



GOVERNOR'S JUVENILE JUSTICE COMMISSION

JIM DOYLE, GOVERNOR

DEIRDRE GARTON, CHAIR

December 28, 2007

The Honorable Herbert H. Kohl
United States Senate
Judiciary Committee
330 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Kohl:

Thank you for the invitation and opportunity to testify at the hearing of United States Committee on the Judiciary titled "Reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act: Protecting Our Children and Our Communities." It was truly an honor. It was also a pleasure to have breakfast with you that day and for you to engage me and other witnesses in dialogue at the hearing.

I greatly appreciate your consideration of and attention to the issues related to the reauthorization of this important statute, and that of the Committee as a whole. Today, I am writing in response to questions posed to me by your office following the hearing.

1. What evidence exists to show that the public is willing to see greater investment of federal appropriations and support in juvenile justice?

Thank you so much for this question. An assessment of the public's support for the varied responses to youth offending is important because policymakers often justify expenditures for punitive justice reforms on the basis of popular demand. To the extent Congress' misreading of public sentiment has led to the adoption of more expensive policy alternatives than the public wants, tax dollars are likely being wasted on policies that are costly, possibly ineffective and less popular than is widely assumed.

Recent polling data reveals the public's support for rehabilitative measures over more punitive measures when dealing with youth delinquency and crime. A survey conducted by the MacArthur Foundation's Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice found that taxpayers' willingness to pay for additional rehabilitation is almost 20 percent greater than their willingness to pay for additional punishment (\$98.49 vs. \$84.52). Conversely, significantly more respondents are unwilling to pay for additional incarceration. The findings of this survey are significant because as opposed to merely asking respondents whether they approve or disapprove of a policy (i.e., incarceration vs. diversion), respondents were asked what they as individual taxpayers are willing to pay for a specific policy. This phrasing yields a more accurate estimate of respondents' attitudes towards a specific policy (e.g., would you be willing to pay an additional \$100 in taxes for this change in the law?).

In addition, a recent poll commissioned by the Center for Children's Law and Policy, as part of the MacArthur Foundation's Models for Change juvenile justice reform initiative found that :

- Less than 15 percent of those surveyed believed that incarcerating youth was a “very effective” way to rehabilitate youth.
- Nearly 9 out of 10 (89 percent) of those surveyed agreed that “almost all youth who commit crimes have the potential to change.”
- More than 7 out of 10 agreed that “incarcerating youth offenders without rehabilitation is the same as giving up on them.”
- Eight out of 10 favor reallocating state government money from incarceration to programs that provide help and skills to enable youth to become productive citizens.
- More than 75 percent of respondents favor juvenile justice policies that keep nonviolent youth in small facilities in their own communities, and 6 of 10 favor community supervision for nonviolent youth.

In its reauthorization of the JJDP, Congress can ensure that the federal government's approach to juvenile justice accurately reflects taxpayers' will and beliefs. The Coalition for Juvenile Justice—a national association of State Advisory Groups—and more than 250 other national, state-based and local organizations recommend prioritizing cost-effective approaches to youth delinquency and crime that yield real benefits for public safety. Specifically, by consensus, this group of organizations recommends the following changes in the statute with which I concur in principle. I would be interested in reviewing and commenting on specific language to accomplish these changes:

- Amend Sec. 223(a)(7)(B) to promote alternatives to detention and incarceration;
- Amend Sec. 222(e) to promote high performance standards and outcomes in states with incentive funds;
- Amend Sec. 204(b)(7) to require the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to conduct research on the effectiveness of the practice of trying juveniles as adults in criminal courts and the status of the conditions of placement of youth in adult jails and prisons; and
- Amend Sec. 299C(a)(2) to prohibit the use of federal funds for ineffective programs, such as boot camps, scared straight programs and large residential institutions.

2. What would it mean for your state to receive a large infusion of Title V funds?

In 2002, the Wisconsin Office of Justice Assistance conducted a County Needs Survey.¹ Seventy-five (75) of the respondents from sixty-one (61) counties listed “funding for delinquency prevention services” as their most critical need. In an informal survey conducted by the Office of Justice Assistance during the fall of 2007, grantees both public and private begged for help in implementing evidence-based services in their communities which are primarily

¹ It was the last survey conducted given the paucity of Title V allocations and increased earmarking of those funds during the following five years.

prevention programs. 2003 was the first year that Wisconsin received no federal Title V funds. Consequently, projects using Title V funding received no continuation funds in calendar year 2004 and there was no funding source focused solely on delinquency prevention in Wisconsin. In 2004, Wisconsin received \$246,000; in 2005 \$249,000; in 2006 \$56,250; and in 2007 75,000—down from \$741,000 in 1999.

In 2005, Wisconsin developed a Statewide Title V Model Program to address the loss of federal funds for prevention work. Prior to 2002, the Title V funds that we did receive had historically gone to high need communities to support community projects such as:

- Boys and Girls Clubs on the Lac Courte Oreilles reservation and in the Greater Milwaukee Area;
- Integrated service projects in poverty stricken rural areas and Milwaukee Wraparound services; and
- The Disproportionate Minority Confinement Reduction initiatives in Milwaukee, Dane, Rock, Kenosha, Racine and Rock Counties.²

In 2005, Wisconsin proposed running a model Title V Delinquency Prevention program in Wisconsin. The funds would be used to:

- Refocus Wisconsin's county-based juvenile justice systems on comprehensive community-based prevention services as the most cost effective way to reduce crime;
- Rebuild community prevention policy boards to support the integration of services in a way that best serves youth and families, especially our growing minority population;
- Reinvigorate county systems that have—due to lack of resources—been forced to focus the majority of juvenile justice funds on a few deep end kids who require out-of-home care;
- Restore Wisconsin's commitment to youth by funding programs that support young children and families, help to keep youth in school, and prevent juvenile delinquency by reducing risk factors;
- Respond proactively to youth experiencing multiple risk factors, and help build protective factors in at-risk youth across the state.

Wisconsin projected the cost of the program to be approximately \$5 million. The entire amount (\$2-\$5 million) would supplement county juvenile justice systems (presently under-funded with Youth Aids dollars). It would allow Title V funds to be available to every county statewide. Projects would be funded for 2-3 years, prioritized by need, with continuation decisions based on positive, data driven outcomes. Priority would be given to funding evidence based programs.

The types of programs that would be funded and encouraged are described in the meta-analysis commissioned by the Wisconsin State Advisory Group, the Governor's Juvenile Justice

² Milwaukee, Dane, Rock, Kenosha, Brown and Racine counties account for nearly 75% of all youth committed to juvenile correctional facilities in Wisconsin, and 87% of the minority youth committed to those facilities.

Commission, *What Works, Wisconsin*.³ Those would include programs such as: Chicago Parent Child Centers, Perry PreSchool, Nurse-Family Partnership program, Strengthening Families, Skills, Opportunities and Recognition (SOAR), Positive Adolescent Choices, Michigan State Therapeutic Interventions, Multisystemic Therapy, Multidimensional Family Therapy, Treatment Foster Care.

A large infusion of federal funds into prevention would do a number of things to put infrastructure in place to address the prevention needs of our children and their families, such as:

- Providing funding statewide, while leveraging local dollars, to help communities refocus their efforts in the areas of preventing delinquency and building protective factors in at-risk youth, families, and communities.
- Reducing delinquency, and providing diversion options for urban minority youth by building the capacity of communities to proactively and comprehensively serve these youth and families in a fair, unbiased, culturally sensitive and effective manner.
- Increasing the use of proven and promising programs in the areas of delinquency prevention and early intervention to help move communities toward self-sustaining juvenile justice programs and systems.
- Expanding the use of the Milwaukee Wraparound program (including its unique funding mechanism) to other counties to maximize the use of Medicaid dollars, shift to a family need based system of care, and provide services to youth while holding them accountable and maintaining them safely in their homes.
- Renewing a commitment to healthy youth and families that is the underlying theme in the Title V Delinquency Prevention Program.

3. How would additional funding of Title V for prevention programs affect incarceration rates of youth?

In March of this year, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority published a program evaluation summary, “Redeploy Illinois program decreases incarceration rates among juveniles” (see attached). It was an assessment of a pilot program in the Second Judicial Circuit of the state that provides community-based and restorative justice services to nonviolent felony offenders. The Second Circuit was one of four sites. The sites were asked to employ alternatives to incarceration such as:

- Establishing a continuum of local, community based sanctions and treatment alternatives for juvenile offenders who would be otherwise incarcerated;
- Establishing or expanding local alternatives to incarceration;
- Creating or expanding assessment and evaluation services of programs;
- Creating or expanding supervision services or programs for individual juvenile offenders; and

³ Op Cit Appendix A at page 1- 6.

- Focusing on juveniles who would otherwise be held in confinement.

These are the very sort of system improvements and supports that are typically funded using Title V funds. And, in most cases there are cost savings and opportunities to use the federal monies to leverage state or county funding for ongoing sustainability of community based alternatives to incarceration.

In Illinois, as the program summary cites, after ten months of implementation Redeploy Illinois was a success in multiple ways:

- The program met its statutory objectives in implementing community based sanctions, treatment alternatives and services for juveniles that would have otherwise been committed to corrections or secure detention;
- Projected reductions in corrections commitment were predicted to exceed the target of 35% or more reductions.
- Program costs were dramatically lower per juvenile than the cost of committing juveniles to corrections.

4. What information do we have about the likely long term economic effects of such an investment in prevention?

Again, I point to the meta-analysis conducted in the *What Works Wisconsin* study that shows in Table 1 (see attached) the return on investment in prevention programs.⁴

Also, in his September 2007 testimony before the healthy Families and Communities Subcommittee to the U.S. House Committee on Education and Labor, Steve Aos, Assistant Director of the Washington State Institute for Public Policy, presented his Institute's research that shows long-term economic benefits of investments in prevention of juvenile delinquency and crime (full testimony and a prevention program chart are attached).

Using rigorous standards, his Institute found that there are economically attractive evidence-based options in juvenile justice programming and prevention, as well as adult corrections. Notably the following evidenced-based approaches, among several others, were found to produce declines in repeat offending/recidivism:

- Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care and similar highly-refined family focused therapeutic programs;
- Diversion of nonviolent offenders into structured community based programs;
- Educational/academic skill development;
- Juvenile sex offender treatment.

However, some juvenile justice programming was shown to be detrimental in meeting the goal of deterring future offending, specifically "Sacred Straight" and similar approaches that employ the idea of taking youth into adult correctional institutions to hear about the grisly reality of a life of crime. In addition, some approaches showed no discernible effect in reducing crime and delinquency, including the following, among others:

- Surveillance-oriented probation/parole;

⁴ Ibid.

- Wilderness challenges;
- Court supervision without services (simple release).

In terms of primary prevention, Aos and his colleagues also found significant long-term cost savings in employing evidence-based approaches, such as:

- Nurse Family Partnerships for mothers (parents) of young children;
- Pre-K education for low income 3-4 year olds;
- High school graduation.

The big take away from Aos' research and testimony is that the portfolio for use of prevention funding must steer away from ineffective approaches and invest in those that are clearly known to be effective. Such judgments can be made now based on his research and that of others. As an ancillary benefit that can also be assumed, Aos adds that early, holistic juvenile justice interventions will lead to lower construction and facility costs as the population of confined juveniles declines.

5. During the hearing, we heard about the important role the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention plays in conducting research and providing technical assistance to states. In your opinion, should OJJDP do more in these two areas to assist states?

Yes! Vis-à-vis the Administrator, OJJDP is, by statute, the lead agency within the federal government charged with developing and implementing policies that govern the treatment of juvenile offenders by federal agencies and the federal government's efforts to influence the states' juvenile justice systems. In carrying out these functions, it is critical that OJJDP do more to conduct research and provide technical assistance to the states, with particular emphasis on that which relates to state-identified needs.

First, not every state has the resources to evaluate the effectiveness of their laws, policies and programs using the proper research methods, i.e., control groups, double-blind studies, etc. In addition, the overwhelming majority of states are not equipped to compare the impact of their laws, policies and programs with those of other jurisdictions. As the federal home and nationwide hub for juvenile justice, OJJDP is perfectly positioned to conduct these evaluations and research studies and/or partner with states and local jurisdictions to conduct these evaluations and studies so that states and local jurisdictions know to a scientific certainty what works and what does not.

Second, having determined what works and what doesn't, translating research into practice requires assistance and guidance. No two jurisdictions are alike, therefore developing and replicating successful practices from one jurisdiction to the next is not as simple as applying a cookie-cutter approach. States and local jurisdictions new to the practice require technical assistance to help them understand the practice, understand why it works and successfully adapt the practice to their jurisdiction in a way that works for their population(s) and produces similar results.

In its reauthorization of the JJDP, Congress can ensure that OJJDP better fulfills its research and technical assistance functions for the benefit of the states and the general public's safety. The Coalition for Juvenile Justice and more than 250 other national, state-based and local organizations recommend amplifying OJJDP's research and technical assistance functions in

ways that serve the field. Specifically, by consensus, this group of organizations recommends the following changes in the statute, with which I concur in principle. I would be interested in reviewing and commenting on specific language to accomplish these changes:

- Amend Secs. 251 and 252 to prioritize OJJDP's research and technical assistance functions to support states' efforts to comply with the core protections of the JJDP, advance research that is responsive to state-identified needs and help states identify and replicate best- and evidenced-based practices.

Many thanks for the opportunity to respond to your questions. Please feel free to call upon me if any additional information can be beneficial to your efforts to improve the federal response in support of state and local efforts and improvements in juvenile justice. I may be reached at 608-266-3323. You may also call upon Tara Andrews, Deputy Executive Director for Policy, at the Coalition for Juvenile Justice, a national leadership association of State Advisory Groups based in Washington, DC: 202-467-0864, ext. 109.

Sincerely,



Deirdre Wilson Garton

Chair, The Wisconsin Governor's Juvenile Justice Commission



Program Evaluation Summary

Vol. 5 No. 2

March 2007

Redeploy Illinois program decreases incarceration rates among juveniles

By Kimberly Burke

A Redeploy Illinois pilot program implemented in the Second Judicial Circuit of Illinois provides community-based services to non-violent juvenile felony offenders.

This *Program Evaluation Summary* describes an evaluation of the Second Judicial Circuit's Redeploy pilot program. The evaluation of the program was supported by a grant awarded to the Authority by the Illinois Department of Human Services.

The Second Judicial Circuit Redeploy Program was instituted to apply individualized evidence-based practices to address the needs of middle and high-risk juvenile offenders. Probation officers and community service providers monitor and provide services to juveniles selected for the program, and a research team evaluated program implementation and impact between March

and December 2005. Several methods were used in this evaluation, including online surveys, interviews, site visits, and focus groups with key personnel.

Background

Redeploy Illinois Public Act 093-0641 provides counties or groups of counties with funding for community-based services, which can include opportunities in education, recreation, community service, crisis and health intervention, and alternative forms of detention for non-violent youth who would otherwise be committed to the Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice (IDJJ).

Research through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention suggests that non-violent youth are less likely to be involved in subsequent delinquent behavior if they receive appropriate services in the community rather than being incarcerated. These community-based options for juveniles are also usually less expensive than institutional care in correctional facilities.

Redeploy Illinois programs are being implemented at four pilot sites in Illinois. Sites are located in the Second Judicial Circuit, serving Crawford, Edwards, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Jefferson, Lawrence, Richland, Wabash, Wayne, and White counties, and in Macon, St. Clair, and Peoria counties. By accepting the funds to provide community-based services to delinquent youth, programs are obligated to reduce the number of youth Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice commitments by 25 percent for the previous three years.

At the time of this evaluation, the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC) Juvenile Division oversaw juvenile incarceration. The Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice now oversees these commitments.



Rod R. Blagojevich, Governor
Sheldon Sorosky, Chairman
Lori G. Levin, Executive Director

120 S. Riverside Plaza, Suite 1016
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Phone: 312-793-8550, TDD: 312-793-4170,
Fax: 312-793-8422
website: www.icjia.state.il.us

Program Evaluation Summaries are derived from program evaluations funded or conducted by the Authority. The full evaluation reports are available from the Authority.

For more information about this or other publications from the Authority, please contact the Authority's Criminal Justice Information Clearinghouse or visit our website.

Printed by authority of the State of Illinois, March 2007.

Program performance

The evaluation team selected six performance indicators following the principles of balanced and restorative justice (BARJ) to assess the program. BARJ is a justice philosophy recognizing that victims, offenders, and communities have an equally vital role in the justice process. The three main components of BARJ are repairing the harm to victims by holding offenders accountable for their actions, developing offenders' pro-social competencies to prevent repeat delinquent behavior, and ensuring community safety by fostering positive relationships among all community members.

Performance indicators

The Second Judicial Circuit's program involved community, family members, and crime victims. Implementation performance indicators included program alignment with the Redeploy Illinois Public Act, the juvenile participant selection process, program communication and awareness, service options, providers, and availability, resource utilization, and assessment methods.

Program alignment

The Redeploy Illinois Act contains specific purpose statements for a county or a group of counties receiving funding to implement the program. The Second Judicial Circuit's program met five of 13 alignment indicators. The indicators in which the program was found compliant included:

- Establishing a continuum of local, community-based sanctions and treatment alternatives for juvenile offenders who would be otherwise incarcerated.
- Establishing or expanding local alternatives to incarceration.
- Creating or expanding assessment and evaluation services or programs.
- Creating or expanding supervision services or programs for individual juvenile offenders.
- Focusing on juveniles who would otherwise be held in confinement.

The program was found to still be a "work in progress" or near compliance with six alignment indicators including creating or expanding education, vocational, and substance abuse services and programs for individual juvenile participants, coordinating mental health services, providing other individualized services, and restoring the participant within the community.

The evaluation found that it was too early to tell whether the program was in compliance with reducing the county or circuit's utilization of secure confinement of juvenile offenders. Evaluators projected that the judicial circuit would commit 18 juveniles to IDOJJ compared to the average of 41 juveniles for the years 2001 through 2003. The evaluation concluded before the end of the program's first year. Incarceration data is not yet available from IDOJJ for that time period.

Juvenile participant selection process

The program served 54 juvenile participants during the evaluation period and was projected to serve 65 during the first year. Participants are required to be between the ages of 13 and 17 years old, have been adjudicated for an offense punishable by incarceration in IDOJJ, have only one prior adjudication, and have a Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument (YASI) score of medium-high risk. Juveniles convicted of first-degree murder or a Class X forcible felony are ineligible. A Juvenile Justice Redeploy Illinois Form, used to capture background information on each juvenile including, demographics, date of referral, referring agency, prior placement information, education status, YASI results, prior adjudication information, and medical information, helps determine and document a juvenile's eligibility to be part of the Redeploy program.

Communication and program awareness

Community awareness of the Second Circuit Redeploy Illinois program was promoted in meetings, newspaper and newsletter articles, phone calls to community members, other agencies, and victim service organizations, and e-mail updates to judges, state's attorneys, and public defenders. Telephone interviews were conducted with key juvenile justice personnel in the Second Circuit to determine the effectiveness of these methods. Overall, the meetings, e-mail updates, and phone calls were perceived as the most effective methods of increasing awareness of the program.

In June and November 2005, online surveys were administered to key stakeholders to determine changes in awareness and perceptions of the program. The number of respondents indicating they were familiar with Redeploy Illinois increased between June and November 2005, while the number of respondents indicating they were somewhat familiar with the program decreased.

Service options and providers

The program offered a variety of services for participants. Specific needs were determined on a case-by-case basis. A focus group comprised of representatives from proba-

Figure 1
Second Judicial Circuit Redeploy Illinois pilot program rewards and consequences

Program rewards	Program consequences
Home	Home
Family cohesiveness Extended curfew Overnight stay with friends Participation in extracurricular activities (school dances)	Restrictive curfew Extra chores Loss of phone privileges Threat of stay with other relatives
Probation/court	Probation/court
Positive feedback from judge/prosecutor Early discharge from home confinement, probation, or detention Probation rather than IDOC placement Reduction in required community service hours Credit for public service employment Reduction in required program-related sessions and meetings Shopping coupons Food	Detention GPS tracking Commitment to IDOC Extended probation and treatment requirements Probation violation recorded Writing assignment Removal from home Assignment to another program
Other	Other
Special activity privileges Journal writing, music Enrollment in regular classes	Suspension from school Behavior modification classes

tion, the state's attorney's office, and pre-qualified service providers identified specific needs, including IQ testing, victim mediation, follow up for the Aggression Replacement Training Program, a mentoring program for at-risk juveniles, and an outdoors program.

Resource utilization

During the evaluation period, the juvenile probation caseloads in each county of the Second Judicial Circuit varied from three to 35. The number and duration of contact between probation officers and program participants fluctuated depending on risk level and seriousness of the offense.

Assessment methods

Juveniles were assessed for program eligibility with a variety of tools that gauge the amount of risk, to himself or others, of keeping the juvenile in the community, either to himself or others. A pre-sentence investigation was prepared by the probation department to determine whether it was safe for the juvenile to remain within the community.

Program impact indicators

Evaluators used five performance indicators to determine the extent to which Redeploy Illinois is impacting juveniles and their communities in the Second Judicial Circuit. Indicators included a reduction in IDOC commitments, program impact on juveniles, their families, and victims, and services and sanctions utilization rates. Other indicators were the program's use of rewards and consequences to address violations and to motivate juveniles in their continued progress in the program, program alignment with the goal statements outlined in the Redeploy Illinois Public Act, and detention and probation utilization rate.

Data for detention and utilization rate were limited or unavailable at the time of evaluation.

Reduction in IDOC commitments

The Second Judicial Circuit averaged 41 juvenile IDOC commitments between 2001 and 2003. The projected number of IDOC commitments for March through December 2005 was 18, representing a 56 percent reduction. Based

on the circuit's Redeploy Illinois service delivery budget, 65 juveniles were projected to complete the program during the evaluation period at an estimated cost of \$4,712 per juvenile. IDOC data to confirm the projections were unavailable.

In state fiscal year 2005, courts admitted 1,563 juveniles to IDOC at a per capita annual cost of \$70,827.

Program impact on juveniles, families, and victims

The overall short-term impact of the program on the juveniles and their families was positive based on interviews with representatives from the juvenile justice system and participants' family members. The representatives surveyed and interviewed noted that victim involvement needed to be improved.

Program services and sanctions

Participants who successfully completed individualized treatment were discharged from the program. Services and sanctions were used interchangeably and were provided on a continuum from least restrictive to very restrictive services including aggression replacement training, functional family therapy, multi-systemic therapy, global positioning system tracking, residential drug treatment and psychological and psychiatric evaluation. Participants received a variety of these services based on need.

Program rewards and consequences

A variety of rewards and consequences were used within the residence of the participant by probation and court services and by schools to encourage juveniles to stay on course with the program (*Figure 1*). Participants indicated rewards and consequences used were effective during focus groups.

Recommendations

Evaluators noted that the success, sustainability, and long-term effects of the program are dependent on continued efforts to change the attitude and perceptions of those involved in the juvenile justice system, as well as the community at large, through targeted education programs. Evaluators suggested that the technology of the juvenile justice system be improved to facilitate communication and coordination between juvenile justice practitioners and the service providers. A greater investment in technology would also improve the program's ability to collect, analyze, and report data.

Evaluators acknowledged the challenge of serving all 12 counties in the Second Judicial Circuit. They recommended identifying specific needs in each county and then following up with the appropriate targeted programs and services. Evaluators also recommended continuing impact and implementation evaluation to identify areas of the program that are succeeding as well as those that require improvement or modification.

Other recommendations included targeting specific programs and services to involve the victims. For example, victim-offender conferencing should be encouraged as a part of the Second Judicial Circuit's Redeploy program. When funding allocations are made, the program should focus on victims, key stakeholders, and the community at large, as well as on the juvenile offenders.

Conclusion

After 10 months of implementation, the Redeploy Illinois program was running successfully in the Second Judicial Circuit. The program met the objectives listed in the Redeploy Illinois Public Act, implementing community based sanctions, treatment alternatives, and services for juveniles who would have otherwise been committed to IDOC or placed in secure detention. The projected reduction in IDOC commitments for 2005 should exceed the target of 25 percent or more. Additionally, the program costs were dramatically lower per juvenile than the cost of committing juveniles to IDOC.

ICJIA

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

The Second Judicial Circuit Redeploy Illinois evaluation was conducted by Powered Performance, Inc. This summary was written by ICJIA Research Analyst Kimberly Burke.

This project was supported by a grant awarded to the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority by the Illinois Department of Human Services. Opinions, findings, and conclusions contained in this document are those of the evaluators and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, the Illinois Department of Human Services, or Second Judicial Circuit Redeploy Illinois program administrators.

What Works, Wisconsin

What Science Tells Us about Cost-Effective Programs for Juvenile Delinquency Prevention

A Report to the Wisconsin Governor's Juvenile Justice
Commission
and the Wisconsin Office of Justice Assistance

Stephen A. Small, Arthur J. Reynolds,
Cailin O'Connor, and Siobhan M. Cooney

A joint initiative of the University of Wisconsin–Madison
Schools of Human Ecology and Social Work, and the
University of Wisconsin–Extension, Cooperative Extension

June 2005

This project was supported by funds from the
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs.

TABLE 1.
Summary of Selected Effective Programs for Preventing Crime and Enhancing Well-Being

					Per Participant Costs and Benefits in \$2004		
Program	Target group/ Focus	Intensity and length	Major crime prevention impacts	Impacts linked to crime prevention	Benefits Costs	Net benefit (Benefits – Costs)	Return per \$1 invested
Primary Prevention							
Preschool Education							
Child-Parent Centers	Child/ Enrichment, Parent involvement	Part day, 1-2 years	Arrests, Incarceration up to age 24	Ed attainment Achievement Abuse & neglect	78,732 7,755	70,977	10.15
High/Scope Perry Preschool	Child/ Enrichment, Home visits	Part day, 1-2 years	Arrests, Incarceration up to age 40	Achievement Ed attainment Income	145,414 16,648 283,995 16,648	128,766 267,347	8.74 (age 27) 17.07 (age 40)
Abecedarian Project	Child/ Enrichment	Full day, 5 years	None reported	Ed attainment Achievement Mother employment	142,327 70,588	71,739	2.02
Family Support							
Nurse-Family Partnership – High risk	Parent/ Home visits	2 hrs biweekly 2-2 ½ years	Arrests up to age 15	Abuse & neglect Substance use Teen pregnancy	37,041 7,324	29,717	5.06
Strengthening Families Program 10- 14	Parent, child/ Groups	2 hrs weekly 7-14 weeks	Conduct problems	Substance use Peer pressure	6,833 874	5,959	7.82
Social-Emotional Learning							
Skills, Opportunities, and Recognition	School population/ Parent and teacher training	Consistent through primary grades	Violent behavior	School behavior Achievement Alcohol misuse	14,810 4,712	10,100	3.14
Olweus Bullying Prevention Program	School population/ Improving school environment	Consistent through school years	Vandalism, fighting, theft, and bullying	School behavior	--	--	--

					Per Participant Costs and Benefits in \$2004		
Program	Target group/ Focus	Intensity and length	Major crime prevention impacts	Impacts linked to crime prevention	Benefits Costs	Net benefit (Benefits – Costs)	Return per \$1 invested
Secondary Prevention							
<i>Family Training</i>							
Family Effectiveness Training	Child, Family/ Training and therapy	1-1.5 hrs weekly 13 weeks	Conduct problems	Peer association Family functioning	--	--	--
<i>Social Skills Training</i>							
Positive Adolescent Choices Training	Child/ Social skills training	Unspecified	Aggression Violent behavior Arrests	None reported	--	--	--
<i>Mentoring</i>							
Big Brothers Big Sisters	Youth/ Mentoring	2-4 times monthly 12 months	Violent behavior	School behavior Achievement	4,166 4,117	59	1.01
<i>Vocational/Job Training</i>							
Job Corps	Youth/ Residential training	Full day, 4-6 months	Arrests Incarceration	Income Ed attainment Welfare use	22,883 15,804	7,079	1.45
Juvenile Offender Programs							
<i>Diversion</i>							
Adolescent Diversion Project	Youth/ Case mgmt, mentoring	6-8 hours per week, 18 weeks	Reduced recidivism	None reported	24,708 1,825	22,883	13.54
<i>Therapeutic Interventions</i>							
Multisystemic Therapy	Youth/ Family therapy	60 hours, 4 months	Re-arrests Out-of-home placement	Family function Mental health	15,395 5,832	9,563	2.64
Functional Family Therapy	Family/ Family therapy	8-12 hours	Re-offending Sibling delinquency	Family communication	29,111 2,197	26,914	13.25
Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care*	Youth/ Foster care with therapeutic treatment	Residential, 6-9 months	Re-arrests Subsequent days incarcerated	Hard drug use	27,460* 2,524*	24,936*	10.88*

					Per Participant Costs and Benefits in \$2004		
Program	Target group/ Focus	Intensity and length	Major crime prevention impacts	Impacts linked to crime prevention	Benefits Costs	Net benefit (Benefits – Costs)	Return per \$1 invested
<i>Case Management/Multimodal Interventions</i>							
Repeat Offender Prevention	Youth/ Case mgmt; center- and home-based services	Daily, 12-18 months	Sustained petitions for new offenses	Drug use Completion of court-ordered obligations	--	--	--
<i>Standard Services**</i>							
Juvenile Court	Youth/ Formal hearing, adjudication, & disposition	2-3 hearings; length of supervision varies	N/A	N/A	<i>Average cost = 2,000</i>	N/A	N/A
Standard probation	Youth/ Monitoring & supervision	Weekly contact, min. 12 months	N/A	N/A	<i>Annual cost = 2,160</i>	N/A	N/A
Juvenile Correctional Institution	Youth/ Confinement & treatment	Residential; length varies	N/A	N/A	<i>Annual cost = 68,255</i>	N/A	N/A

Note: The estimated economic benefits include actual and projected economic returns through adulthood. Estimates of both costs and benefits across studies are based on different sets of assumptions and different lengths of follow up. Estimates from the Washington State study are based on a different set of assumptions than those of the other reports.

* Costs and benefits for Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (TFC) are given in comparison to regular group home treatment. One year of TFC costs \$2,524 more than group home care for the average participant, and yields \$27,460 in benefits per participant, as compared to group home residents. All other program costs and benefits are stated in comparison to "no treatment."

** Standard services are included in the table for the purpose of cost comparison.

**Testimony of Mr. Steve Aos
to the Healthy Families and Communities Subcommittee
of the Committee on Education and Labor,
United State House of Representatives
Tuesday, September 18, 2007**

Evidence-Based Public Policy Options that Reduce Crime and Criminal Justice Costs

Thank you Madam Chair and Members of the Committee. I am Steve Aos, Assistant Director of the Washington State Institute for Public Policy. The Institute I work for was created by the Washington State Legislature in 1983 to carry out non-partisan research on projects as directed by the Legislature.

I have been asked to discuss recent work we have done for the Washington State Legislature on juvenile justice issues. Since our Legislature has taken a broad view of crime and ways to reduce it, I will also broaden my remarks on the juvenile justice system to encompass our analysis of prevention programs for youth before they become involved in the juvenile justice system, and, at the other end of the age spectrum, cost-effective public policy options for adult offenders. As I discuss, we have found that all three efforts are needed if a state is to implement a long-term crime reduction strategy that uses taxpayer money efficiently.

Legislators in Washington State asked my Institute to examine a straightforward question: What works to reduce crime—and what doesn't?

They wanted us to apply rigorous standards to identify the specific "evidence-based" public policy options they could exercise. They also wanted to know whether the options could pass an economic test. That is, if an option can reduce crime, then does the program also save taxpayers more money than the option costs? Thus, the two hallmarks of our work are its explicit focus on evidence-based options and on sound economics. Washington legislators wanted to identify public policies that pass both tests.

We have published a number of reports on our work. Our October 2006 study—"Evidence-Based Public Policy Options to Reduce Future Prison Construction, Criminal Justice Costs, and Crime Rates"—contains the full set of options we have identified to date. I will briefly summarize our findings today; the full document is available on our website: www.wsipp.wa.gov.

In short, this is what we did and what we found. We conducted a systematic review of all research evidence we could locate to identify what works, if anything, to reduce crime. We found and analyzed 571 rigorous comparison-group evaluations of adult corrections, juvenile justice, and prevention programs, most of which were conducted in the United States during the last 30 years. We then estimated the benefits and costs of many of these evidence-based options from the perspective of Washington State. That is, if

Washington were to implement any of these options, would they be beneficial to the state? Finally, we projected the degree to which alternative “portfolios” of these programs could affect future prison construction needs, criminal justice costs, and crime rates in Washington.

We found that some evidence-based programs can reduce crime, but others cannot. Per dollar of spending, a number of the successful programs produce favorable returns on investment. Public policies incorporating these options can yield positive outcomes for Washington. We then projected the long-run effects of three example portfolios of evidence-based options: a “current level” option as well as “moderate” and “aggressive” implementation portfolios.

We found that if Washington successfully implements a moderate-to-aggressive portfolio of evidence-based options, a significant level of future prison construction can be avoided, Washington taxpayers can save about two billion dollars, and crime rates can be reduced. Perhaps most significant for your hearing today, we found that several of the most cost-effective options are in the juvenile justice and prevention areas.

Before discussing our findings in a bit more detail, I want to report to you that the 2007 Washington Legislature used the Institute’s findings to alter substantially the State’s approach toward some criminal justice policies. The Legislature has shifted funding away from some previous efforts that have not proven successful and moved those funds toward evidence-based cost-beneficial programs. In addition to shifting funding, the 2007 Legislature also increased funding levels for some of the most economically attractive options on our list. The Legislature expects a payoff for its action: as a result of these new investments, the Legislature now expects future crime rates and criminal justice costs to be lower than they otherwise would be. In effect, Washington has placed a fiscal bet on these options and now must deliver the results for the taxpayers who pay for the programs.

As we did our research, the first thing we learned is that a coherent set of crime reduction policies must be broad in scope and be targeted at the long run. We found that it is necessary to think about a “portfolio” of public policy options if the long-term goal is to reduce crime and save taxpayers money. Thus, the strategies that we identified are in three broad public policy areas: prevention, juvenile justice, and adult corrections. We found that some well-researched prevention programs for children and their families can reduce crime down the road. We also found that several juvenile justice programs designed for youth already in the juvenile justice system are critical elements of an overall crime reduction strategy. Finally, we identified a number of effective and cost-beneficial options in the adult corrections system.

The important point from our work is this: a coherent long-term strategy involves all three elements—prevention, juvenile justice, and adult corrections. Our overall conclusion is one of good news: In the last two decades, research on what works and what doesn’t has developed and, after considering the comparative economics of these options, this information can now be used to improve public resource allocation.

For the topic of this hearing in particular, we found that cost-effective prevention and juvenile justice programs are a very significant part—perhaps over half—of the solution for Washington to achieve long-term reductions in crime rates as well as net reductions in criminal justice costs. A significant way to avoid having to build adult prisons down the road is to implement evidence-based cost-beneficial prevention programs for youth and for youth in the juvenile justice system.

Some Specific Findings

The findings from our study center on three questions: what works to reduce crime; what are the economics of each option; and how would alternative portfolios of these options affect Washington's prison construction needs, state and local criminal justice costs, and crime rates?

I have attached an Exhibit from our October 2006 study that summarizes some of the key findings from our current systematic review of the evaluation research literature. As the Exhibit reveals, we found a number of programs that have demonstrated statistically significant reductions in crime outcomes. We also found other approaches that do not achieve a statistically significant reduction in recidivism. Thus, the first lesson from our evidence-based review is that some programs work and some do not. A direct implication from these mixed findings is that public policies that reduce crime will be ones that focus resources on effective evidence-based programming while avoiding ineffective approaches.

An example of the information provided on the attached Exhibit is the juvenile justice program called "Functional Family Therapy" (FFT). This program follows a specific training manual and approach. The FFT program, which has been implemented in Washington, involves an FFT-trained therapist working for about three months with a youth in the juvenile justice system and his or her family. The goal is to increase the likelihood that the youth will stay out of future trouble. We located and meta-analyzed seven rigorous evaluations of this program—one conducted in Washington—and find that the average FFT program with quality control can be expected to reduce a juvenile's recidivism rates by 15.9 percent.

We also wanted to know what the economics looked like for FFT. To do this we estimated benefits from two perspectives: taxpayers' and crime victims'. For example, if a program is able to achieve statistically significant reductions in recidivism rates, then taxpayers will spend less money on the criminal justice system. Similarly, if a program produces less crime, then there will be fewer crime victims. For the FFT program, we find that the program costs, on average, \$2,325 per juvenile participant. The 15.9 percent reduction in recidivism rates that we expect FFT to achieve generates about \$34,146 in life-cycle benefits, measured in terms of the taxpayer and crime victim costs that are avoided because of the reduced long-run level of criminal activity of the youth. Thus, the net present value of this juvenile justice program is expected to be \$31,821 per youth.

Bottom Line

The purpose of our legislatively directed study was to test whether evidence-based public policy options could: (a) lower the anticipated need to build new prisons, (b) reduce state and local fiscal costs of the criminal justice system, and (c) contribute to reduced crime rates.

We found that there are economically attractive evidence-based options in three areas: adult corrections programs, juvenile justice programs, and prevention. Per dollar of spending, several of the successful programs produce favorable returns on investment. Public policies incorporating these options can yield positive outcomes for Washington.

We also found that if Washington can successfully implement a moderate-to-aggressive portfolio of some of these evidence-based options, then a significant level of future prison construction can be avoided, state and local taxpayers can save about two billion dollars, and net crime rates can be lowered slightly. In particular, we found that cost-beneficial prevention and juvenile justice programs play a critical role in a long-term crime control strategy for Washington State.

Finally, as I mentioned earlier, the 2007 Washington Legislature used this information to make significant changes to the way it funds the state's prevention, juvenile justice, and adult corrections systems.

Madam Chair, this concludes my testimony.

Reducing Crime With Evidence-Based Options: What Works, and Benefits & Costs

Washington State Institute for Public Policy Estimates as of October, 2006	Effect on Crime Outcomes Percent change in crime outcomes, & the number of evidence-based studies on which the estimate is based (in parentheses) (1)	Benefits and Costs (Per Participant, Net Present Value, 2006 Dollars)			
		Benefits to Crime Victims (of the reduction in crime) (2)	Benefits to Taxpayers (of the reduction in crime) (3)	Costs (marginal program cost, compared to the cost of alternative) (4)	Benefits (total) Minus Costs (per participant) (5)
Notes: "n/e" means not estimated at this time. Prevention program costs are partial program costs, pro-rated to match crime outcomes.					
Programs for People in the Adult Offender System					
Vocational education in prison	-9.0% (4)	\$8,114	\$6,806	\$1,182	\$13,738
Intensive supervision: treatment-oriented programs	-16.7% (11)	\$9,318	\$9,369	\$7,124	\$11,563
General education in prison (basic education or post-secondary)	-7.0% (17)	\$6,325	\$5,306	\$962	\$10,669
Cognitive-behavioral therapy in prison or community	-6.3% (25)	\$5,658	\$4,746	\$105	\$10,299
Drug treatment in community	-9.3% (6)	\$5,133	\$5,495	\$574	\$10,054
Correctional industries in prison	-5.9% (4)	\$5,360	\$4,496	\$417	\$9,439
Drug treatment in prison (therapeutic communities or outpatient)	-5.7% (20)	\$5,133	\$4,306	\$1,604	\$7,835
Adult drug courts	-8.0% (57)	\$4,395	\$4,705	\$4,333	\$4,767
Employment and job training in the community	-4.3% (16)	\$2,373	\$2,386	\$400	\$4,359
Electronic monitoring to offset jail time	0% (9)	\$0	\$0	-\$870	\$870
Sex offender treatment in prison with aftercare	-7.0% (6)	\$6,442	\$2,885	\$12,585	-\$3,258
Intensive supervision: surveillance-oriented programs	0% (23)	\$0	\$0	\$3,747	-\$3,747
Washington's Dangerously Mentally Ill Offender program	-20.0% (1)	\$18,020	\$15,116	n/e	n/e
Drug treatment in jail	-4.5% (9)	\$2,481	\$2,656	n/e	n/e
Adult boot camps	0% (22)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e
Domestic violence education/cognitive-behavioral treatment	0% (9)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e
Jail diversion for mentally ill offenders	0% (11)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e
Life Skills education programs for adults	0% (4)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e
Programs for Youth in the Juvenile Offender System					
Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (v. regular group care)	-22.0% (3)	\$51,828	\$32,915	\$6,945	\$77,798
Adolescent Diversion Project (for lower risk offenders)	-19.9% (6)	\$24,328	\$18,208	\$1,913	\$40,623
Family Integrated Transitions	-13.0% (1)	\$30,708	\$19,502	\$9,665	\$40,545
Functional Family Therapy on probation	-15.9% (7)	\$19,529	\$14,617	\$2,325	\$31,821
Multisystemic Therapy	-10.5% (10)	\$12,855	\$9,622	\$4,264	\$18,213
Aggression Replacement Training	-7.3% (4)	\$8,897	\$6,659	\$897	\$14,660
Teen courts	-11.1% (5)	\$5,907	\$4,238	\$936	\$9,208
Juvenile boot camp to offset institution time	0% (14)	\$0	\$0	-\$8,077	\$8,077
Juvenile sex offender treatment	-10.2% (5)	\$32,515	\$8,377	\$33,064	\$7,829
Restorative justice for low-risk offenders	-8.7% (21)	\$4,628	\$3,320	\$880	\$7,067
Interagency coordination programs	-2.5% (15)	\$3,084	\$2,308	\$205	\$5,186
Juvenile drug courts	-3.5% (15)	\$4,232	\$3,167	\$2,777	\$4,622
Regular surveillance-oriented parole (v. no parole supervision)	0% (2)	\$0	\$0	\$1,201	-\$1,201
Juvenile intensive probation supervision programs	0% (3)	\$0	\$0	\$1,598	-\$1,598
Juvenile wilderness challenge	0% (9)	\$0	\$0	\$3,085	-\$3,085
Juvenile intensive parole supervision	0% (10)	\$0	\$0	\$6,460	-\$6,460
Scared Straight	+6.8% (10)	-\$8,355	-\$6,253	\$58	-\$14,667
Counseling/psychotherapy for juvenile offenders	-18.9% (6)	\$23,126	\$17,309	n/e	n/e
Juvenile education programs	-17.5% (3)	\$41,181	\$26,153	n/e	n/e
Other family-based therapy programs	-12.2% (12)	\$15,006	\$11,231	n/e	n/e
Team Child	-10.9% (2)	\$5,759	\$4,131	n/e	n/e
Juvenile behavior modification	-8.2% (4)	\$19,271	\$12,238	n/e	n/e
Life skills education programs for juvenile offenders	-2.7% (3)	\$6,441	\$4,091	n/e	n/e
Diversion progs. with services (v. regular juvenile court)	-2.7% (20)	\$1,441	\$1,034	n/e	n/e
Juvenile cognitive-behavioral treatment	-2.5% (8)	\$3,123	\$2,337	n/e	n/e
Court supervision vs. simple release without services	0% (8)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e
Diversion programs with services (v. simple release)	0% (7)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e
Juvenile intensive probation (as alternative to incarceration)	0% (5)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e
Guided Group Interaction	0% (4)	\$0	\$0	n/e	n/e
Prevention Programs (crime reduction effects only)					
Nurse Family Partnership-Mothers	-56.2% (1)	\$11,531	\$8,161	\$5,409	\$14,283
Nurse Family Partnership-Children	-16.4% (1)	\$8,632	\$4,922	\$733	\$12,822
Pre-K education for low income 3 & 4 year olds	-14.2% (8)	\$8,145	\$4,644	\$593	\$12,196
Seattle Social Development Project	-18.6% (1)	\$1,605	\$4,341	n/e	n/e
High school graduation	-10.4% (1)	\$1,738	\$2,851	n/e	n/e
Guiding Good Choices	-9.1% (1)	\$570	\$2,092	n/e	n/e
Parent-Child Interaction Therapy	-3.7% (1)	\$268	\$784	n/e	n/e
Program types in need of additional research & development before we can conclude they do or do not reduce crime outcomes:					
Programs needing more research for people in the adult offender system		Comment			
Case management in the community for drug offenders	0% (13)	Findings are mixed for this broad grouping of programs.			
COSA (Faith-based supervision of sex offenders)	-22.3% (1)	Too few evaluations to date.			
Day fines (compared to standard probation)	0% (1)	Too few evaluations to date.			
Domestic violence courts	0% (2)	Too few evaluations to date.			
Faith-based programs	0% (5)	Too few evaluations to date.			
Intensive supervision of sex offenders in the community	0% (4)	Findings are mixed for this broad grouping of programs.			
Medical treatment of sex offenders	-21.4% (1)	Too few evaluations to date.			
Mixed treatment of sex offenders in the community	0% (2)	Too few evaluations to date.			
Regular parole supervision vs. no parole supervision	0% (1)	Too few evaluations to date.			
Restorative justice programs for lower risk adult offenders	0% (6)	Findings are mixed for this broad grouping of programs.			
Therapeutic community programs for mentally ill offenders	-20.8% (2)	Too few evaluations to date.			
Work release programs (from prison)	-4.3% (4)	Too few recent evaluations.			
Programs needing more research for youth in the juvenile offender system					
Dialectical Behavior Therapy	0% (1)	Too few evaluations to date.			
Increased drug testing (on parole) vs. minimal drug testing	0% (1)	Too few evaluations to date.			
Juvenile curfews	0% (1)	Too few evaluations to date.			
Juvenile day reporting	0% (2)	Too few evaluations to date.			
Juvenile jobs programs	0% (3)	Too few recent evaluations.			
Juvenile therapeutic communities	0% (1)	Too few evaluations to date.			
Mentoring in juvenile justice	0% (1)	Too few evaluations to date.			