting canceled	1	0	1	0	0
No show for follow up meeting	3	0	3	0	0
Discharge	23	10	7	2	4
Client refused services	4	0	3	0	1

The service information compiled in Table 15 for the DRCs should be considered with caution. The majority of files reviewed contained little to no service information, while a few files contained the vast majority of information reported. An example of this is one of the Sandoval County DRC clients had 120 counts of attending in their file which accounts for 84% of the recorded attendance counts for that program. It should be noted the record of ‘Attended’ did not tell us what services the clients actually received, only that the clients were physically at the

program that day. Some of the services recorded could have occurred on the same day and therefore should not be looked at as all day events (i.e. GED Prep and Career 101 class could have occurred on the same day).

Table 15. Service Counts for DRCs	Total	Colfax County DRC	Lea County DRC	Sandoval County DRC	Santa Fe County DRC
In referral accepted by program	9	9	0	0	0
Intake	20	7	1	2	10
Attended	363	1	215	143	4
Career 101 class	4	0	0	4	0
E2020/school credits	57	0	0	57	0
GED Prep	24	0	0	24	0
Field trip	10	0	0	10	0
Out referral from program	6	6	0	0	0
Absent due to being in detention	5	0	0	5	0
Disciplinary action recorded	1	1	0	0	0
No Show	5	0	0	5	0
Discharge	7	0	0	2	5

PROGRAM INTERVIEWS

Program interviews were conducted as part of phase two and phase three. The client file review was conducted as phase four. The different program types are separated into sections and each program is addressed individually regarding how it operates, the population served, and how success is measured. As stated in the methodology section, phase two interviews were conducted with program administrators, and phase three interviews were conducted with line staff members where appropriate to enhance the information gathered during phase two. Phase two and three interviews are combined. Any discrepancies between administrators' and line staff members' statements concerning program operation are noted by site. Client file review findings from the 8 sites are addressed and data tables are provided. We expected each program would collect basic client level information including referral information, intake information, services provided and discharge information. In our experience the collection of this type of information is routine and is useful for documenting how clients are referred, become clients, progress through, and discharge from programs. This information is generally useful for describing how programs operate including describing the client population, how programs provide services to clients, and how clients enter and leave programs.

In general, we found in our review of a small sample of client files at each of the visited sites that programs maintained very limited information on their clients and the services they received. While this was generally true there were differences among the programs visited. This is

discussed in more detail below. Because of the lack of client information at most programs our ability to describe the population served, the services they received and to use this information to help describe how the programs operate and whether they meet best practice standards is limited.

Day Reporting Centers in New Mexico:

Five Day Reporting Center (DRC) sites were visited during phase two. The sites are located in Colfax, Lea, Sandoval, Santa Fe, and Taos Counties. Additionally Colfax, Lea, Sandoval, and Santa Fe Counties were revisited during phases three and four. Each site is discussed separately in this section.

Colfax County

Prior to August 2010 the DRC program in Colfax County was called Project Life Alignment (PLA). In August 2010 PLA was discontinued and a new DRC program named Crossroads was implemented. According to information provided during the interview PLA was discontinued because of documented problems including the length of time clients spent in the program, transportation issues with students, and problems between students and staff.

Referrals to Crossroads were made by an interdisciplinary team composed of the local juvenile probation office, and the school's principal, vice principal, and counselor. Students referred to the program had ongoing behavioral problems within the school setting. The program was considered both an alternative to detention, and an alternative to school detention, suspension and expulsion. Crossroads was the last alternative for the students who were referred, the next step being expulsion from school and for some an escalation in their status in the juvenile justice system. The goal of the program was to provide behavioral modification, help maintain academic success, provide life skills and successfully reintegrate the students back into their respected schools.

Crossroads was located on Raton High School's campus. The program served students from 7th grade through 12th grade. During the first school year all of the students were middle school aged with only one high school freshman being served, only one female was served, and all the students were minorities.

The program was designed to allow students who would otherwise be expelled from school for behavioral issues to attend school and earn school credits in a structured environment.

Crossroads mirrored a classroom setting. Crossroad employed one teacher. During the day the teacher was also accompanied by Behavioral Management Service (BMS) staff members who worked individually with students. BMS provided highly structured and supportive therapeutic behavioral intervention services to clients on a staff to client ratio of 1:1 with the goal to promote change in the client's behavioral patterns so they might have been able to stay in school, the community, and/or their home (CYFD, 2011). BMS staff members monitored the behavior of their assigned client 4 hours a day during the school week. The teacher was seldom the only adult in the room with the students and at the time of the phase two interview a video monitoring system was in the process of being installed in the classroom for enhanced monitoring.

Crossroads served 15 students at a time with the hope of reintegrating the students back into the larger school system after a semester of attendance. It was possible for a student to be reassessed and allowed to attend two semesters, but this would be a rare case. Two semesters was the

maximum any student could attend Crossroads. Students who attended Crossroads attended class through PLATO which is an online accredited learning system that provides education, assignments and testing (PLATO, 2011). PLATO is recognized by the New Mexico Public Education Department (PED).

Students attending the program were not allowed to interact with other Crossroad students except during lunch and regularly scheduled breaks. They were also not allowed to interact with the regular students attending classes on Raton High School campus, with the exception of being allowed to attend special school functions and participate in extracurricular activities.

Crossroads accepted all referrals sent to them, but did not have staff to accommodate special education students. Students successfully completed the program once they brought up any failing grades, were caught up academically to their peers, addressed their behavioral issues, and were able to reintegrate back into school.

The program finished its first school year in May 2011. During phase three we found the program was no longer in existence after the end of the school year in May. Beginning in Spring 2012 a new program was set to begin receiving referrals. The new reporting program is named the Learning Lab. JJAC had provided funding for the previous Crossroads program, but will not be providing funding for the Learning Lab program. Reportedly the cut in JJAC funding did not have to do with the incident that closed Crossroads, but due to lack of disbursement of funds from JJAC in total. At the time of the interview the new Learning Lab program had not yet begun, and is therefore beyond the scope of this report as the goal of this report is to report on running programs funded by JJAC in selected counties.

The file review of 9 Crossroads program files revealed the program collected information on age, race/ethnicity, gender, and current school year. The program files did not contain information on discharge dates, discharge status, or the client's living arrangement. The average client population served was Hispanic males, age 14, and in the 8th grade.

The files did not contain attendance information or services which were provided to the clients. Due to this lack of information along with the lack of discharge information we were unable to assess how the program functioned for any given client from the beginning when an intake was performed to the end when a discharge was performed. We were able to document intakes for 8 of the 9 clients and found out-referrals were made for 6 clients. We also found one client received disciplinary actions.

Lea County

The Lea County DRC program was restructured in 2009 into the current program now referred to as the Youth Reporting Center (YRC). The YRC is run by a private non-profit company contracted by the county. During the phase two interview the administrator noted referrals to the YRC come directly from the single juvenile court judge in Lea County. During phase three the interviewees, who are program staff noted referrals to the YRC come from both probation officers and judges. The program is an alternative to detention and is the last resort for youth in the juvenile justice system in Lea County before being sent to juvenile detention. The goals of the program are to provide an alternative to detention for juveniles so they are not detained with juveniles who may be more seriously involved in the criminal justice system, to keep juveniles

off the streets during times of the day when they are supervised, and to provide rehabilitative treatment to juveniles. A youth successfully completes the program when the term established by the probation office or judge expires and the youth has not gotten into further trouble.

According to interviewees the program's effectiveness is best measured by overt behavioral changes from the clients, and the clients not getting into further trouble and subsequently being referred back to the program. The program is able to track if a client has been in their program before through their electronic database.

According to the interviews the program has a design capacity of 10, but sometimes accepts an additional referral for a total of 11 juveniles at one time. The population served is considered at high risk for committing subsequent delinquent acts. Males and females are both served by the program with the age range being served between 12 and 18. It was stated during the phase three interview the majority of the clients served are Hispanic males age 15 to 16.

The YRC operates Mondays through Fridays from 2pm until 8pm. Youth who are still attending school may arrive at the program between 2pm and 4pm depending on what time school lets out. Youth are required to stay in the program until 8pm. The YRC recognizes major government holidays, and operates through extended school breaks.

Juveniles who are not currently attending school may earn school credits through APEX which is a web-based school curriculum program that is recognized by Lea County schools. APEX is an online learning system that provides school curriculum for students who need to recover credits to keep up with their school aged peers (APEX, 2011). The YRC provides a structured environment where time to complete school work, exercise, substance abuse counseling, and life skills are provided. If a youth already has their GED while attending the program a staff person helps the youth in searching for a job. Program success is partially measured by the number of youth who successfully complete the program. Because the program has only been in operation 2 years the program has not started to collect recidivism information.

The file review revealed the program collected information on age, race/ethnicity, gender, current school year, substance use, client's living arrangement, discharge year, and discharge status. In total 10 files were reviewed. The majority of clients were minority males with an average age of 15, living with 1 biological parent, and discharged from the YRC successfully. The YRC program was the only phase four program that had an electronic database to store client information and attendance dates.

The file review revealed client attendance was tracked by the program with some clients attending much longer than others (range was from 7days to 74 days). Although attendance dates were recorded, services received by clients on those dates were not provided. Inside the YRC a schedule is posted on a wall noting what services clients receive hourly Monday through Friday; however these services are not recorded in the client files. Because the posted schedule may change on a given day and is adjusted overtime we cannot reliable document the services received by the clients.

Sandoval County

The Sandoval County DRC Program according to the phase two interview with a program administrator has been in operation since 2007. The phase three interviewee stated it was their belief the program has been in existence for approximately 12 years. The DRC is considered an alternative to detention and the operation of the DRC is contracted out to a private non-profit corporation, Youth Development Incorporated (YDI). Juveniles are referred to the program through juvenile probation, local schools, the local juvenile drug court, and the local police department. Program success measures include the number of youths who don't become further involved in the juvenile justice system and by the number of juveniles who utilize the services recommended by the DRC.

The DRC is designed to serve a maximum of 20 youth at one time. However, the program used to be staffed by 3 persons and recently one position was dissolved without a plan to refill it. The cap, as decided upon by YDI administrators, still lies at 20. There is an average of 8 to 9 youth in the program at any one time with more youth being served during the school year than over the summer. Youth stay in the program anywhere from about 3 days to an entire school year. Youth who attend for only 3 days are usually those who were suspended from school and are ordered to attend DRC instead of serving their suspension at home. Those referred from drug court, probation and judges usually attend for longer period of time and usually not for less than 30 days. According to the interviews there have been no problems including short-term school suspension and juvenile justice system referred clients. The DRC recently started tracking recidivism by looking back 30 days, 6 months and 1 year to see if former program juveniles were placed in juvenile detention.

According to information from the interviews on average clients are 16 year old males coming from a mix of ethnic/racial backgrounds. The DRC serves both males and females ranging in age from 12 to 17. The sample of 10 client files provided during the file reviewed showed the majority of youth served by the DRC are Hispanic males, with an average age of 16, living with at least one biological parent if not both, and client's completed the program successfully.

Although it appears for the service information gathered and reported in table 15 in the preceding section regarding the file review was regularly recorded for clients it is not. Surprisingly, out of the 143 recordings of client attendance, 120 of those recordings belong to one individual client, with 4 of the other 10 clients not having any attendance dates recorded at all. To further emphasize this skew in data, out of the 57 recording of 'E202/school credits' 47 of those recordings belong to one individual client, with 7 of the 10 clients not having any record of receiving 'E2020/school credit' services.

Santa Fe County

The Santa Fe County DRC Program has been in operation since 2006 and is located inside the Santa Fe Youth Development Center building, which also houses the juvenile detention facility. Nearly all referrals to the DRC Program are made by a Children's Court judge or probation officer as an alternative to detention, and almost all of the clients are referred as they are released from juvenile detention. The DRC accepts referrals for pre- and post-adjudication cases, and probation and parole violations. The DRC's design capacity is 15 clients.

This program lists rehabilitation as its main goal. The program is designed to help youth finish school, get their GED, or reintegrate back into school. All youth in the program participate in the online learning system recognized by the Santa Fe public schools, E-2020. In addition to basic school work, the DRC provides secure supervision for kids, narcotics anonymous meetings, music and art classes, and counseling. The program director also acts as an advocate for program youth including working with the school system to get those eligible back into the public school system and providing effective communication with the youths' probation officer. The program provides services for the period of time the juvenile is required to attend which can be anywhere from 3 days to 4 months. The program is open year round.

The program mirrors a non-gender specific classroom for youth 13-17 years of age. The program is comprised of high-risk youth and youth who have already committed delinquent acts. Youth can be removed from this program for sustained or serious misbehavior, or severe behavioral health issues. According to the interviews, youth who are removed from the program are referred to residential treatment. The program director believes the program is effective in helping youth find a life outside of crime.

The file review of the Santa Fe DRC offered little substance for this report. While we requested files for discharged clients, only 6 of the files belonged to discharged clients, 2 files belonged to active clients, and we could not confirm whether the other 2 client files were for active or discharged clients. The paperwork kept in the files varied greatly and the only consistent information in the files was an intake. It is unclear why the program did not provide only discharged files as requested or why paperwork varied greatly between the files.

A large amount of information was missing from the client files when conducting the file review. For example, gender was missing for 60% of the clients, age was missing for 70%, for 2 of the ten files we could not tell if the clients were still active in the program or discharged, and grade level, guardian client was living with and city of residence were missing for all but one client.

Services provided were sporadically recorded in the files (ex. client attendance was not regularly recorded as seen by only 4 files containing attendance dates out of 10 files reviewed). During the interview it was stated all students participate in E2020 which could not be substantiated by the file review.

Taos County

The Taos County DRC, called the Learning Lab, has been operated by Rocky Mountain Youth Corps under an agreement with the local juvenile justice continuum since 2006. Referrals to the program are made under the collaboration of the local juvenile probation and parole office (JPPO), and the school. It is not necessary for a juvenile to have an open case with the JPPO to be referred to the Learning Lab. Students referred to the program have had ongoing behavioral problems within the school setting. The youth are identified as either having serious truancy problems or have committed delinquent acts in school.

The program's mission is to provide a support net to catch students before criminal or juvenile justice referral needs to be made. The program is designed to help the youth finish school or

reintegrate back into school. The Learning Lab does not accept a youth if the youth has already been in the program for one full semester, there is an opposing gang member already in the lab, or the child exhibits severe behavioral health issues. Youth who are not accepted to the Learning Lab for one of these three reasons are referred to residential treatment. The Learning Lab requires that each of its students complete attendance, physical training, community service, and a resume.

Because of the budget the program has a capacity of 10 youth semester. The single teacher for this program is provided by the Taos School District. Interviewees feel they can help children make significant changes in their lives and schooling. Interviewees also noted they would like to reach the Native American population and be available for kids who have already dropped out of school but this would require more funding.

Since this program takes youth prior to a delinquent referral, tracking recidivism was reported to be less relevant. Program leaders believe that youth in their program are able to keep out of the juvenile justice system with the help of their program and programs like it.

Disproportionate Minority Contact Reduction Programs in New Mexico:

Two DMC Reduction Programs were visited during phase two. The programs were located in Dona Ana and Santa Fe Counties. A third site in Taos County was originally listed to be interviewed, but when we learned the site no longer received JJAC funding the interview was not scheduled. A phase three interview was conducted with an administrator of the Santa Fe DMC Reduction Program as line staff were no longer employed by the program.

Note: The Dona Ana County DMC Reduction Program is currently not in operation. The interview took place before the program ended. The Santa Fe County DMC Reduction Program is also currently not in operation. The phase two interview took place before the program end and at the request of CYFD the program was scheduled to and did completed a phase three interview after the program ended. There were no files to conduct a phase four file review for the Santa Fe DMC Reduction Program.

Dona Ana

At the time of the interview, June 2010, the Dona Ana County DMC Reduction Program had been in operation for 3 years. The program's main goal was to understand, study, and reduce DMC in the juvenile justice system. The program worked in collaboration with the county juvenile justice continuum. The program established a dedicated website to inform and address the issues of DMC. The website address was: <http://dmctarc.nmsu.edu/index.html>. The website contained both Dona Ana County and state-wide DMC data which was meant to be used by the Dona Ana continuum team to inform juvenile justice professionals on ways to reduce and eventually eliminate DMC.

It was the programs personnel's belief that the program increased the community's engagement in juvenile justice by meeting with Juvenile Probation and Parole Officers and by building other relationships. The program personnel also used DMC information they collected when they taught criminal justice courses at New Mexico State University. Concerns regarding inconsistent funding for DMC were expressed during the interview.

Santa Fe

The DMC Reduction Program in Santa Fe County began in operation in 2007 and was based at a middle school. Students were screened as high risk using the criteria determined by the National Center for Dropout Prevention. The program used restorative justice principles that included an emphasis on accountability in student behavior, a student art program, and building student commitment to school. The goal of the program was to increase parental involvement. We were told the program was able to keep 86% of the juveniles in the program attending school and passing onto the next grade.

The program transitioned through 3 distinct phases for addressing DMC. The first phase involved looking at the major decision points in the juvenile justice system to see if there is disproportionate contact with minorities. The second phase involved a direct service approach based on the information discovered in phase one. The third and phase was a disparities approach which was to select children deemed high-risk, notwithstanding race or ethnicity.

During the third phase, Santa Fe County realized the need to identify red flags in school behavior before a youth is expelled or committed delinquent acts, this was based on the premise the youth were asking for help. High-risk youth were identified as having experienced trauma, school absence/truancy, having been left back in school, and disruptive behaviors or bullying. Also noted during the phase two interview was children in households where parents did not speak English have more power and separate lives than children whose parents did speak English.

The program served 30 juveniles at a time with the majority being 8th grade Hispanic males. The youth were identified as high risk of committing delinquent acts in the future. The program's goal was to serve these youth and give them the tools to cope with their stresses and emotions in a more constructive way.

The Santa Fe DMC Reduction Program ceased to exist in 2011.

We requested files to be reviewed. There were no program files to conduct a phase four file review for the Santa Fe DMC Reduction Program. Santa Fe County did provide aggregate data regarding the number of youth served and outcome information.

Girls Circle Programs in New Mexico:

Administrators from two Girls Circle programs were interviewed during the first wave of phase two interviewing. The programs were located in Chaves, and Taos Counties. Both programs report they follow the Girls Circle curriculum established by Girls Circle Inc. and have been in existence since 2006. The programs are structured to provide services to girls at high risk, and displaying behavioral issues such as truancy and fighting. The main obstacles reported were difficulties finding space and time in the schools to operate, and issues surrounding transportation to and from the program. The Girls Circle program in Taos was contacted for and completed a phase three interview.

Chaves County

The Chaves County Girls Circle Program is one of several programs overseen by the Chaves County Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA). The majority of girls referred to the

program are middle school and high school aged. Referrals are made program by teachers and principals, juvenile probation, or self-referral. Foster children are also often referred.

The goal of the program is to positively impact girls, to empower girls to be powerful women, and help girls want to become rule abiding, productive community members. The program is designed to help girls before they get into gangs, drugs or delinquency. The program holds 2 circles per week with a capacity on each circle of 10 girls. Once a juvenile is referred to the program she is expected to attend one circle a week for 3 months. It is the program coordinator's belief that the program is successful and Girls Circle Programs should be implemented in every school starting at 5th grade, and the equivalent of a Girls Circle Program for boys called Boys Councils should be put into practice as well.

While the program does not formally track recidivism and does not maintain any formal tracking system, they do informally track clients by checking with the local juvenile probation office about CYFD referrals or delinquent acts which occur to individuals after completion of the program.

Taos County

The Taos County Girls Circle Program is contracted out to a local facilitator who runs the program in the local middle school. Currently referrals to the program come from the local middle school. The program serves only the middle school population. The program does not exclude any girls or type of delinquent act and some girls are referred to more specific treatment if needed, such as substance abuse treatment. The program is designed to provide early intervention to at risk girls who might otherwise continue unwanted behaviors which could result in multiple consequences including expulsion from school and escalation into the juvenile justice system. The goal of the program is to help girls with female specific issues, self-image, body image, relationships, and decision making. The program maximum capacity is 10 girls and runs 8 to 12 sessions depending on the group. The demographics of the circles held reportedly represent the larger school population. The program has not had to remove any girls from the program since its inception, but if a girl drops out of school then they simultaneously leave their circle.

The program is currently looking into ways to track recidivism rates in conjunction with the local juvenile probation office. The program coordinator believes that the girls who have completed a Girls Circle are involved in fewer fights, receive fewer referrals to the juvenile justice system, are doing better in school, and have improved self-esteem. The program coordinator indicated middle school girls who are at risk are best served by Girls Circles and the Girls Circle group is sometimes the safest place for attendees to express the personal struggles in their lives. It is the belief of the program coordinator that more girls stay in school who attend the groups, and if the program had additional staff they could provide more services and reach more kids, which would not only be beneficial for the attendees, but also provide an avenue for the schools to receive additional funding since schools receive more funding when kids stay in school. It was reported funding of the Taos County Girls Circle program fluctuates quite a bit from year to year, where currently there is not enough funding for one fulltime personnel.

There were a few discrepancies between phase two and three interviews. During phase two the program coordinator interviewed stated: the program also serves high school girls; the program receives some of the referrals from the local juvenile probation office; the program serves up to 12 girls at a time; and each group meets for 10 to 12 sessions or about one school semester. The phase three interview revealed these statements to not be currently accurate. The program does not serve any high schoolers, all of the referrals come for the school, the maximum capacity of a group is 10 girls, and each group runs 8 to 12 sessions depending on the needs of the group.

There were no files to conduct a phase four file review for the Taos County Girls Circle Program. The program keeps a group note of the circle held but does not keep individual files or notes for clients. Because the program occurs at the middle school during school hours attendance is tracked by the school system, and those records belong to the school and not the Girls Circle program. We don't know why the program does not maintain client files, but because the program does not we could not confirm the number of sessions provided, attendance at sessions, length of sessions, or content of the sessions. It would be useful for the program to maintain this type of information.

Intensive Community Monitoring Programs in New Mexico:

Three ICM programs were visited during the second wave of phase two interviews. The 3 programs were located in Rio Arriba County, Santa Fe County, and Taos County. Because none of the ICM programs employ staff beyond the administrator phase three interviews were not conducted. As stated in the methodology section, due to limited funding and travel requirements phase four files reviews were conducted only at sites also participating in the phase three interviews. Therefore file reviews of the ICM programs were not conducted. Base on the phase two interviews the Rio Arriba and Santa Fe County ICM programs appear to be functioning as Sheldon (1999) and Austin et al. (2005) described how ICM programs should function.

The ICM programs in New Mexico are pre-adjudication alternatives to detention. The programs are designed to supervise juveniles in the community who are awaiting their adjudication court date after committing a crime. Juveniles are referred to the program by a judge in coordination with the local juvenile probation office. Supervision of the juveniles varies by site and within the sites on a case by case basis. Services provided by the programs vary slightly between sites, however all sites provide supervision along with assessments and/or referrals for community programs (e.g. YMCA), substance abuse treatment and support, and job placement if applicable. Each county contracts the ICM services to private non-profits. The programs are operated by a single individual in each county titled the ICM Coordinator. Each program started operation at different points in time. The Santa Fe and Taos County programs operate 365 days a year, while the Rio Arriba County ICM operates 10 months a year with a 2 month break during the summer. Juveniles who would otherwise be referred to the Rio Arriba County ICM during the 2 month break are referred to the local JPO for supervision instead. The demographics of the clients most frequently referred to the ICM programs are Latino/Hispanic males between the ages of 12 to 18. None of the programs interviewed have an official design capacity, however the average case load held by the Rio Arriba and Santa Fe County ICM coordinators is around 12 juveniles and the Taos County ICM coordinator holds a case load averaging 6 juveniles at a time. The length of time a juvenile spends in the program is on a case by case basis with the average being between 2 and 3 months. All sites have begun to track their impact on recidivism rates with

Santa Fe County being the only site to have had a study of their program's impact on recidivism rates. Each ICM interviewed reported different goals which are displayed in the counties individual sections. All sites described success in terms of clients complying with all court ordered requirements, attending school, maintaining grades, being a positive community member, and not getting into any more trouble with law enforcement or school.

One of the biggest obstacles the programs have had to overcome in their specific communities is getting their clients back into school. Some teachers and administrators have been reluctant in accepting their former students back into the classroom after the students had disruptive classroom behaviors and poor attendance. The solution has been hands on mediation by the ICM coordinators with the student and teachers. This mediation has proven successful except in Espanola High School, for which we cannot provide as to why the mediation has not proven successful in this one school.

A second obstacle has been finding afterschool programs for youth in order to keep them busy and not idle. The Rio Arriba County ICM coordinator has resolved this issue by referring juveniles to the local YMCA program which offers afterschool activities, supervision, and accountability. The Santa Fe ICM coordinator overcame this obstacle by finding an afterschool program to refer the juveniles to; however the afterschool program was not free. In order to grant some of the youth 'scholarships' to the program, the Santa Fe ICM coordinator provides training for the afterschool program's personnel for free in exchange for some of the ICM program youth to attend the afterschool program for free.

Rio Arriba County

The Rio Arriba ICM has been in operation since 2007. Rio Arriba ICM clients are required to check in with the ICM coordinator nightly by phone 7 days a week and have a minimum of 3 face to face contacts per week. On a case by case basis clients may be required to have up to 7 face to face visits per week. Face to face contacts take place at school and at the juvenile's home. The Rio Arriba County ICM program provides rehabilitation and prevention services for juveniles who are at risk of escalating further into the juvenile justice system. The Rio Arriba County ICM program has started to track recidivism earlier this year and will be tracking recidivism at 1 month, 3 months, 6 months and 1 year after receiving ICM services.

Santa Fe County

The Santa Fe ICM was established before 1999, and has had the same coordinator since 1999. ICM clients are required to check in with the Santa Fe ICM coordinator by phone nightly 7 days a week and have a minimum of 3 face to face contacts per week. The average client is required to attend 4 face to face visits per week with the ICM coordinator. Based on a case by case review clients may be required to have up to 7 face to face visits per week. Face to face contacts take place at school and at the juvenile's home. The Santa Fe ICM goal is to reduce recidivism by 10%. The Santa Fe ICM coordinator believes the true goal of ICM is to redirect and help kids get to a place where by the time they go to final adjudication and get put on probation they will know exactly what they need to do and what works in order to be successful and how to create their best self. According to the coordinator, Santa Fe County recently had an independent study completed for their program that among other things found the program reduces recidivism by

95%. We did attempt to attain a copy of the independent recidivism study, but were unsuccessful in attaining a copy to confirm this claim.

Taos County

The Taos ICM has been in existence since 2006. Supervision by the Taos ICM coordinator consists of 4 phone calls per week and 2 face to face office visits per week which have the potential to increase if the client's case deems it so. Due to the distance a client may have to travel for office visits in Taos County, the ICM coordinator may reduce the number of face to face visits to 1 time per week and increase the number of phone contacts if traveling is a hardship. The Taos ICM coordinator does not perform face to face visits outside of the office. The goal of the Taos County ICM program is to keep the juveniles out of detention, and to assess and refer them to services that can help turn the juvenile's life around. Recidivism is tracked by following up with JPO to see if a juvenile stays out of legal trouble, however Taos County ICM personnel stated that it is difficult to tease out what contributing factors cause a juvenile to be successful or not. The Coordinator believes the program has a direct positive effect on the population it serves and helps to reduce recidivism rates.

Reception and Assessment Centers in New Mexico:

Attempts to schedule interviews at 4 different Reception and Assessment Centers (RAC) sites in the State of New Mexico were made during phase two. We were able to schedule interviews with administrators at three of the four sites. Additionally all three sites visited also participated in phases three and four. The RACs visited were located in Bernalillo, Dona Ana, and Sandoval Counties. After numerous attempts to contact Santa Fe County RAC administrators for a phase two interview, the site was removed from the study.

Bernalillo County

According to the administrator interviewed during phase two the Bernalillo County RAC, called New Day, has been in operation since 2007. During the phase three interview the interviewee stated they have been with the RAC since 2007 and it has been in existence for about 8 years (approximately 2004). The RAC is considered an alternative to detention. The RAC's main goal is to divert juveniles from the juvenile justice system and help juveniles' access services to move forward in a proactive way. When juveniles are referred to the RAC they are assessed for a variety of potential referral services. Services youth can be assessed and referred to include education, vocational education, anger management treatment, substance abuse treatment, day reporting programs, and social services. The RAC does not directly provide services, but rather assesses and refers juveniles for services in the community. The program serves 12 to 17 year old youth. The RAC can serve youth younger than 12 years of age, but the youth would need to be assessed and then picked up by their guardians right away as the RAC is located in the same building as a safe home for youth, and staff seek to limit the amount of contact a younger youth would have with an older safe home client. Juveniles with more serious violent offenses are not served by the RAC. The program operates year round, 24 hours a day, 7 day a week.

Juveniles are referred to the program by law enforcement officers and the Bernalillo County Youth Services Center (YSC) staff. Schools, family members, and friends can refer youth to the RAC. Self-referrals are also accepted. While the administrator stated schools refer to the RAC often this was contradicted by the phase three staff interview. The staff interviewee noted that

although schools are encouraged and can refer to the RAC they seldom take advantage of the RAC as a resource. Efforts have been taken to get more police officers to refer juveniles directly to the RAC. However, despite these efforts some police officers still take juveniles to the YSC. The YSC then refers the juveniles to the RAC. RAC administrators believe this extra step could be avoided if the police would take the juvenile directly to the RAC. There is no cap to how many juveniles can be referred to and accepted by the RAC at any given time. Clients are deemed successful if they get linked up with the treatment/agency the RAC refers them to.

The program tracks recidivism of juveniles by checking at 30 days, 6 months and 1 year if the juvenile has been placed in juvenile detention. The data on recidivism is still in the early stages so there were no figures to report at the time of the interviews. It is the belief of the program administrator that the program saves the community money as youth who are referred to the program do not spend time in the more expensive juvenile detention center. The monthly budget from JJAC to the RAC has averaged approximately \$1,250.00 per month for the previous three years.

The average demographics of the youth referred to the RAC as seen by the file review are 15 year old Hispanic youth, either male or female, in the 9th grade, and discharged as successful from the RAC in 2011. The files contained similar paperwork, but some files were missing information such as discharge status, race/ethnicity, and current grade attending in school. All files similarly had an in referral acceptance by the program, an intake and a discharge performed. Interestingly we did not find documentation of the clients being referred by the program out to another provider for treatment, as this is the primary duty of a RAC this was an item we expected to see (this does not mean an out referral from the program did not occur, it just does not confirm a referral was made as expected).

Dona Ana County

The Dona Ana County RAC, referred to as the Juvenile Assessment and Reporting Center (JARC), has been in operation since 2006. In early 2010 the JARC went through a system wide change. The phase two interview was conducted in June 2010. In July 2010 the JARC once again went through a transition and was contracted out to a private non-profit company named Families and Youth, Inc. (FYI). The phase three interview and the file review were conducted individually with the FYI JARC administrator and two staff members in late November 2011.

The goals of the JARC are to prevent youth from escalating their contact with the juvenile justice system, to keep families together, and to assess and refer youth experiencing a variety of issues such as substance abuse, domestic violence and other issues. All youth referred to the program are served by the program. Referrals to the program can come from a variety of sources including law enforcement, schools, parents, friends, and self-referrals. The majority of the youth are referred by law enforcement and the local schools. The JARC operates year round 24 hours a day 7 days a week. The program serves youth ranging in age from 9 to 17. The reported average age range served is 14 to 17. It was reported during the interview the majority of youth referred to the JARC are Hispanic, with an approximate split of 60% males and 40% females.

JARC staff follows up with the youth they serve for an average of 30 days after the initial visit to the JARC to see if the youth have enrolled into and are completing the recommended services.

The file review did reveal follow-ups were recorded in all but 1 of the clients' files who accepted JARC services. The program tracks recidivism by keeping track of re-offenses committed by youth the JARC has served. The administrator of the program feels the JARC could serve more walk-in (self-referred) clients in the community. The administrator stated they are trying to get the word out into the community of the services the JARC offers and the program is working to de-stigmatize the JARC as being only for youth in trouble rather than being for all youth in need.

Phase four revealed the JARC serves an average population of Hispanic males, 16 years in age in the 10th grade, who live with one biological parent, and successfully complied with the referral the JARC staff made.

Across all files reviewed it is apparent not all hardcopy files kept track of all services performed. This is seen by the example of 12 youth being discharged as successful from the program yet only 5 client folders had an intake recorded as being performed, which it is assumed an intake would need to be performed for a client to be in the program let alone discharge successfully.. However, it can be inferred from the data the 12 clients who received referrals are the 12 clients who also successfully complied with the referral the JARC staff made (the other 3 youth refused JARC services). It appears that all of clients referred for treatment of some type complied with the referral. The JARC also followed up with clients beyond the referral made to another agency and documented these follow ups in the client files.

Sandoval County

The Sandoval County RAC has been in operation since 2006 and is listed as a model program by the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) project. The majority of the juveniles served by the program are referred prior to the youth being referred to the local juvenile probation office as an alternative to detention. The majority of referrals to the RAC come from law enforcement officers, school resource officers, and school administrators. The goal of the RAC is to provide a center where juveniles can be assessed and referred to proper services to get their specific needs met, and provide a center where police officers can drop off juveniles for assessments thereby allowing the contacting officer to return to their duties on the streets. The RAC accepts all referrals except for felony charges when the juvenile is automatically sent to the detention center. Currently the RAC is located in 3 separate offices in Sandoval County. The offices are located in Bernalillo High School, Rio Rancho High School, and at the Sandoval County Juvenile Probation office. In addition to the administrator staff interview during phase two, two line staff members were interviewed during phase three, one from the site located within Bernalillo High School and the other from the site located at the Sandoval County Juvenile Probation office.

The RAC serves as a single point of entry for youth arrested by law enforcement. However, some police and juvenile probation officers within Sandoval County still do not bring youth directly to the RAC. Ongoing efforts are being made to address the lack of referrals by those few officers.

The RAC provides intake services, a juvenile justice risk assessment, a mental health/psychosocial assessment and screens for acute needs and suicide risk. The RAC includes crisis

and case management intervention. The RAC refers juveniles to a large variety of programs and services including the day reporting program, schooling, vocational education, anger management treatment, and to counselors who are trained in assessing for further mental health and substance abuse treatment. Clients are followed up with for a period of 30 days after being referred for a service from the RAC. Follow up consists of the client meeting briefly with RAC staff for weekly (about 10 minutes on average) appointments to assess and discuss how the client is progressing on reaching agreed upon goals. A client is deemed successful by the RAC if they get connected with the service(s) they were referred to by the RAC within the 30 day follow up period. Occasionally a client's follow up period will be extended past 30 days, usually at the request of the client. According to the interview follow up periods rarely exceed 45 days.

The Sandoval County RAC maintains a management information system. The program is in the process of beginning to collect recidivism data on their clients. It is the belief of the program personnel interviewed that the RAC helps to reduce recidivism and helps to save the county money by keeping fewer juveniles in detention. According to information provided during the phase 2 interview, before the program was implemented the average number of youth held in the juvenile detention center was 14. Since the program has been in full operation, the average number of juveniles held in detention has averages 3 or 4 juveniles.

The paperwork contained in the files reviewed during the phase 4 file review was similar. However, more detailed information was found in the site located at the Sandoval County Juvenile Probation office than at the Bernalillo High School site.

The majority of the clients served at the Sandoval County RAC located at the Sandoval County Juvenile Probation office were Hispanic males, 15 years of age, in the 9th grade, living with one biological parent, and were discharged from the RAC as successful. Six of the 10 clients successfully completed the program, it would be assumed that all 6 would have completed an intake, been referred to a service, and discharged from the program. In the records reviewed 5 of the clients had service records of an intake taking place and a referral being made, and 4 had a service note of a discharge being made. Although the records kept by the program were orderly it appears the service records were either incomplete or notices of intake, referrals and discharges were optionally recorded as services in the client files.

The majority of the clients served by the Sandoval County RAC located at Bernalillo High School site were American Indian males, 17 or 18 years of age, in the 10th or 11th grade, living on the San Felipe Indian Reservation, and were still active in the program at the time the file review was conducted. Discharged files were requested for the file review, but the majority of files (4 of 6) provided by the BHS RAC for review were active case files. Five of the 6 clients had an intake recorded and only 3 had an indication of a referral. Although the records kept by the program were orderly, it appears the service records were either incomplete or notices of intake were optionally recorded as services in the client files.

Restorative Justice Panels in New Mexico

Four Restorative Justice Panels were visited and interviewed during phase 2. The Grant County Restorative Justice Panel was revisited during phase 3.

Similarities between Chaves County and Sandoval County

The majority of juveniles referred to the Chaves and Sandoval County Restorative Justice Panels are referred by the local juvenile probation office or from the court system and are considered pre-referrals. The coordinators of the two different panels are responsible for gathering the diverse group of offenders, victims, parents and police to a meeting in which the circle as a whole develops a restorative plan and timetable. Both the Chaves and Sandoval County Restorative Justice coordinators indicated a need for increased education of law enforcement officials regarding the restorative justice concept.

Chaves County

The Chaves County Restorative Justice Panel has been in operation since early 2006. The goal of the program is to provide for positive outcomes for youth and the community. The program accepts all referrals, except youth with a gun-related charge. The design capacity of the program is 15 to 18 juveniles. The majority of juveniles referred to the program are males and nearly all are first time offenders. According to the interviewee the race/ethnicity of the juveniles referred to the program matches the county's population. The program is designed to last no longer than 180 days. In order for a juvenile to complete the program they must pay their restitution as determined by the restorative justice circle, and write a letter of apology to the victim. The program does not have a management information system and does not track recidivism rates.

Sandoval County

The Sandoval County Restorative Justice Panel has been in operation since early 2008. The goal of the program is to hold youth more accountable in community based setting. The design capacity of the program is 1 to 2 youth per month. The program accepts all referred youth to the program except youth who are referred to a residential treatment, drug court or private counseling program, or if there is a pending lawsuit with the victim. The program does not require the youth to write an apology letter to the victim as a matter of course, although it may be part of the process. Completion of the program occurs once the juvenile completes the terms of the contract the juvenile signed with the restorative justice circle. Juveniles are given two weeks at most to complete the terms of the contract.

The program tracks recidivism at 30 days, 90 days and one year after program completion. This is done by checking the CYFD FACTS case management system to see if there have been any referrals for former clients.

The program coordinator believes that the program has a broad and positive community impact in helping kids succeed, and restorative justice panels help communities heal after bad events occur. It was stated during the interview that with more manpower the Restorative Justice Panel could provide more service to juveniles and the community.

Grant County

The Grant County Restorative Justice Panel, referred to as the Circles in the Schools (Circles), has been in operation since 2008. The program's main goal is to reduce negative behavior in the schools by reducing bullying, conflicts and disruptions in the class room. The program is

currently being operated in multiple classrooms in elementary, middle, and high schools within 3 school districts.

The panel functions as an enhanced, co-ed Girls Circle, and follows much of the Girls Circles curriculum. The group facilitators are trained in the Girls Circles curriculum and community conferencing, with some also being trained in mediation and conflict resolution. Only when specific topics are presented to the groups will the different genders be separated. Circles operates in school classrooms one hour a week during the school year. The group capacity is set at 12 with a minimum of 6 served at a time. According to the administrator interviewed during phase 2 if a classroom exceeds 12 students, then the classroom is divided and 2 separate circles are held. During the phase 3 interview with a line staff member it was said the line staff member currently has a group of 26 students and has not had to separate group yet due to capacity because the group has been ‘manageable.’

Because the juveniles in the program have not come into contact with the juvenile justice system the program is not considered an alternative to detention. The groups are established in lower socioeconomic areas that have higher parental imprisonment rates. The program has been collecting data on the program’s youth behaviors. It is the belief of the program administrators that the program helps to educate youth about behavioral choices, which in turn helps to reduce delinquency and reduce the number of juveniles being referred for criminal acts. The program not only helps youth stay out of trouble, but saves the community money by reducing the number of youth being referred to detention. The program also helps to spot youth who are in need of social services and helps to connect youth to those resources.

Although there are no client files for the groups that are held, and attendance list is kept and a group note is made after each group held.

Santa Fe County

The Santa Fe County Restorative Justice Panel, called Peer Panel, was established in 2007. Peer Panel is solely operated within the public middle school system. The first three years of operation took place in one middle school. During the past year it has been expanded into 3 additional middle schools (total of 4 currently in operation). The goal of the program is to help children to understand the impact of their behaviors on other students’ learning. The program is designed as behavioral intervention preliminary to suspension. It is the belief of the program administrators that detention and suspension are purely punitive forms of punishment for a student’s unwanted behaviors. Peer Panel’s administrators believe that if a student is suspended from school then the student can feel exiled from the school and has more potential to get into legal trouble with law enforcement while not enrolled in school. By providing Peer Panel an alternative to suspension is available and can help to integrate students into their school community.

The majority of referrals to Peer Panel come from a team of teachers who make a joint decision regarding whether or not to refer the student to the program. Behavioral issues that constitute a referral to Peer Panel are not considered criminal, instead the behaviors that constitute a referral are said to be routine disruptive behaviors witnessed in schools. Due to there not being a crime committed by the referred individual the program is not considered an alternative to detention.

Rather the program can be thought of as pre-alternative to detention as no contact has yet been made in the juvenile justice system by the referred student.

Once a student is referred to the panel they are termed the respondent. The respondent must present themselves before a body of peers. The peers who comprise the panel are selected by teachers and asked to voluntarily sit on the panel. Emphasis is placed on the panel being a diverse group of peers and not based on academic merit alone. Students who comprise the panel receive an elective credit as it is considered a class. During a class period 1 to 3 respondents may be seen. When the respondent appears before the panel the peers take turns introducing themselves, discussing with the respondent why the behavior committed was disruptive to the learning process and the impact the behavior had on fellow students, and problem solve with the respondent on how to display better behaviors in the future and/or how to resolve a problem, if one exists. Peers never counsel a respondent on their behavior or personal issues that may arise as a topic. A teacher is always present who may provide higher insight for the respondent's behaviors and/or life issues. The meeting between the Peer Panel and the respondent normally ends with a community contract being made between the Peer Panel and the respondent. The community contract usually lasts until the end of the grading period, for middle schools a grading period is a quarter of the school year. The majority of community contracts are behavioral with case specific tasks to complete (for example: having to clean or receiving tutoring), and grade progress reports must be signed by the parents of the respondent. The community contracts are framed as the respondent took away from the school with their misbehavior, so now they have to give back to the school. If another student or a teacher was hurt by the respondent's misbehavior an apology is almost never required by the respondent as an overt insincere apology can cause further damage.

If a respondent fully completes their community contract with no further disruptive behaviors than the respondent does not have to meet with the Peer Panel again. However, it is normal for a student to be referred to the Peer panel twice for disruptive behaviors and for the Peer Panel to take action to try and help the respondent to eliminate these disruptive behaviors. Because referrals to the Peer Panel are not criminal program administrators believe it is not pertinent to track recidivism defined as such. However, program administrators do believe it would be beneficial to track respondents' behavioral changes and grades as a way of proving the success of the program. The program's administrators are currently in the beginning development stages of trying to configure how to track the believed success of their program.

The majority of students referred to the Peer Panel are Hispanic/Latino middle school aged males. However, it was noted during the interview that the racial/ethnic breakdown of the program is similar to population of the school.

Three obstacles were reported in implementing the program. The greatest obstacle reported was funding. Every year since the programs existence the program has come at risk of being cut and has had its budget reduced even though it is thought to be successful in resolving problem behaviors and keeping more children in school. The second obstacle has been trying to find time in teachers' and school administrators' schedules to be informed, trained, and integrated into the program. The third obstacle has been the unexpected costs incurred by the Restorative Justice Coordinator. The nature of the position of the coordinator requires them to be mobile and travel to various schools throughout the day; however, mileage and cell phone costs are not reimbursed.

DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONTACT

Disproportionate minority contact (DMC) is defined as an overrepresentation of minority youth at any stage within the juvenile justice system (Huizinga et al., 2007). The nine stages within the juvenile justice system where contact occurs are: arrest; referral; diversion; case petitioned; secure detention; delinquency finding; probation; confinement in secure correctional facility; and case transferred, certified, and waived to adult court (OJJDP, 2009). Based upon 2005 – 2010 year Relative Rate Indexes (RRIs) every county within New Mexico is experiencing DMC at multiple stages of the juvenile justice system.

Hoytt et al. (2002) lists the possible causes for the existence of DMC:

- Individual police practices and policies may make it more likely that minority youth are arrested (e.g., targeting patrols in low-income neighborhoods or in racial or ethnic minority neighborhoods).
- Where offenses happen greatly influences the potential for arrests (e.g., targeting street corners in cities is easier than targeting homes in the suburbs).
- Differential reactions of victims to offenses committed by white and minority youth (e.g., white victims disproportionately perceive offenders to be minorities).
- Youth exhibit different behaviors (e.g., youth of color may commit certain crimes more frequently).
- System personnel show overt racial bias.

OJJDP (2009) lists 4 stages to assessing why DMC exists:

Stage 1: Generate possible explanations

Stage 2: Identify the types of data and the patterns of results needed

Stage 3: Obtain the data

Stage 4: Analyze the data and identify the most likely mechanism(s) creating DMC in this jurisdiction.

During interview wave two, program personnel were asked their familiarity with DMC, if DMC exists in their county, the possible causes of DMC in their county, and if their program helps to reduce the disparity. The added questions on DMC help to accomplish OJJDP's (2009) stage 1 by generating possible explanations of why DMC exists and perhaps where it exists as well. Eight interviews were conducted during wave two. Interviewees at 7 of the 8 sites visited provided responses to the added DMC questions. The interviewee at the 1 site that chose not to answer the DMC questions stated that the topic of DMC is not constructive and is not the focus of their approach with the program. Some program personnel interviewed appeared more informed about DMC and its possible causes than others. Efforts were made during the interviews to explain DMC further to those who may not have been as familiar with the topic of DMC.

All 7 interviewees stated that DMC does exist in their counties. The majority of the interviewees stated that the stage of the juvenile justice system where DMC is greatest is at the arrest stage.

The causes of DMC varied between sites. Causes of DMC included: cultural, socioeconomic status, police bias, prejudice, and societal. The majority of interviewees stated their programs help and is designed to reduce DMC by diverting minority youth from juvenile justice system or further penetrating the system and addressing cultural specific issues. One site noted their program has not been in operation long enough to measure if it helps to reduce DMC, but should be able to measure that soon. Below are summaries of DMC interviews from three interview sites.

One person interviewed stated that DMC is a crock. Those that need to be arrested are being arrested. Gangs are made up much more of minorities, Hispanics/Latinos and African Americans, than Caucasians. The causes of DMC are societal, socioeconomic and cultural and not due to discriminatory practices.

Another person interviewed stated that DMC does exist in their county. The causes of DMC are police bias at the arrest stage of the juvenile justice system and the socioeconomic status of the arrestee. Although the police are just trying to perform their job duties, sometimes they unconsciously profile certain populations which can cause an increase in that demographic targeted. Targeted groups are Latinos/Hispanics, African Americans, and juveniles who dress with baggy clothes and sideways ball caps. The socioeconomic status of the arrestee is also a cause of DMC. Caucasians may be able to hire an attorney who may be able to get them off completely or reduce their sentence more than the Latino/Hispanic youth who may not be able to afford to hire an attorney to represent them.

A third person interviewed noted that their county has been trying to actively pursue and reduce DMC. It has proven to not be an easy task as DMC figures such as relative rate indexes have not been released on a regular basis. It was this administrator's belief at this site that figures concerning DMC need to be released at regular intervals annually to each county via the internet in order for each county to be better able to assess how their program(s) are affecting DMC.

A forth person interviewed disclosed their community was made up of approximately 50% whites and 50% and the referrals made to the program in the prior year were all Hispanic save one Anglo. Disproportionate minority contact was stated to exist, but the cause appeared to be social economic status rather than discrimination from officers or the court system. The majority of their referrals were coming from the impoverished part of town which the majority of individuals and families happened to be Hispanic.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Many of the programs visited and where interviews were completed self-reported operating at or close to best practice standards as identified in the literature review. One program, the Sandoval County RAC, reported they are a model program for the Annie E. Casey JDAI project. Another program, the Grant County Restorative Justice Panel, reported they are a restorative justice panel when the definition of a restorative justice panel does not fit the actual practices of the program. Based on the range of adherence to known best practice standards we categorized the programs into three broad categories: exceeds best practice standards, meets best practice standards, and does not appear to be meet best practice standards. All 19 sites visited were categorized into 1 of these 3 categories based on information collected during the interviews of administrators and

staff and the file review process when compared to standard practices. It is important to remember the categorization is based on comparing information gathered during the interviews in conjunction with the file reviews with the literature review completed in phase one.

The following 4 programs exceed current best practice standards for their program type: the Chaves County Girls' Circle, the Sandoval County DRC, the Sandoval County RAC, and the Santa Fe County ICM. These programs reportedly are performing above best practice standards.

Thirteen of the programs reportedly meet current best practice standards for their program type. These programs are: the Colfax, Lea, Sandoval, Santa Fe, and Taos County Day Reporting Centers; the Dona Ana, and Santa Fe County DMC Reduction programs; the Taos County Girls' Circle programs; the Bernalillo, and Dona Ana RACs; and the Chaves, Sandoval, and Santa Fe Restorative Justice Panels.

Two programs appear to not be performing to current best practice standards. One of these programs is the Grant County Restorative Justice Panel. Based on the interviews the Grant County Restorative Justice Panel does not appear to be functioning as a true restorative justice panel, but more as an enhanced co-ed Girls' Circle program. The Grant County Restorative Justice Panel might be better categorized under OJJDP's grant programs as a school program rather than an alternative to detention or a gender-specific program. The other program that does not appear to be performing at current best practiced standards is the Taos County Intensive Community Monitoring program. The Taos County ICM program appears to be functioning as an ICM, but lacks in monitoring individuals in the community, and lacks in the number of face to face visits and phone contacts with program juveniles per week when compared to standard practices described in the literature (Sheldon, 1999). When compared to other ICM programs within New Mexico, the number of individuals served by the Taos County ICM program appears to be low. The Taos County ICM program would operate as standard practices described by Sheldon (1999) by increasing the average number of face to face contacts with clients from 2 to at least 3 visits per week and by conducting these visits in the community rather than solely in the office, have daily phone contact with clients instead of only 4 times per week, and increase the capacity of clients served by the program at any given time from 6 to comparable NM ICM program capacities of 12.

The file review performed showed a wide variance in the amount and quality of client level information maintained by programs. It would be useful for programs to consistently and reliably collect information on the clients they serve. This includes referral information, intake information, service information, and discharge information. Multiple programs stated they keep separate tracking sheets from the client files which is how they report required information to CYFD rather than relying on information kept in client files. We don't know why programs might maintain information this way. We believe it would be useful for providers It would appear in order to attain consistency of the information kept by the providers a minimum dataset developed by CYFD would help to gain consistency of information gathered across all programs who provide services to juveniles and receive JJAC funding.

Since this research project began 5 of the programs scheduled for interviews closed or were reorganized due to various reasons including most notably funding cut backs. It was stated

during interviews from more than one interviewee that program administrators are well aware of the uneasy ground their programs stand on when relying on funding from JJAC and CYFD. One of the administrators stated it can be hard to prove if a program works or not if the program loses some funding and has to reconstruct itself every few years due to this ebb and flow of funding.

In conclusion, this report completes the larger research project. The second phase was designed to interview program administrators on how their programs operate. The third phase was designed to enhance information attained during phase two by interviewing line staff members. The four and final phase was to complete a file review in order to provide client level information that would inform our understanding of how the various programs operate and serve clients. Categorizations of programs into three broad groups was completed based upon best practices reported on in phase one's literature review compared to the results of each program's phase 2,3 and to a lesser degree phase 4 findings. All four phases were meant to analyze the impact of juvenile justice programming in the nine selected New Mexico counties, and study and report on how these programs contribute to the understanding of law enforcement and juvenile justice system factors, which perpetuate Disproportionate Minority Contact in New Mexico.

REFERENCES

- APEX. (2011). APEX. Retrieved on July 6, 2011 from APEX's website: <http://www.apexlearning.com/>.
- Austin, J., Johnson, K. D., and Weitzer, R. (2005). Alternatives to the Secure Detention and Confinement of Juvenile Offenders. *OJJDP Juvenile Justice Bulletin*.
- Children, Youth, and Family Services. (2011). Behavioral management services policy and procedures. Retrieved on July 6, 2011 from the New Mexico Children Youth and Family Service' official website: http://www.cyfd.org/pdf/providers/BehavioralHealthRFPNR_1.pdf.
- 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.
- Hoytt, E. H., Schiraldi, V., Smith, B. V., & Ziedenberg, J. (2002). Reducing racial disparities in juvenile detention. *Pathways to Juvenile Detention Reform*, 8. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Huizinga, D., Thornberry, T. P., Knight, K. E., Lovegrove, P. J., Loeber, R., Hill, K., and Farrington, D. P. (2007). Disproportionate minority contact in the juvenile justice system: A study of differential minority arrest/referral to court in three cities. Retrieved on August 17, 2010 from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service official website:
<http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/grants/219743.pdf>

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.

National Criminal Justice Reference Service <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/171155.pdf>

New Mexico Sentencing Commission (2010a). *Analysis of the Impact of Juvenile Justice Programming in Six New Mexico Counties*. New Mexico Sentencing Commission.

New Mexico Sentencing Commission (2010b). *A Review of Juvenile Justice Programs in New Mexico*. New Mexico Sentencing Commission.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2009). Disproportionate minority contact technical assistance manual, 4th edition.

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.

PLATO. (2011). PLATO. Retrieved on July 6, 2011 from PLATO's website: <http://www.plato.com/>.

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.randalph.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.

Santa Fe. (2011). Intensive Community Monitoring. Retrieved on March 8, 2011 from the official website of Santa Fe, New Mexico: <http://www.santafenm.gov/index.aspx?NID=1251>

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. (2009). Disproportionate minority contact technical assistance manual, 4th edition.

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

JJAC Program Interview Guide

General Information

Interview Date: _____ / _____ / _____

Interviewer Name: _____

Program Name: _____

Program Type: _____

Program Location (City and County) _____

Position or Job Title of Interviewee: _____

Name of Interviewee: _____

Number of years and months as a member of this program: _____ / _____

Briefly describe your role in the program: _____

Section A: Program Information

1. How long has this program been in operation?: _____

2. In your words, what do you believe is this program's main goal?: _____

3. Are there other goals?: _____

4. Does this program have a policies and procedures manual?

1. Yes
2. No

Request a copy. Did you obtain a copy? _____

5. What is the capacity of this program? (how many clients can be served): _____

6. How long is the program designed to last in days? _____

7. What types of cases does this program include? (mark all that apply)

- Pre-Referral
- Deferred prosecution (Pre-adjudication)
- Post-adjudication

Probation/Parole violation
 Other, (specify) _____

8. What type of offenses are eligible? (mark all that apply)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Misdemeanors | <input type="checkbox"/> Felonies |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Drug sales | <input type="checkbox"/> Drug possession for sale |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Drug user | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-drug offenses |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Juveniles with no offense | |

9. Are there reasons for exclusion? _____
(If yes, specify) _____

10. Under what circumstances is a juvenile offender removed from the program?

11. What is the most likely disposition of a case when a participant is removed from the program?

12. Who makes the determination to remove someone from the program?

13. What conditions must be met to complete the program?

14. Is this program an alternative to detention?: _____

15. How would you define 'alternative to detention'? _____

16. What days of the week and what hours is this program open? _____

17. How often are services provided to clients?: _____

18. Does your program have a client management information system?:

Yes _____ No _____
If yes, can you describe the system?: _____

If no, can you describe how the program stores client information?: _____

19. Ask for clean copies of any forms used to collect client information. (sign in sheets, assessment forms, screening forms, referral forms, service forms, discharge forms, etc.)

Section B: Client Information

1. What are the major characteristics of this program's target population (i.e. age range, gender, other demographic characteristics, criminal history, family history, etc.) pre-adjudication, post-adjudication, arrested youth, detained youth)?

2. Is race/ethnicity self-reported? _____

3. Do you feel this program is reaching and serving the most appropriate population?

Yes _____ No _____

If no, why: _____

5. In your opinion, is the population being served by this program benefiting from the program?

Yes _____ No _____

If no, why : _____

6. Do you believe there are other populations that could benefit from this program?

Yes _____ No _____

If so, who? _____

Section C: Services

1. How are juveniles referred to this program? (police, parents, schools, juvenile probation, other CYFD, other): _____

2. Please describe program eligibility criteria: _____

3. How often are services provided to clients?: _____

4. What services does this program provide ?

Probe by program type:

(RAC: screening, mental health, and psychosocial assessment, referrals for outside treatment services and counseling, case management)

(Restorative Justice Panel: personal services to victims, community service, written apologies, verbal apologies)

(Girls Circle: role playing, gender specific themes, journaling)

(Day Reporting Program: intensive supervision, schooling, vocational education, anger management, substance abuse counseling)

5. Briefly describe the juvenile programs you feel are most effective and why? _____

6. Is there room for improvement in the services provided to your clients?

Yes _____ No _____

If so, how would you change this program to make it more effective? _____

7. Are ancillary services available? (For example: job training, employment assistance, medical care, and after care)

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, please list some examples of these services: _____

Section D: Outcomes

1. How do you feel clients benefit from this program?: _____

2. How effective do you feel TYPE OF PROGRAMS is in comparison to the traditional juvenile justice system?

3. Do you feel this program has an impact on the juvenile justice system?

Yes _____ No _____

Why or why not? _____

4. To what extent do you feel this program is successful in retaining participants?

5. Overall, how important do you believe the role of this program is in impacting recidivism rates?

- 1- Very important
- 2- Important
- 3- Somewhat important
- 4- Not that important
- 5- Not important at all

6. How does this program track or measure recidivism? _____

7. Do you feel the program has succeeded in enhancing participant's capacity to function in the community? (i.e. education, job skills, employment, housing and health)

Yes _____ No _____
If yes, please explain: _____

Section E: Disproportionate Minority Contact

I have a few questions on a different subject that has become a topic of debate both nationally and locally. There appears to be more youth of color (**minorities – Hispanics, Native Americans, and African Americans**) within the juvenile justice system (**be sure to be ready to note the different points of contact**) than there are of non-minorities or Whites/Caucasians which has been termed Disproportionate Minority Contact.

- 1) Do you know what DMC is?

Yes _____ No _____

- if 'yes', continue to #2
- if 'no' inform interviewee of DMC and its possible causes, and only proceed asking questions further than #1c if interviewee appears confident in knowledge about DMC in their area (skip questions 2 and 3 if you explain what DMC is and its possible causes to the interviewee)

- a) To what extent do you believe DMC exists in your community?

- b) Do you believe your program reduces DMC in your community? If yes, ask question #1c

Yes _____ No _____

- c) How does your program reduce DMC in your community?

- 2) How familiar are you with DMC?

- 3) Can you describe the possible causes and factors that contribute to DMC?

- 4) What is the extent that DMC exists in your county?

- a) What do you think are the causes of DMC?

i) Can you think of any other causes?

Yes _____ No _____

- ii) What are the other causes?

- iii) Are there diversion (**be prepared to define diversion**) programs established and being utilized in your county?

Yes _____ No _____

- iv) What are the diversion programs being utilized?

- d) Do you believe your program helps to reduce DMC?

Yes _____ No _____

- i) If yes, how does the program help to reduce DMC?

- ii) What improvements can be made to the program to further the reduction of DMC?

e) Are there other programs that you believe help in reducing DMC?

Yes _____ No _____

i) If yes, what are the programs?

For each program named:

i) Does the program exist in **county**?

Yes _____ No _____

ii) If yes, do you have a part in the program?

iii) How does the program help to reduce DMC?

iv) What improvements can be made to the program to further the reduction of DMC?

DMC Definition:

Disproportionate minority contact (DMC) is defined as an overrepresentation of minority youth at any stage within the juvenile justice system (Huizinga et al., 2007). The nine stages within the juvenile justice system where contact occurs are: arrest; referral; diversion; case petitioned; secure detention; delinquency finding; probation; confinement in secure correctional facility; and case transferred, certified, and waived to adult court (OJJDP, 2009).

Possible causes of DMC:

- Individual police practices and policies may make it more likely that minority youth are arrested (e.g., targeting patrols in low-income neighborhoods or in racial or ethnic minority neighborhoods).
- Where offenses happen greatly influences the potential for arrests (e.g., targeting street corners in cities is easier than targeting homes in the suburbs).
- Differential reactions of victims to offenses committed by white and minority youth (e.g., white victims disproportionately perceive offenders to be minorities).
- Youth exhibit different behaviors (e.g., youth of color may commit certain crimes more frequently).
- System personnel show overt racial bias

Section F: Final Perspectives

1. What do you feel is the most accurate measure of the effectiveness of the program?

2. Please describe any benefits the program has brought about for your job and office?

3. Please describe the most serious problems you encountered in the implementation of the program?

How were these problems resolved?

4. Have any unanticipated issues arisen since the implementation of the program?

Yes _____ No _____

If so, please briefly explain these issues: _____

How were these issues resolved? _____

5. Has this office incurred any extra costs due to the implementation of the program?

Yes _____ No _____

If so, please explain the sources of these extra costs? _____

6. Has this office achieved any savings because of the implementation of the program?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, please explain how were these savings achieved? _____

Section G: Comments
