

Comprehensive Plan for Juvenile Delinquency Prevention  
for the 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial District  
developed by the  
Sedgwick County Juvenile Corrections Advisory Board  
(Team Justice)

Updated on May 3, 2013

Requirements

Consistent with provisions set forth in K.S.A. 75-7046, a charge of the Sedgwick County Juvenile Corrections Advisory Board (Team Justice) is to modify the juvenile justice comprehensive strategic plan periodically. The Kansas Juvenile Justice Authority (JJA) requires each unit of local government to develop and update a 3-year delinquency prevention plan for certain funding applications. Local comprehensive plans developed by Juvenile Corrections Advisory Boards (JCABs) or other community coalitions and/or collaborations may be used. The plan should:

- I. Describe the extent of risk factors identified in the community
- II. Describe how risk factors will be addressed
- III. Include a benchmark to reduce the juvenile crime rate

Sedgwick County Juvenile Corrections Advisory Board (Team Justice)

Team Justice was established by the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners in 1999 to assist in the oversight of community planning for juvenile offenders. The 16-member Board meets monthly and makes recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners regarding the ongoing needs of juveniles in the community. The purpose, duties and guidelines for the work of Team Justice are detailed in the Charge of the Board. The Sedgwick County Web site at [http://sedgwickcounty.org/corrections/advisory\\_boards.aspat](http://sedgwickcounty.org/corrections/advisory_boards.aspat) displays the purpose and duties of Team Justice. The provisions of K.S.A. 75-7038 through 75-7053 establish juvenile corrections advisory boards; membership is specifically set forth in K.S.A. 75-7044. Team Justice is governed with bylaws, last amended on 12/5/08.

Team Justice is responsible for facilitating grants for juvenile justice programs and services in Sedgwick County as well as to review performance measures information on all publicly funded juvenile justice programs. Included in this oversight are programs funded by JJA as well as the Sedgwick County Crime Prevention funded grant programs. Some grant applications issued by JJA require a Prevention Policy Board (PPB) to “provide general oversight for the plan, approve the plan prior to submission to the State, and make recommendations to the responsible local agency for the distribution of funds and evaluation of funded activities.” JJA encourages existing local community coalitions and/or collaborations be used for the purpose of the PPB. JCABs meet many of the representation requirements. In Sedgwick County, Team Justice serves as the Prevention Policy Board.

Team Justice has a balanced representation of public agencies, private nonprofit organizations serving children, youth and families, business and industry; however, parents of at-risk youth and youth are not currently serving at this time. Preference will be given to parents of at-risk youth for future open positions on the Board (for general appointments). The Board is committed to expanding youth involvement. Census data for 2011 shows that among youth age 10-17 in Sedgwick County, 36.84% are minority. There are 12.3% African Americans in this age group. African Americans make up 19% of the Team Justice board. At this time, there are no other minority groups represented on the board. The gender composition of the Team Justice board is 50% male and 50% female.

Sedgwick County has demonstrated a sustained commitment to disproportionate minority contact (DMC) reduction efforts. The Sedgwick County DMC initiative incorporates advocacy, alternatives to secure detention, cultural competency training and program development, administrative policy and procedural changes and structured decision making tools. Team Justice agreed to serve as the DMC Committee for Sedgwick County and incorporated DMC as a standing agenda item for every meeting. Team Justice utilizes data and analysis through a DMC lens to make continuous system improvements and to refine programs.

Team Justice provided oversight during the 3-year DMC pilot project which concluded in September 2007. At that time, Sedgwick County was selected to participate in the DMC Action Network, a new component of the *Models for Change: Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice Initiative*. On November 2, 2007, Team Justice reaffirmed their commitment, as the DMC Committee, to reduce the disproportionate arrests of minority youth in Sedgwick County. On February 1, 2008, Team Justice agreed to provide oversight for the MacArthur Foundation grant funds. The MacArthur Foundation project concluded on June 30, 2012. On November 4, 2011, Team Justice agreed to serve as the governing board for the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) in Sedgwick County. On February 28, 2013, Team Justice expressed a continued commitment to DMC reduction efforts as a part of JDAI.

Team Justice review of grant applications related to juvenile justice programs in Sedgwick County encompasses ensuring that all proposals describe:

- how the proposed program will affect policies, practices and system improvement strategies to identify and reduce DMC;
- the efforts undertaken by the agency to become culturally competent;
- plans to ensure staff are culturally competent to serve the target population; and,
- knowledge of cultural characteristics and barriers the target population faces.

### Background

During 1998 in the original development of the 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial District's Comprehensive Plan for Juvenile Delinquency Prevention, four risk factors from the Communities That Care (CTC) Model were selected as priority risk factors: Early and Persistent Antisocial Behavior, Family Management Problems, Academic Failure Beginning in Late Elementary School and Lack of Commitment to School. In February 2009, Team Justice decided to exclude CTC data from its evaluation of risk of delinquency until participation in the survey reaches acceptable levels.

For several years, Sedgwick County fell below the standards of participation for planning purposes (60%) and for evaluation (80%). For 2009, Sedgwick County showed 49% participation for the CTC survey, well below the standard for both planning and evaluation. Team Justice acknowledges JJA's interest in utilizing the CTC model as the survey provides a broad look at risk in the community for all youth, not just those with involvement in the juvenile justice system. Team Justice agreed that CTC survey participation levels would be monitored annually and the data utilized when acceptable participation levels were achieved.

In 2012, with 62% participation overall, Sedgwick County met the participation level necessary for planning purposes. Tenth grade participation (59%) and twelfth grade participation (42%), did not meet the 60% participation threshold in 2012. Prior to 2011, USD 259 administered the CTC survey to youth through a system of active consent. Parents were asked to sign a form granting permission for their child to participate. In 2011, the Board of Education decided to administer the survey based on a system of passive consent. Under the passive consent system, two weeks prior to administration of the survey, schools sent information to students' parents, along with notification of the option to opt out of participation. Parental permission is considered granted unless the refusal form is signed and returned to the school. The move to passive consent improved participation levels considerably. It should be noted, however, that USD 259 does not administer the portion of the survey related to the family domain.

At this time the risk of delinquency in Sedgwick County is organized using the Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) model. The RNR model improves the understanding of distinctive features of delinquency risk and targets specific risks that have a criminogenic impact on the youth rather than risk of other social maladies such as teen pregnancy. In other words, the CTC model is proscriptive on a broad community level while the RNR model enables program goals to be established around the individual focusing on criminogenic risk. In February 2013, Team Justice expressed preference to continue utilizing the RNR model to examine the extent of risk factors in Sedgwick County and monitor CTC survey participation levels as expected by the Juvenile Justice Authority.

The RNR model incorporates eight risk factors: History of Antisocial Behavior, Antisocial Personality, Antisocial Cognition, Antisocial Associates, Family, School and/or Work, Leisure and/or Recreation and Substance Abuse. The RNR model prioritizes the first four of these risk factors as the strongest predictors for further offending; however, the first risk factor is static and cannot typically be impacted by program services since it is past-oriented. Diversion programs, however, offer services in lieu of formal court processing and impacts this risk factor to an extent. To determine level and type of risk, Sedgwick County uses two screening instruments: the Youthful Level of Service Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) and the Sedgwick County Department of Corrections Juvenile Risk Assessment Instrument: Brief Screen (commonly referred to as the JIAC Brief Screen).

### Timeframe

The *Benchmark 5 Report Update* provides an annual comprehensive assessment of risk factors and JJA outcomes. The purpose of the report is to present and analyze assessment data which provides the framework for updating the delinquency prevention plan. Team Justice is charged

with the responsibility of modifying the juvenile justice comprehensive strategic plan periodically. The expectation set by JJA is that the community comprehensive plan be updated on a 3-year cycle. This ensures that the plan remains consistent with the data.

The origins of the title “Benchmark 5” evolved from the process of developing a strategic plan in 1998. At that time, five committees formed the Sedgwick County Juvenile Justice Community Planning Team charged with engaging in a process of risk and resource assessment. The committees were: Data Research; Resource Assessment; Performance Evaluation and Outcomes; Media-Community Mobilization; and, Funding and Operations. The five committees addressed the critical components of the Benchmark 5 activities. These activities and associated tasks evolved into the assessment of risk factors and JJA outcomes. Therefore, “*Benchmark 5*” is of historical significance, but the title no longer refers to specific items or activities reported on.

### Certification

Team Justice is responsible for review of grant applications related to juvenile justice programs in Sedgwick County. In 2008 the Kansas Advisory Group on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (KAG) included a new step of requiring local JCAB certification for Prevention Trust Fund, Title II and Title V grant applications. The certification required from the JCAB is that *the proposed grant program will provide services to youth and their families that are consistent with the community comprehensive plan*. The certification process involves the following:

- notification of grant announcements sent via E-mail to members of a distribution list maintained by the Sedgwick County Department of Corrections;
- the Sedgwick County website being utilized to post information about funding opportunities;
- the annual Benchmark 5 Report Update presentation provides an overview of the assessment of risk factors and JJA outcomes in the 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial District to assist prospective providers in being more competitive and successful;
- a proposal form (initially approved by Team Justice on December 5, 2008 and affirmed on February 28, 2013), being utilized in which the agency must illustrate how the proposed program is consistent with the 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial District’s Comprehensive Plan for Juvenile Delinquency Prevention;
- submission of proposal forms a week prior to the meeting to allow board members an opportunity to review the proposal and to have access to the necessary information to support decisions;
- a program representative attending the Team Justice meeting in which certification is being requested in order to be available to answer questions concerning the proposal; and,
- programs receiving certification (including continuation grants) periodically updating the JCAB each year.

In 2012 Title II grants require both certification by the local Juvenile Corrections Advisory Board and endorsement by the JDAI Steering Committee. Team Justice serves both of those functions. Endorsement means that *the program will advance the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative in the local community*. The endorsement process involves the same process as certification; however, there is one additional section to the proposal form.

### I. The Extent of Risk Factors Identified in the Community

The YLS/CMI was implemented by the Kansas Juvenile Justice Authority (JJA) in January 2007. The YLS/CMI is a standardized risk and needs instrument that assists in the prediction of which youth are more likely to re-offend by measuring the known predictors of recidivism. The YLS/CMI is utilized by Sedgwick County Juvenile Field Services for youth admitted for services that are under supervision of JJA. Six years of data (2007 – 2012) is available, which meets the preferred level to establish trends.

The JIAC Brief Screen was developed in a joint effort by Sedgwick County Juvenile Field Services and Dr. Craig-Moreland. The instrument is a result of Sedgwick County's efforts to embrace the RNR model but failing to locate a valid brief screen instrument related to the model. The JIAC Brief Screen was implemented in January 2008 by the Sedgwick County Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center. The JIAC brief screen instrument was treated as conditionally valid with initial validation taking place in August 2009. Results indicated a strong correlation with the YLS/CMI for a validity period of 90 days. Individual domains were analyzed to ensure integrity of the relationship at the domain level. Most of the domains of the JIAC Brief Screen were found to be significantly related to the domains on the YLS/CMI (moderate range of correlation coefficients); exceptions were the school / work domain and the leisure / recreation domain. An experienced team of local administrators worked together to make some changes to the JIAC Brief Screen to improve the consistency of the two instruments in the two domains in question. Subsequent validation studies (in May 2010 and July 2011) revealed improved correlations for both domains.

Local data from the JIAC Brief Screen related to the YLS/CMI domains is available to compare with YLS/CMI data locally and on a statewide basis. This information helps us see our risk areas that emerge among those who interface with the juvenile justice system. A full description of risk factors in the community, however, is not possible during periods when there is insufficient participation in the CTC survey. Annually, the Benchmark 5 Report Update includes updated data on the differences in risk levels observed in the 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial District, compared to the state as a whole. Historically, the data shows the 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial District has a smaller percentage at the low risk level and a considerably higher percentage at the high risk level. Data in the Benchmark 5 Report Update also illustrates the extent of risk factors identified in the juvenile justice system providing a point of contrast between youth in our community with minimal contact with the juvenile justice system (an intake at JIAC) and those with more serious involvement (those who have responded to the YLS/CMI due to being under supervision of JJA).

## II. How Risk Factors will be Addressed

Three prevention priorities from the RNR model are prioritized to receive first consideration: **Antisocial Personality, Antisocial Cognition and Antisocial Associates**. These risk factors were identified and prioritized in the updates to this comprehensive plan that occurred in 2010 and 2013. Utilizing risk factors from the RNR model shifts priorities away from the four risk factors from the original 1998 strategic plan from the Communities That Care model (Family Management Problem, Academic Failure Beginning in Late Elementary School, Lack of Commitment to School, and Early and Persistent Anti-social Behavior).

In June 2010, the Team Justice Board engaged in a process involving discussion and review of the data concerning the extent of risk factors in Sedgwick County, definitions of the risk factors, the continuum of services, and the primary risk factors addressed by prevention programs in Sedgwick County. The process concluded in October 2010, with approval of an updated comprehensive plan, which was subsequently submitted to the Juvenile Justice Authority. In February 2013, the Team Justice Board engaged in a workshop to review current data concerning the extent of risk factors in Sedgwick County, and to discuss updates to the comprehensive plan. In 2010 and 2013, the Team Justice Board prioritized the three risk factors from the RNR model listed above.

The general consensus of Team Justice is that the History of Antisocial Behavior is also an important risk factor; however, this factor was not selected as a priority since it is static in nature. History of Antisocial Behavior cannot typically be impacted by program services, with the exception of diversion, since it is past-oriented. The assessment of this risk factor involves consideration of past criminal behavior which cannot be improved. It does, however, serve as an indication of who needs intervention.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> tier of risk factors (Family, School/Work, Leisure/Recreation and Substance Abuse) provides the means for juvenile delinquency prevention programs to address the three priority risk factors. Family-oriented programs were identified as providing the best opportunity to intervene; however, a balanced approach to fund programs including all risk factors is preferred (as long as the focus is impacting one of the three priority risk factors). Currently funded programs and those applying for funding in the future can be designed around the 2<sup>nd</sup> tier risk factors; however, all programs must be able to identify program components that impact one of the priority risk factors. This means that school-based programs, substance abuse treatment programs, and leisure/recreation programs are acceptable provided the program design impacts one or more of the three priority risk factors. All programs are expected to engage / involve families due to the importance on the impact on long-term outcomes. "Family" in the context of prevention programming refers to the child-defined family.

Preference for funding has shifted from programs targeting youth who had multiple risk factors to programs targeting youth who are at moderate to high risk for future delinquency. Preference is given to programs structured to provide minimal services to low risk clients and increased dosages for moderate and high risk clients.

Preference is given to programs that incorporate evidence-based practices and be able to clearly describe how the program components impact the priority risk factors. This is differentiated from evidence-based programs.

Note that in addition to the prevention programs included in the continuum of services, the City of Wichita Special Liquor Tax Grant funds substance abuse treatment services and programs in Wichita / Sedgwick County. Therefore, the substance abuse domain was not a focus of discussion.

### III. Benchmark to Reduce the Juvenile Crime Rate

Arrest is a critical system contact point to impact; however, establishing a specific benchmark to reduce the juvenile crime rate is difficult for two reasons. First, the juvenile crime rate is impacted by a number of factors that can influence whether or not an arrest occurs which are beyond the scope of our prevention programs. For example, population density and degree of urbanization, economic conditions (poverty level and unemployment rate), climate, policies of other components of the justice system (law enforcement, prosecutorial, judicial, correctional and probational) and crime reporting practices of the citizens in the community. Second, reductions in the funding available for prevention programming cause variability in efforts to achieve reduction. There is, however, specific criteria service providers can strive for to ensure that the returns on investments in prevention grow and surpass taxpayer costs. For planning purposes it is fundamentally important to detail the expectations of prevention programs to achieve a reduction in the juvenile crime rate. Program effectiveness is the means by which a reduction in the juvenile crime rate will be achieved. Programs are evaluated on their efforts to address youth at the greatest risk for future delinquency. Benchmarks for program characteristics are:

- *At least 70% of the clients served by the program should have an elevated risk to re-offend as determined by an objective and standardized assessment instrument.*
- *Successful completion rates of prevention programs should fall between 65% and 85%. Each program's definition of success should clearly describe completion criteria and the expected timeframe. Completion criteria should be objective and based on offender progress in meeting target behaviors. As the number of high risk youth served increases, it is expected that the success rate will decrease.*
- *Differential success rates should reveal low levels of disparity between race / ethnicity and gender categories. Programs are expected to accurately track participant demographics along with whether or not the youth successfully complete the program. Such data should be available for analysis of differential success rates. The difficulty in making demographic categories consistent across all data entry systems and recording clients with multiple racial categories is acknowledged. However, every effort should be made by the program to keep the number with an "unknown" race at a minimum.*

- *Recidivism should be an outcome for each program to report on participants who successfully complete the program.*
- *Program outcomes should be reported by the risk level of the client served.* Differentiating expectations according to risk level encourages programs to serve clients with an elevated risk level.
- *Youth assessed at a low risk for future delinquency should, as a general rule, be served by minimally invasive means so as to not disrupt aspects of their prosocial environments.* Offenders should be provided with supervision and treatment levels commensurate with risk levels consistent with the research findings of the literature (Lowenkamp & Latessa, 2004. *Understanding the Risk Principle: How and Why Correctional Interventions Can Harm Low-Risk Offenders*. Topics in Community Corrections). Additionally, low risk clients should be served separate from high risk clients to avoid delinquent contagion. Interventions for this population can entail referrals to agencies outside the juvenile justice system, particularly when the high needs of the youth involve non-criminogenic factors. Too much intervention by the juvenile justice system can cause more damage according to the research.
- *High moderate and high risk youth must have at least 100 hours of targeted services (the time frame varies according the type of services provided). Low risk youth should receive minimal services.* Dosage of services must be provided through a strategic and thoughtful design proportionate to risk level. According to Edward J. Latessa, Ph.D. (2012) in his presentation, “What Works in Reducing Recidivism with Youthful Offenders: Understanding the Risk and Need Principles” programs must provide the most intensive interventions to higher risk offenders. Higher risk youth require much higher dosage of treatment. The “rule of thumb” is 100 hours for moderate risk clients and 200+ for high risk. This does not include work/school and other activities that are not directly addressing criminogenic risk factors. However, consideration should be given to programs that provide services to parents who also “act as an agent of change.” Some programs may address the dosage principle by structuring the clients time. For example, high-risk clients’ activities are structured 40% - 70% of the time for 3-9 months. However, programs should consider that dosage refers to quantity of services *and* targeting of services to risk domains.
- *Programs should incorporate evidence-based practices and be able to clearly describe how program components impact the priority risk factors.* This is differentiated from evidence-based programs.
- *Team Justice aspires to fund programs with large effect sizes.* Research advances through meta-analysis (primarily based on the work of Drs. Delbert Elliott, Edward Latessa and Mark Lipsey) provide general performance on the ability of programs in reducing delinquency in the target population, referred to as “effect size.” The Washington State Institute for Public Policy recently released new effect size information. The Team Justice Board recommends the state of Kansas gather the financial data needed to allow our district to move forward with cost effectiveness measures (to be able to gauge dollar values on the returns on investments in prevention and on taxpayer costs).



- *Priority is given to programs that build youth competencies and reduce risk to reoffend.* Programs should facilitate learning / doing and attaching / belonging through planned activities with measurable outcomes.
- *Programs are encouraged to utilize positive youth development concepts.* The concepts can be utilized to frame interventions, to create outcome measures, and to address responsivity issues.
- *Program staff should build and maintain proficiency in Motivational Interviewing (MI) on an ongoing basis.* MI interaction techniques and skills facilitate behavior change in clients.
- *Program staff should engage and involve families to improve structure, relationships and client success.* Family involvement can be instrumental in improving long-term outcomes. The family is defined by the youth.
- *Program staff should be responsive to the learning style, motivation, temperament, gender and culture of the client.* Cultural competency entails race and ethnicity; gender, gender identity and sexual orientation; disabilities; economic diversity and hardships / family experiences based on social economic status; religion; and, generational differences. Services should be tailored to the “world” the client knows rather than the “world” the staff knows.