

JANUARY 2021 – DECEMBER 2021

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN



*NEW JERSEY
JUVENILE JUSTICE COMMISSION*

Gurbir S. Grewal, Attorney General
Chair, JJC Executive Board

Jennifer LeBaron, Ph. D, Acting Executive Director

County Management Structure

Name	Title	JJC Grants			Duties
		SCP	FC	JDAI	
Erica Holguin*	Principal Account Clerk	x	x	x	Bookkeeping, ordering payments for vendors/contracts agencies, keeping accurate, up to date records of payments to agencies, Jams fiscal reports.
Le'Var Starr*	Co-Youth Services Administrator/Direcror of Youth Services	x	x	x	High Supervision & Home Detention Supervisor, JDAI , YSC Coordinator, managinf the functions of planning, and program development, and contracting for county youth services commission funded agencies.
Francine Vince*	Human Services Director	x	X	X	Human Services Director, Supervises YSC Coordinator.
Marilyn Del Valle	Administrative Assistant	X	X	X	Clerical, managing correspondence with agencies and youth services commission members
Jenny Vuksic*	Co-Youth Service Administrator/Children's Mental Health Planner	✗	✗	✗	Back up to Laquan Hargrove. Assists YSC coordinator with monitoring functions?
Erin Mooney*	Supervisor Contract Management	X	X	X	Supervisor to Principal Account Clerk

Legend

SCP – State Community Partnership
 FC – Family Court

JDAI – Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative

* Staff is funded in whole or part through a JJC grant.

Planning Bodies

CYSC – County Youth Services Commission

CJJSI – County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement

No	Race/ Ethnicity*	Name & Designee	Position/Representative	CYSC	CJJSI
1	Black	Le’Var Starr	Youth Services Commission Administrator	X	X
2	White	Honorable Rudolph Filko	Presiding Judge – Family Part of the Superior Court	X	X
3	White	Melanie Nowling Alt. Ryan McNamee	Family Division Manager (or Assistant Family Division Manager)	X	X
4	Black	Dawn Moody	Chief Probation Officer	X	X
5	White	Freeholder Cassandra “Sandi” Lazzara	Highest elected official of County government (e.g., Freeholder/ County Executive)	X	
6	Hispanic	Camelia Valdez Alt. Jason Harding	County Prosecutor	X	
7	White	Judy Fallon Alt. Larry Alvarez	County Public Defender	X	
8	White	Stephen Radke	County DCP&P District Manager	X	X
9	Black	Brenda Browne	County Mental Health Administrator	X	
10	Hispanic	Carlos Rodriguez	County Superintendent of Schools	X	X
11	White	Raymond Branco	Superintendent of the County Vocational School	X	
12	White	Francine Vince	County Human Services Department Director	X	
13	Black	Shanell Toomer	Youth Shelter Director	X	
14	Black	Dennis Hughes	Youth Detention Center Director	X	
15	Hispanic	Donna Glinkin	Juvenile Family Crisis Intervention Unit - Director	X	
16	Other	Det/Sgt. Laila Cristobal	President – Juvenile Officers Association or other law enforcement representative who works primarily with youth/Police	X	
17	Black	Brenda Browne	County Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Director	X	
18	Black	Duwan Bogert Alt. Chrystal Cleaves	Workforce Investment Board Representative	X	

* Race/Ethnicity: White, Black, Hispanic or Other (Other represents Native American, Alaskan Native and Asian or Pacific Islander).

Planning Bodies

CYSC – County Youth Services Commission

CJJSI – County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement

No	Race/ Ethnicity*	Name & Designee	Position/Representative	CYSC	CJJSI
19	White	Cynthia Heller	Business Representative	X	
20	White	Amanda Compton-Dover	Court Liaison - Juvenile Justice Commission	X	
23	White	Honorable Rudolph Filko	Juvenile Judge – Family Part of the Superior Court	X	X
24	White	Robert Tracy	Trial Court Administrator – Family Part of the Superior Court	X	X
25	White	Melanie Nowling	Family Division Manager – Family Part of the Superior Court	X	X
26	Black	Courtne Thomas	JJC JDAI Detention Specialist		X
27	White	Judy Fallon Alt. Larry Alvarez	County Public Defender’s Office	X	X
28	Hispanic	Camelia Valdez Alt. Jason Harding	County Prosecutor’s Office	X	X
29	Black	Dawn Moody Alt. Myrna Villanueva/Jennifer Wood	Probation Division	X	X
30	Black	Carolyn McCombs	Private/ Non-profit organization	X	X
31			Parents of youth in the juvenile justice system		
32			Youth member		
33	White	James Sawyer	Organization that works on the behalf of parents/families/youth	X	
34					
35					
36					

* Race/Ethnicity: White, Black, Hispanic or Other (Other represents Native American, Alaskan Native and Asian or Pacific Islander).

Planning Bodies

CYSC – County Youth Services Commission

CJJSI – County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement

No	Race/ Ethnicity*	Name & Designee	Position/Representative	CYSC	CJJSI
37					
38					
39					
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					
47					
48					
49					
50					
Total Number of Members				28	14

* Race/Ethnicity: White, Black, Hispanic or Other (Other represents Native American, Alaskan Native and Asian or Pacific Islander).

ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

- When answering questions regarding trends, describe *whether* any change has occurred, the *direction* of any change (e.g., increase/up, decrease/down), and the *size* of any change (e.g., small, moderate, large).
- When answering questions regarding rank orders, draw comparisons between categories (e.g., using terms like least/smallest, most/largest).

DEMOGRAPHICS

1. Using the data in Table 2 (County Youth Population, ages 10-17, Row 3), describe how the male, female, total youth population has changed between 2015 and 2018.

Overall, there was a small percentage decrease in the total population of the youth of Passaic County between 2015 and 2018 (-1.7%). Male youth in Passaic County between the ages of 10-17 saw the most significant percentage decrease (-1.9%) while female youth saw a percentage decrease of (-1.4%). Male youth represent 50.9% of the total youth population in Passaic County (26,878) while the female population represents 49.1%.

2. Insert into the chart below the youth population by race and ethnicity beginning with the group that had the greatest number of youths in the year 2018.

Ranking of Youth Population by Race, 2018		
Rank	Group	Number
1	White	39,988
2	Black	8,429
3	Other	4,345

Ranking of Youth Population by Ethnicity, 2018		
Rank	Group	Number
1	Non-Hispanic	26,677
2	Hispanic	26,085

3. Insert into the chart below the youth population by race and ethnicity beginning with the group with the highest % change between 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of Total County Youth Population by Race, 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Group	% Change	Number
1	Black	-6.0%	8,429
2	White	-3.4%	39,988
3	Other	-0.3	4,345

Ranking of Total County Youth Population by Ethnicity, 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Group	% Change	Number
1	Non-Hispanic	-6.4%	26,677
2	Hispanic	1.2	26,085

4. Using the information in Question 1 and the ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about your county’s overall youth population by gender, race and ethnicity in 2018? How has population changed since 2015?

The total Youth Population in Passaic County hasn’t seen a significant percentage change between the years of 2015 and 2018 (-3.6%). Both male and female youth in Passaic County experienced a decrease in population. Males between the ages of 10-17 experienced a decrease in population by -1.9% (534) while females experienced a decrease of -1.4% (372). Non- Hispanic youth in Passaic County experienced the highest percentage change of -6.4% (1,817). Hispanic youth was the only demographic to experience any increase in overall population 1.2% (305).

NATURE & EXTENT OF DELINQUENCY

JUVENILE ARRESTS

5. Using Table 5 (County Juvenile Arrests by Offense Category, Row 8), describe the overall change in delinquency arrests between 2015 and 2018.

In 2017, there were a total of 1,496 juvenile arrests in Passaic County. The Juvenile arrest rate per 1,000 youth was 28.4% in 2017 representing a decrease in both the number and the rate. The overall decrease in juvenile arrest from 2015 to 2017 was -22.0%. There was a significant increase in Drug and Alcohol Offenses from 2015 (251) to 2017 (348)), while the trend for Violent Offenses decreased by -54.3% in the same two-year time period.

6. Insert into the chart below juvenile arrests offense categories beginning with the category that has the greatest number of arrests in 2018.

Ranking of Offense Categories, 2018		
Rank	Offense Category	Number
1	Public Order & Status Offenses	703
2	Drug/Alcohol Offenses	348
3	Property Offenses	141
4	Violent Offenses	126
5	All Other Offenses	100
6	Weapons Offenses	64
7	Special Needs Offenses	14

7. Insert into the chart below juvenile arrests offense categories beginning with the highest % change between 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of Offense Categories between 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Offense Category	% Change	Number
1	Special Need Offenses	-54.8	14
2	Violent Offenses	-54.3	126
3	Property Offenses	-40.8	141
4	Drug/Alcohol Offenses	38.6	348
5	Public Order & Status Offenses	-24.1	703
6	All Other Offenses	-16.7	100
7	Weapons Offenses	-15.8	64

8. Using the information in Questions 5 and the ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about your county's overall juvenile arrests in 2018? How has juvenile arrests changed since 2015?

In 2015, there were a total of 1,918 juvenile arrests in Passaic County. The juvenile arrest rate per 1,000 youth was 35.7. In 2018, there was a decrease in both number and rate. One thousand four hundred and ninety-six (1,496) youth were arrested in Passaic County in 2018 bringing the arrest rate per 1,000 youth to 28.4. The overall decrease in juvenile arrest from 2015 to 2018 was -22.0%.

In 2015, Public Order & Status Offenses, Violent Offenses and Drug and Alcohol Offenses made up the top three offense categories for juveniles who were arrested. In 2018, Public Order/Status Offenses and Drug and Alcohol Offenses remained in the top three, but Violent Offenses were replaced by Property Offenses in the ranking categories.

The largest decline in offense categories at arrest was among Special Needs Offenses, with a

decline of -54.8%. Other offense categories that saw declines included Violent Offenses (-54.3) and Property Offenses (-40.8%). One category increased from 2015 to 2018: Drug/Alcohol Offenses (38.6)

Disproportionate Minority Contact and Racial and Ethnic Disparities

9. Looking at data worksheets Table 6 and 7 (Total County Youth Population compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race), describe the % of youth population arrested for 2018 (Column F) by Race and Ethnicity.

The total number of youth arrests have decreased from 2015 to 2017 by -4.0%, from 1,918 arrest in 2015 to 1,841 arrest in 2017. When examined by race and ethnicity, there was a considerable variation in the changes in youth arrest. The number of white youths arrested in 2015 was 1,150. White youth arrests in 2017 increased by 3.6% to a total of 1,191. Black youth arrested in 2015 totaled 759, that number decreased -17.7% totaling 625 arrest in 2017.

The number of Hispanic youth arrested increased by 11.0% from 2015 to 2017. Hispanic youth totaled 931 arrest in 2015 that number was increased to 1,033 in 2017. Non-Hispanic Youth experienced an -18.1% decrease in arrest from 2015 (987) to 2017 (808).

10. Insert into the chart below Juvenile Arrests in 2018 by race and ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest number of arrests.

Ranking of Juvenile Arrests by Race, 2018		
Rank	Group	Number
1	White	1191
2	Black	625
3	Other	25

Ranking of Juvenile Arrests by Ethnicity, 2018		
Rank	Group	Number
1	Hispanic	1,033
2	Non-Hispanic	808

11. Insert into the chart below Juvenile Arrests between 2015 and 2018 by Race and Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest % change.

Ranking of Juvenile Arrests by Race, 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Group	% Change	Number
1	Other	177.8%	25
2	Black	-17.7%	625
3	White	3.6%	1,191

Ranking of Juvenile Arrests by Ethnicity, 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Group	% Change	Number
1	Non-Hispanic	-18.1	808
2	Hispanic	11.0%	1,033

12. Using the information in Questions 9 and ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about your county’s overall juvenile arrest by race and ethnicity in 2018? How have juvenile arrests by race and ethnicity changed since 2012?

The percentage of all youth arrested in 2017 was 3.5%, which is equivalent to the percentage rate in 2015. When examining the data black youth are twice as likely to be arrested (7.4%) in comparison to the all other race/ethnic groups (3.5%)

VIOLENCE, VANDALISM, WEAPONS, AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE IN COUNTY SCHOOLS

- **For Questions 13-15, use Table 8 (Violence, Vandalism, Weapons, and Substance Abuse in County Schools).**

13. Look at the Total of School Based Incidences (Row 5) and describe the overall change in the total school-based incidences over the academic periods, 2015-2016 and 2017-2018.

In the 2015-2016 school year there were 808 school-based incidents reported. In the 2017-2018 school year the number of reported incidents increased by 13.6% (918). Three of the four reported incident categories experienced an increase in reported incidents while Incidents of Substances were the sole category to experience a decrease -4.1%.

14. Insert into the chart below school incidences beginning with the category that has the greatest number of incidences.

Ranking of School Based Incidences, 2017-2018		
Rank	Incidences	Number
1	Incidents of Violence	506
2	Incidents of Substances	281
3	Incidents of Vandalism	69

4	Incidents of Weapons	62
---	----------------------	----

15. Insert into the chart below school incidences beginning with the highest % change between the academic periods 2015-2016 and 2017-2018.

Ranking of School Based Incidences Between 2015-2016 and 2017-2018			
Rank	Incidents	% Change	Number
1	Incidents of Weapons	77.1	62
2	Incidents of Vandalism	23.2	69
3	Incidents of Violence	19.3	506
4	Incidents of Substances	-4.1	281

16. Using the information in Question 13, and ranking charts above, what does the information tell you about your county’s overall school-based incidents over the academic period 2015-2018. How has school-based incidents changed since the academic period 2015-2018?

Incidents involving violence and substances continue to exhibit the highest number of incidents reported. These two categories account for 787 of the 918 reported school incidents. Together these two categories account for 89.44% school-based incidents reported for the 2017-2018 school year. Although overall the total of school-based incidents has increased by 13.6 incidents of Substances, higher than others, was the only category group to experience a decrease in incidents rate and number -4.1% and down from 293 incidents reported to 281.

NATURE & EXTENT OF COMMUNITY FACTORS THAT PUT YOUTH AT RISK

ENROLLMENT IN AND DROPOUTS FROM COUNTY SCHOOLS

➤ **For Questions 17 use Table 9 (Enrollment in and Dropouts from County Schools).**

17. Look at the % Change over Years (Column E) and describe how enrollment in schools and dropouts has changed between academic periods 2015-2016 and 2017-2018.

The Passaic County enrollment increased by 5,763 from 80,522 in 2015-2016 to 86,285 in 2017-2018 with 28,155 of youth from Paterson representing 33% of the total population. In 2015-2016, there was a disproportionate number of school dropouts for Latinos, totaling 433 males and 343 females, representing 78% of the total, while they were 47.5 percent of the population. African

Americans represented 18% of total dropouts. African Americans and Latino Americans combined represented 96% of total dropouts. Data related to school dropout rates in 2017-2018 is currently not available.

COMMUNITY INDICATORS OF CHILDREN AT RISK

➤ For Questions 18, use Table 10 (Community Indicators of Children at Risk).

18. Insert into the chart below the % Change over Years (Column H), from largest to smallest.

Ranking of Community Indicators			
Rank	Community Indicator	% Change	Number
1	Children Receiving TANF (Welfare)	-52%	2,762
2	Child abuse/neglect substantiations	-46	337
3	Births to Girls (Ages 10-19)	-13%	339
4	Children receiving NJ SNAP (formerly food Stamps)	-10	46,733

19. Using the information in the above chart, describe how the community indicators of children at risk changed over a period.

Passaic County has recently experienced a decrease (-10%) in the number of youth’s receiving NJ SNAP (formerly food stamps). This decrease is slightly less than the average decrease in children receiving SNAP benefits across New Jersey by -5 percentage points. Children receiving TANF have experienced the highest rate change (-52%) compared with -60% in the state of New Jersey

20. Using information from your county’s Municipal Alliance Plan, describe the overall risk and protective factors for each domain. How was this information used in your planning process?

Information is no longer available.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR
DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PLAN**

Extent of Need (overall increases or decreases in population, arrests, incidents in school and community indicators)

21. Taken collectively, what do the increases and decreases in the answers to Question 1 (changes in youth population), Question 5 (changes in overall juvenile arrests) and Question 13 (Total of School Based Incidents), tell you about how your County's overall need for prevention programs/services have changed in recent years?

The Population of youth ages 10-17 in Passaic County has remained relatively consistent in terms of race and ethnicity from 2015 to 2018. The largest change in this group was among black youth, with an overall decrease of 6% over this time period. The population changes alone are settled and will not impact services.

In 2017, there were a total of 1,496 juvenile arrests in Passaic County. The Juvenile arrest rate per 1,000 youth was 28.4% in 2017 representing a decrease in both the number and the rate. One thousand four hundred and ninety-six youth were arrested in Passaic County in 2017 bringing the arrest rater per 1,000 youth to 28.4%. The overall decrease in juvenile arrest from 2015 to 2017 was -22.0%.

African American and Latino Americans combined represent a disproportionately high percent of school dropouts at 96% of total dropouts.

In the 2015-2016 school year there were 808 school-based incidents reported. In the 2017-2018 school year the number of reported incidents increased by 13.6% (918). Three of the four reported incident categories experienced an increase in reported incidents while Incidents of Substances was the sole category showing a decrease of -4.1%.

Taken together, the arrest data combined with the school incidents report appear to show that school based interventions are keeping all but the more serious infractions out of the law enforcement arena, and further supports the need for school based supportive services and interventions.

Nature of Need (specific changes in the nature of populations, arrests, incidents in school and community indicators)

22. Based on the answers to Question 12 (nature and change in the nature of delinquency arrests), Question 16 (nature and change in the nature of school based incidents), Question 19 (change in the nature of community indicators), and Question 20 (highest priority risk factors), which offense categories and which indicators of youth at risk seem reasonable to address through your County's delinquency prevention programs/services?

The increase in incidents involving violence and substance indicate a real need for an increased level of community and family support. In addition, the number of children receiving TANF coupled with the increase of children living in poverty is another significant risk factor for youth involvement in the Juvenile Justice System. The examination of risk factors indicate that all risk factors are high priority, therefore the planning committee is recommending that programs address and counteract the negative influences within family and individual domains such as parenting, education, drug and alcohol prevention, decision making, self-esteem and pro-social activities will be considered.

23. Looking at your answers to Questions 9, what does this information tell you collectively about the youth population and juvenile arrests in your county by race and ethnicity at this point of the juvenile justice continuum within your county?

The total number of youth arrests have decreased from 2015 to 2018 by -4.0%, from 1,918 arrest in 2015 to 1,841 arrest in 2017. When examined by race and ethnicity, there was a considerable variation in the changes in youth arrest. The number of white youths arrested in 2015 was 1,150. White youth arrest in 2018 increased by 3.6% to a total of 1,191. Black youth arrested in 2015 totaled 759, that number decreased -17.7% totaling 625 arrest in 2017.

The number of Hispanic youth arrested increased by 11.0% from 2015 to 2017. Hispanic youth totaled 931 arrest in 2015 that number was increased to 1,033 in 2018. Non-Hispanic youth experienced an -18.1% decreased in arrest from 2015 (987) to 2018 (808).

Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need – Delinquency Prevention Programs

24. Was additional data, not provided by the JJC, used in your county's planning process? (If other data was used submit a copy in Chapter 13.

What does any other available data tell you about how your County's overall need for prevention programs has changed in recent years and which offense categories and which indicators of youth at risk seem reasonable to address through your County's prevention programs/services? Are there additional data that relates to Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial and Ethnic Disparities?

The Key Informant Survey was distributed to Individuals, families, agency directors, front line staff, board member, volunteer, court employees, probation employees, concerned citizens and others throughout Passaic County. Respondents were asked to identify problem areas/obstacles as well as service needs and rank the areas affecting youth in Passaic County the most. The top problem areas identified were Poor Parent relationship with male parent (98.2%) lack of grade level performance (97.3%) poor social/interpersonal skills, Aggressive/Fighting Behavior (97.3%) and experienced trauma (96.4%). Top service area needs were identified as; Mentoring/Advocacy (99.1%), After School Programs (98.2%), Education Alternative/Supplements (99.1%) Community Policing Programs (95.5%).

RECOMMENDATIONS

25. Looking at your answers to Questions 21, 22 and 24, what is the County’s juvenile prevention plan to address problems and county trends. List recommendations and priorities below.

What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
Overall School Performance-Solutions should include academic, social and emotional learning	The arrest data combined with school-based incident reports seem to show that school-based interventions are keeping all but the more serious infractions out of the law enforcement arena, and further supports the need for school based supportive services and interventions. Furthermore 99.1% of YOUTH respondents cited anger/aggression control training was necessary while 97.3% of YOUTH leader respondents identified failure to perform at grade level as a barrier.	Social and emotional learning, anti-bullying curricula, conflict resolution training, mentoring for those at risk of drop-out, after school programming, enrichment programs, parents’ engagement, literacy training for parents and youth. Diverse education training and experiences.
Instability within the community to include (but not limited to): inadequate housing, transportation, health access, food insecurity, substandard education, unemployment, skills training and literacy	The sheer number of children receiving TANF coupled with the amount of our youth and families living in poverty is a significant risk factor for youth involvement in the juvenile justice system. 46,733 children in Passaic County receive NJ SNAP benefits.	Solutions to include (but not limited to) financial literacy, health, nutrition, trauma, implicit/explicit bias, substance abuse, mental health access, systemic racism.
Disproportionate African American and Latino American drop-out rates. Disproportionate minority contacts with public systems.	96% of all school dropouts in Passaic County were African American and Latino American. African American and Latino American youth make up an overwhelming majority of youth on probation, and adjudicated youth as well as committed youth.	Implements Explicit/Implicit Bias Training Sessions.

Comments:

Include training and educational opportunities around systemic and institutional racism, as well as implicit and explicit biases.

26. Looking at your answers to Questions 23 and 24 what recommendations or strategies would your county make with regards to Delinquency Prevention policy and practice through the lens of race and ethnicity? What recommendations or strategies would your county consider ensuring similar outcomes for similarly situated youth?

Comments:

Include training and educational opportunities around systemic and institutional racism, as well as implicit and explicit biases.

DIVERSION ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

- When answering questions regarding trends, describe *whether* any change has occurred, the *direction* of any change (e.g., increase/up, decrease/down), and the *size* of any change (e.g., small, moderate, large).
- When answering questions regarding rank orders, draw comparisons between categories (e.g., using terms like least/smallest, most/largest).

NATURE & EXTENT OF DIVERTED CASES

LAW ENFORCEMENT STATION HOUSE ADJUSTMENTS

- For Questions 1-2, use Table 1 (Police Disposition of Juveniles Taken into Custody by Disposition Type).

1. Look at the Total Police Disposition of Juveniles (Row 6) and describe the overall change in police disposition of juveniles between 2015 and 2016.

In 2015 there was a total of 1,918 Police Dispositions of Juveniles in Passaic County. By 2016 the number of dispositions decreased by -5.8% to 1,806.

2. Look at Cases Handled within Department and Released (Row 1) and describe the overall change in police diversion of juveniles between 2015 and 2016.

For cases that were handled within the police department and released there were 1,084 case reported in 2015. By 2016 that rate change was -19.5% (873).

FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION UNITS

- For Questions 3-7, use Table 2 (FCIU Caseload by Category, 2015 and 2018).

3. Look at the FCIU Total Caseload (Row 7) and describe the overall change in the FCIU caseload between 2015 and 2018.

The FCIU caseload has not seen a significant rate change since 2015. The total caseload for FCIU in 2015 was 1,747. By 2018 there were 1,628 reported cases with FCIU -6.8% rate change.

4. Insert into the chart below the FCIU caseloads beginning with the category that has the greatest number of cases.

Ranking of FCIU Caseload Categories for 2018		
Rank	Category	Number
1	Serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile	774
2	Serious threat to the well-being/physical safety of juvenile	589
3	Other	174
4	Truancy	86
5	Unauthorized absence by a juvenile for more than 24 hours	4
6	Disorder/Petty Disorderly persons offense diverted to FCIU	1

5. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Number of Cases column (Column G), between 2015 and 2018, from largest to smallest.

Ranking of FCIU Caseload Categories between 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Category	% Change	Number
1	Disorderly/Petty Disorderly Persons offense diverted to FCIU	-85.7%	1
2	Unauthorized absence by a juvenile for more than 24 hours	-81%	4
3	Truancy	28.4	86
4	Serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile	-19.7%	774
5	Serious threat to the well-being/physical safety of juvenile	11.3%	589
6	Other	9.4%	174

6. Using the information in the ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about your county's overall FCIU caseload in 2018? How has FCIU caseloads changed since 2015?

There appears to be an insignificant change in the FCIU caseload even with two categories reporting more than an -80% decrease in rate. When delving deeper into the rankings it is evident that similar categories are being ranked in the exact same location as they were ranked 3 years prior. There has been a -6.8% rate change in overall FCIU Caseload from 1,747 in 2015 to 1,628 in 2018. Serious conflict to parent/guardian and child continues to be the leading category in Passaic County with 774 cases reported. However, this number does signify a -19.7% decreased from 2015. There is also an upward trend in the percentage (11.3%) of youth who's well-being/physical safety is threatened.

- **For Question 7, use Table 3 (FCIU Petitions Filed by Petition Type).**

7. Look at the Total Petitions Filed (Row 3) and describe the overall change in FCIU filings between 2015 and 2018.

In 2015, FCIU filed a total of 2 petitions. In 2018 that number was decreased by -100% to 0

petitions filed in 2018

- **For Questions 8-11, use Table 4a (FCIU Referrals by Referral Type).**

8. Look at the Total Referrals (Row 4) and describe the overall change in FCIU referrals between 2015 and 2018.

FCIU made 1,118 referrals in 2015, by 2018 that number was decreased significantly -60.5% to 442 total referrals.

9. Insert into the chart below the referral types beginning with the category that has the greatest number of cases.

Ranking of FCIU Referral Types for 2018		
Rank	Referral Type	Number
1	Referral to other outside agencies	410
2	Referrals made to DYFS (DCP&P)	29
3	Referrals made to Substance Abuse Programs	3

10. Insert into the chart below the FCIU referral types between 2015 and 2018, from largest to smallest.

Ranking of FCIU Referral Types between 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Referral Type	% Change	Number
1	Referrals made to Substance Abuse Programs	-98.3%	3
2	Referrals made to other Outside Agencies	-55.1%	410
3	Referrals made to DYFS (DCP&P)	-6.5	29
4			
5			
6			

11. Using the information in the ranking chart above, what does this information tell you about your county's overall FCIU Referrals to Juvenile Court between 2015 and 2018? How has FCIU Referral change since 2018?

In 2015, FCIU filed a total of 2 petitions. In 2018 there were zero petitions filed by FCIU. In 2015, FCIU made 1,118 referrals. In 2018, the number of referrals decreased by -60.5% to 442 referrals. This Data certainly indicate that FCIU is working with community agencies to successfully divert cases from the court and into appropriate services. The FCIU data also exposes an increasing number of youth with substance use disorders that are being diverted from court processing and being properly referred into substance abuse treatment as clinically indicated. There was a 98.3% increase in the number of referrals made to substance abuse programs from 2015 to 2018.

JUVENILE COURT REFERRALS (NEW FILINGS)

12. Using the data in Table 4b, describe the overall change in referral to juvenile court by race and ethnicity between 2015 and 2018.

Overall referral to court for juveniles decreased by-7.5%. Hispanic youth experienced the highest decrease with -14.6% while individuals categorized as Other experienced a significant rate increase of 84.6%.

13. Insert into the chart below the referrals to juvenile court by race/ethnicity beginning with the group that has the greatest number of referrals.

Ranking of Referrals to Juvenile Court by Race/Ethnicity, 2018		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number
1	Hispanic	263
2	Black	260
3	White	238
4	Other	24

14. Insert into the chart below the % change in Referrals to Juvenile Court between 2015 and 2018 by Race/Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest % change.

to Juvenile Court by Race/Ethnicity, 2015 and 2018		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	% Change
1	Other	84.6%
2	Hispanic	-14.6%
3	Black	-9.7%
4	White	-0.8%

15. Using the information in the ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about referrals to juvenile court by race and ethnicity between 2015 and 2018? How have referrals to juvenile court changed since 2018?

There has been no significant change to juvenile referrals to court in Passaic County. In 2015 there were 849 total referrals to juvenile court, in 2018 court referrals decreased by -7.5% to 785.

Disproportionate Minority Contact and Racial and Ethnic Disparities

16. Using the data in Table 4c (Total Referrals to Juvenile Court compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity), compare, and describe the number of Juvenile Arrests to the number of Referrals to Juvenile Court by Race/Ethnicity between 2015 and 2018.

Total arrest decreased by -4.0% from 2015-2017, and referrals to family court decreased by -7.5% during the same time.

In 2015, 42.8% of all juvenile arrest were referred to family court. In 2018, 42.6% of juvenile arrest were referred to court. For white youth that number decreased by -0.8%. For black youth in 2015 37.9% of were referred to court, and in 2018 41.6% were referred to court. 33.1% of Hispanic youth

were arrested in 2015, and in 2018 22.5% Hispanic youth arrested were referred to court.

FAMILY COURT DIVERSIONS

➤ For Question 17, use data from Table 5a (Total Juveniles Diverted from Family Court).

17. Using the data in Table 5a (Cell E5) describes the overall change in Family Court Diversions between 2015 and 2018.

Overall, there was no significant percentage change. In 2015, there were 200 cases diverted. 39% of those cases were white youth (78) and 33.5% were Hispanic. In 2018, there were a total of 67 cases diverted, 38.8% were white youth, and 35.8% were Hispanic. The percentage of diversions by race have seen no significant change, however the overall number of diversions have decreased.

18. Using the data in Table 5a, describe the overall change in Juvenile Cases diverted by race and ethnicity between 2015 and 2018.

In 2015, there were 200 cases diverted, 39% of those cases were white youth (78) and 33.5% were Hispanic. In 2018, there were a total of 67 cases diverted, 38.8% were white youth, and 35.8% were Hispanic.

19. Insert into the chart below the number of cases diverted by Race/Ethnicity in 2018, beginning with the group that had the greatest number of cases diverted.

Ranking of Juvenile Cases Diverted by Race/Ethnicity, 2018		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number
1	White	26
2	Hispanic	24
3	Black	16
4	Other	1

20. Insert into the chart below the % change in Juvenile Cases Diverted between 2015 and 2018 by Race/Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest % change.

Ranking of Juvenile Cases Diverted by Race/Ethnicity, 2018		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	% Change
1	Black	-69.8%
2	White	-66.7
3	Hispanic	-64.2
4	Other	-50%

21. Using the information in the ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about juvenile case diverted by race and ethnicity between 2015 and 2018? How has Juvenile Cases Diverted changed since 2018?

The overall number of family court diversions decreased by -66.5% from 20015 to 2018. There was a -69.8% decrease in the number of diversion cases for black youth from 53 to 18. White youth diverted cases was reduced by -66.7% from 78 to 26.

Disproportionate Minority Contact and Racial and Ethnic Disparities

22. Using the data in Table 5b (Total Juvenile Cases Diverted compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity), compare, and describe the number of Juvenile Arrests to the number of Juvenile Cases Diverted by Race/Ethnicity between 2015 and 2018.

In 2018, there were a total of 1,191 white youth arrested, and of these, 26 were diverted. 3.6% of white youth arrested were diverted, 625 black youth were arrested, and 16 of them were diverted. 2.6% black youth were diverted. Of the 1,033 Hispanic youth arrested, 24 of them were diverted, 2.3% of Hispanic youth were diverted.

IMPLICATIONS FOR DIVERSION PLAN

Extent of Need – Law Enforcement Station House Adjustments

23. Taken collectively, what do the answers to Question 1 (changes in overall police disposition) and Question 2 (police diversion of juveniles) tell you about your County’s overall need for station house adjustment programs?

In 2015 there was a total of 1,918 Police Dispositions of Juveniles in Passaic County. By 2016 the number of dispositions decreased by -5.8% to 1,806.

For cases that were handled within the police department and released there were 1,084 case reported in 2015. By 2016 that rate change was -19.5% (873).

The totals of both overall police dispositions and police diversions have decreased. The overall dispositions declined by -7.5% while police diversions declined by -66.5%. This data indicates that police diversions are increasing.

Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need - Law Enforcement Station House Adjustments

24. Was additional data, not provided by the JJC, used in your county’s planning process? (If other data was used attach a copy.)

What does any other available data tell you about how your County’s overall need for station house adjustment programs and which offense categories seem reasonable to address through your station house adjustment programs? Are there additional data that relates Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial and Ethnic Disparities?

According to the monthly reports, there was a total of 37 youth served in the YSC funded stationhouse adjustment program in the cities of Passaic and Paterson. According to the JJC, 47.5% of Passaic County youth admitted to secure detention were from Paterson in 2018, and an additional 26.3% were from the city of Passaic. These are also the cities that have the higher concentrations of racial and ethnic minorities.

Extent of Need - Family Crisis Intervention Units

25. Taken collectively, what do the answers to Question 3 (changes in overall FCIU caseload), Question 7 (changes in FCIU petitions filed), and Question 8 (changes in FCIU referrals) tell you about how your County’s overall need for an FCIU and programs used by the FCIU has changed in recent years?

The FCIU caseload has not seen a significant rate change since 2015. The total caseload for FCIU in 2015 was 1,747. By 2018 there were 1,628 reported cases with FCIU -6.8% rate change.

In 2015, FCIU filed a total of 2 petitions. In 2018 that number was decreased by -100% to 0 petitions filed in 2018.

The demand for FCIU services continues to grow in Passaic County. While the overall caseload is and has been decreasing -6.8% since 2015, referrals are being made to the appropriate services. -98.3% of referrals made by FCIU were for substance abuse programs,

this data indicates youth are receiving appropriate services and are being diverted away from family court when possible.

Nature of Need- Family Crisis Intervention Units

26. Based on the answers to Question 6 (change in nature of FCIU caseload) and Question 11 (changes in FCIU referrals), which types of crisis seem reasonable to address through your County's FCIU diversion programs?

There has been a -6.8% rate change in overall FCIU Case load from 1,747 in 2015 to 1,628 in 2018. Serious conflict to parent/guardian and child continues to be the leading category in Passaic County with 774 cases reported, however this does number signify a -19.7% decreased from 2015

In 2015, FCIU filed a total of 2 petitions. In 2018 there were zero petitions filed by FCIU. In 2015, FCIU made 1,118 referrals. In 2018, the number of referrals decreased by -60.5% to 442 referrals. These Data certainly indicate that FCIU is working with community agencies to successfully divert cases from the court and into appropriate services. The FCIU data also exposes an increasing number of youth with substance use disorders are being diverted from court processing and being properly referred into substance abuse treatment as clinically indicated. There was a 98.3% increase in the number of referrals made to substance abuse programs from 2015 to 2018.

The County Youth Services plan must address the problem areas that exhibit the largest impact on our youth and families. Programs should directly address substance abuse/misuse as well as systemic racism. Resources must be provided to FCIU and other community agencies to address the growing conflict among families and systems.

Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need -- Family Crisis Intervention Units

27. Was additional data, not provided by the JJC, used in your county's planning process? (If other data was used attach a copy.)

A Youth and Provider survey was conducted. Copy of provider survey will be attached.

What does any other available data tell you about how your County's overall need for an FCIU and programs used by the FCIU has changed in recent years and which types of crisis seem reasonable to address through your County's FCIU diversion programs? Are there additional data that relates Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial and Ethnic Disparities?

A key informant survey was distributed to providers, public and private sector employees, probation, court employees, family members, and interested citizen. There were over 700 respondents. When asked to rank the highest problem areas for youth in Passaic County, experienced trauma, lack of adult supervision and strained relationship with parent were the top three problem areas.

In the same survey, respondents were asked to identify services needed. Of all program areas, those most frequently identified were after school programming, Mental health Services and tolerance and acceptance programs were the top three service areas chosen.

Extent of Need - Family Court Diversions

28. What does the answer to Question 17 tell you about your County's overall need for Family Court diversion programs?

In 2015, there were a total of 200 juvenile cases diverted. In 2018 there was a -66.5% decrease to 67 cases

There has been a large decrease in the number of cases diverted from family court -66.5%. This data may be an indication of youth being appropriately diverted at other points or it may represent a larger number of youths who were detained.

Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need - Family Court Diversions

29. Was additional data, not provided by the JJC, used in your county's planning process? (If other data was used attach a copy.)

What does any other available data tell you about your County's overall need for Family Court diversion programs and the types of offenses/behaviors seem reasonable to address through your County's Family Court diversion programs? Are there additional data that relates Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial and Ethnic Disparities?

No other data was considered for this topic

Extent of Need – Referrals to Juvenile Court and Juvenile Cases Diverted

30. Taken collectively, what do the answers to Question 12 (overall referral to juvenile court) and Question 18 (overall change in Juvenile cases diverted), tell you about how your County's overall Referrals to Juvenile Court and Juvenile Cases Diverted by race/ethnicity changed in recent years?

In 2015, there were 849 referrals to juvenile court. In 2018, the court referrals decreased by -7.5% to 785.

In 2015, there were a total of 200 juvenile cases diverted. In 2018 there was a -66.5% decrease to 67 cases. There was a -0.8% decrease in the number of diversions for White

youth, from 240 to 238. Black youth diverted was reduced to from 288 to 260. Hispanic youth were diverted -14.6% less frequently from 308 to 263. Youth of other races increased from 13 cases in 2015 to 24 cases diverted in 2018, an 84.6% increase.

Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need - Juvenile Court Diversions

31. Was additional data, not provided by the JJC, used in your county's planning process? (If other data was used attach a copy.)

What does any other available data tell you about your County's overall need for Family Court diversion programs and the types of offenses/behaviors seem reasonable to address

through your County's Family Court diversion programs? Are there additional data that relates Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial and Ethnic Disparities?

No other data were considered for this topic.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Law Enforcement Station House Adjustments

32. Looking at your answers to Questions 23 and 24, what is the County’s juvenile plan to address problems and county trends in this category. Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend. State how the CYSC plan to address the need and/or service gap.

What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	plan to address the need and/or service gap?
Lack of options for law enforcement diversion	JAMS monthly reports, probation and juvenile arrests in Paterson and Passaic. Decrease in diversion referrals. According to monthly reports more than 30 youth were served in the YSC funded station house adjustment programs in the cities of Passaic and Paterson. According to data approximately 60% of Passaic County youth admitted into secure detention were from the cities of Passaic and Paterson	Station House Adjustment Programs in the cities of Passaic and Paterson
Limited options for law enforcement diversion across the county specifically Clifton, Haledon, and all of up-county. Options are needed for second chance low level offenders.	The increase in juvenile arrest in the cities of Clifton and Haledon speak to the need for diversion options. 42.9% of youth who were admitted into detention were admitted on 4 th degree or lower charges.	County Law Enforcement diversion programs.
Increase in family crises and survey responses have identified strained parent/youth relationships as a need.	JAMS monthly reports, and Key Informant surveys strongly suggest the need for enhanced family crisis services.	Family Crisis referral resources to address parent/youth relationship challenges.

Comments:

Youth Services Commission will continue to work with JDAI to monitor diversions with a focus on race and ethnicity and provide this feedback to law enforcement and family court.

Family Crisis Intervention Units

33. Looking at your answers to Questions 25, 26 and 27, what is the County’s juvenile plan to address problems and county trends in this category. Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend. State how the CYSC plan to address the need and/or service gap.

What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	plan to address the need and/or service gap?
Need to continuously grow FCIU	Although FCIU’s caseload has decreased over the last few years, 92.8% of all FCIU youth are referred to outside services which ultimately keeps those youth out of family court involvement and into appropriate treatment options.	Family Crisis Unit.

Comments:

Family Court Diversions

34. Looking at your answers to Questions 28 and 29, what is the County’s juvenile prevention plan to address problems and county trends in this category. Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend. State how the CYSC plan to address the need and/or service gap.

What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC plan to address the need and/or service gap?
Need for alternatives for low level offenders	Percentage of youth who have been admitted into detention to JDC on 4 th or DPD level offenses.	Implement restorative justice programs including Teen Court

Comments:

35. Looking at your answers to Questions 30 and 31 what recommendations or strategies would your county make with regards to Diversion policy and practice through the lens of race and ethnicity? What recommendations or strategies would your county consider ensuring similar outcomes for similarly situated youth?

Comments:

The Youth Services Commission will continue to work with JDAI to monitor diversions with a focus on race and ethnicity and provide feedback to law enforcement and family court.

DETENTION ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

- When answering questions regarding trends, describe *whether* any change has occurred, the *direction* of any change (e.g., increase/up, decrease/down), and the *size* of any change (e.g., small, moderate, large).
- When answering questions regarding rank orders, draw comparisons between categories (e.g., using terms like least/smallest, most/largest).

NATURE & EXTENT OF DETAINED POPULATION

JUVENILE DETENTION ADMISSIONS & AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION

- For Questions 1-5, use Table 1 (Juvenile Detention Admissions by Race/Ethnicity and Gender).

1. Using the data in Table 1 (Cell I5), describe the overall change in juvenile detention admissions between 2015 and 2018.

Overall, admissions into detention have declined from 2015 to 2018 by -13.6%. In 2015 total admissions into detention were 242 by 2018 the number of overall admissions into detention had decreased to 209. In 2015 there were 224 male admissions into detention by 2018 that number was decreased to 190 male admissions. Admissions amongst females saw a slight increase of 5.6% from 2015 (18) to 2018 (19). However, 2018 does reflect a significant decrease in female admission from 2017 in which 34 female admissions were reported.

2. Insert into the chart below detention admissions by race/ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest number of admissions for 2018 (Column F).

Ranking of Detention Admissions by Race/Ethnicity for 2018		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number
1	Hispanic	99
2	Black	89

3	White	14
4	Other	7

3. Insert into the chart below detention admissions by gender, beginning with the group that had the greatest number of admissions in 2018 (Cells D5 & E5).

Ranking of Detention Admissions by Gender for 2018		
Rank	Gender	Number
1	Male	190
2	Female	19

4. Insert into the chart below the % change in admissions by race/ethnicity (Column I), beginning with the groups that had the greatest number of detention admissions between 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of % Change in Detention Admissions by Race/Ethnicity between 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Group	% Change	Number
1	Other	600%	7
2	Black	-27.6%	89
3	White	7.7%	14
4	Hispanic	-5.7%	99

5. Using the information in the ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about your county's juvenile detention admissions by race/ethnicity and gender in 2018? How have admissions by race/ethnicity and gender changed since 2018?

Overall, admissions into detention has declined by -13.6% from 2015 to 2018. Two groups have experienced an increase in admissions into detention since 2015, white youth admissions increased by 7.7% with 13 admissions in 2015 to 14 total admissions in 2018. The 7.7% rate change is reflective in the spike of juvenile admissions of white youth in 2017(22). Youth identified as other experienced the highest increase of 600%. Black youth have experienced a steady decline in admissions since 2015 and black were second in overall numbers decreased with 89, while Hispanic youth experienced the largest raw number decline with 99.

Disproportionate Minority Contact and Racial And Ethnic Disparities

6. Using the data in Table 2, describe admissions to detention as a percentage of referrals to juvenile court for each racial/ethnic group in 2015 and 2018 (Columns C & F). Also compare changes in this figure from 2015 to 2018, in percentage points, across each racial/ethnic group (Column G).

In 2015, there were 849 youth referred to court, of those 242 were admitted into detention. 28.5% of

youth referred to court were admitted into detention. In 2018, a total of 785 youth was referred to court with 209 of them being admitted into detention. The percent of youth referred to court who were admitted into detention was 26.6%. Referrals to court decreased by -7.5% from 2015 to 2018. Detention admissions decreased by -13.6% during the same time period.

There continues to be alarming disparities within the numbers when you begin to look at race and ethnicity. In 2018, of the 238 White youth who were referred to court, 14 of them were admitted into detention (5.9%). Of the 260 Black youth referred to court, 89 of them were admitted into detention (34.2%). Two hundred and sixty-three Hispanic youth were referred to court in 2018, and 99 of them were admitted into detention (37.6%).

7. Using the data in Table 3, describe how the length of stay, average daily population and approved capacity utilization in detention has changed between 2015 and 2018.

In 2015, the average length of stay for youth in a detention facility was 34.8 days with an average daily population of 22.3. In 2018, the average length of stay increased to 36.1 days. The overall change in Average Length of Stay from 2015 to 2018 was 3.7%. In 2015, the Average Daily Population of Passaic County youth in detention was 27.8. The overall change in average daily population from 2015 to 2018 was 24.7%.

ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH IN DETENTION

- For Questions 8-11, use data from the JJC “Data for Detention Section of Comprehensive Plan” report (JDAI sites), or from data collected locally (non-JDAI sites).
8. Insert into the chart below the top three municipalities of residence for youth admitted to detention in 2018, beginning with the municipality with the highest frequency.

Ranking of Municipality where Juveniles Resides, 2018			
Rank	Municipality	Frequency	Percent
1	Paterson	100	48.1%
2	Passaic	55	26.3%
3	Haledon	6	2.9%

9. Describe the age of youth admitted to detention in 2018, including the age category with the most youth, and the average age.

In 2018, the average age at admission into the detention center was 16.4

10. Insert into the chart below the top ten offense types for youth admitted to detention in 2018, beginning with the offense type with the highest frequency.

Ranking of Most Serious Current Offense, by Type, 2018			
Rank	Category	Frequency	Percent
1	FTA	38	18.20%
2	VOP	37	17.70

3	Robbery	28	13.40%
4	Assault	24	11.5%

5	Violation of Detention Alternative/Custody	17	8.1%
6	Weapons	15	7.3%
7	Sex Offenses	7	3.4%
8	Drug/CDS Offense	6	2.9%
9	Murder/Attempted Murder/Conspiracy to Commit Murder	5	2.4%
10	Carjacking	3	1.4%

11. Insert into the chart below the degrees of the offenses for which youth were admitted to detention in 2018, beginning with the degree with the highest frequency.

Ranking of Most Serious Current Offense, by Degree, 2018			
Rank	Degree	Frequency	Percent
1	N/A	98	46.9%
2	2 nd	53	25.4%
3	1 st	28	13.4%
4	3 rd	24	11.5%
5	4 th	4	1.9 %
6	DP/PDP	2	1.0%

12. Describe the typical youth in detention by discussing the most common characteristics of the population by drawing on your answers for question 5 and for questions 8 through 11 (municipality, age, offense). Please use the information from all 5 answers in your response.

When looking at race and gender, most of the youth in detention are Black or Hispanic males. Youth from Paterson and Passaic make up a large population of youth admissions into detention. Youth in detention from Passaic County are most often placed there after a violation of probation or second-degree offense, more often involving robbery or FTA's.

CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH SERVED BY YSC-FUNDED DETENTION ALTERNATIVES

➤ For Questions 13-20, use JAMS data tables from the JAMS packet.

13. Looking at the “Total” in Table 1 for each program on the detention point of the continuum (Total Intakes by Program, 2015 & 2018), describe how admissions to detention alternative programs have changed from 2015 to 2018.

In 2015, there were a total of 303 intakes to detention alternatives program in Passaic County. In 2018, the total number of admissions to county funded detention alternatives declined to 197.

14. Looking at the total for each gender in Table 2 (Total Intakes by Gender, 2018) and the “Total” column in Table 3 (Total Intakes by Race, 2018), and comparing this information with your answer to Question 5 (detention admissions by race/ethnicity and gender), describe any differences or similarities between juvenile detention admissions and admissions to detention alternative programs, in terms of the gender and race/ethnicity of youth admitted.

In 2018, there was a total of 197 Passaic County youth admitted to detention alternative. This included 181 males and 16 females. Sixty-three (63) of the youth admitted to detention alternatives were African American, 15 were White, 110 Hispanic and 5 youth were identified as Other. In the same year there were 190 males admitted into detention and 19 females. In comparison 91.8% of those admitted to detention alternatives were male and 8.2% female, while 95% of those admitted to detention were male and 5% were female. There are slight variations between detention and detention alternatives when examined by race/ethnicity. In 2018, 42.58% of admissions to detention were Black youth and 31.98% of admissions to detention alternatives were Black youth. White youth accounted for 6.7% of admissions to a detention center and 29.55% of admissions to detention alternatives. Hispanic youth made up 47.37% of detention admissions, and 55.84% of alternative admissions.

15. Looking at Table 4 (Average Age by Program, 2018) and comparing this information with your answer to Question 9 (age at admission), describe any differences or similarities between the age of youth placed in detention and the age of youth placed in detention alternative programs.

In 2018, the average age at admission into the detention center was 16.4. The average age at admissions to the detention alternatives programs was 16 for Life Skill Vocational Program, HS/HD. The average age for the case expediter was also 16.

16. Insert into the chart below the top 10 Problem Areas for youth admitted to detention alternatives (“Total” column of Table 6), beginning with the Problem Area affecting the largest number of youths, for 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of Problem Areas by Program					
2015			2018		
Rank	Problem Areas	Total	Rank	Problem Areas	Total
1	Personality/Behavior	1,131	1	Personality/Behavior	699

2	Family Circumstances/Parenting	642	2	Family Circumstances/Parenting	397
3	Peer Relations	543	3	Peer Relations	314
4	Vocational Skills/Employment	490	4	Education	291
5	Attitudes/Orientation	455	5	Vocational Skills/Employment	250
6	Education	388	6	Attitudes/Orientation	225
7	Substance Abuse	33	7	Substance Abuse	59

8	Teen Pregnancy/Parenting	21	8	Teen Pregnancy/Parenting	5
9	N/A	1	9	Medical Problems	2
10			10	N/A	2

17. How has the ranking of Problem Areas changed between 2015 and 2018? Describe in terms of those Problem Areas that have moved up in rank the most.

The rankings between 2015 and 2018 saw very little change. The top three Problem Areas all remained the same with Personality/Behavior, Family Circumstances and Peer Relations.

18. Insert into the chart below the top 10 Service Interventions Needed, But Not Available, for youth admitted to detention alternative programs (“Total” column of Table 8), beginning with the Service Intervention most often needed, for 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of Service Intervention Needed					
2015			2018		
Rank	Service Intervention Needed	Total	Rank	Service Intervention Needed	Total
1	Cultural Enrichment	56	1	Role Model/Mentor	174
2	Decision Making Skills Training	22	2	Counseling/Individual	172
3	Interpersonal Skills Training	12	3	Counseling/Family	166
4	Counseling/Family	10	4	Supervision	165
5	Recreation/Socialization	8	5	Electronic Monitoring	138
6	Counseling/Group	8	6	Academic Education	128
7	Counseling/Individual	7	7	Intensive Supervision	123
8	Independent Living Program	6	8	Legal Services	110
9	Community Service Planning/Monitoring	6	9	Urine Monitoring	90
10	Role Model/Mentor, Vocational Training (Specific), Case Management services and crisis intervention	4 each	10	Recreation/Socialization	78

19. How has the ranking of Service Intervention Needed changed between 2015 and 2018? Describe in terms of those Service Interventions Needed that have moved up in rank the most.

Role Model/Mentor services ranked last in 2015, and has moved to number 1 on the list in 2018. The need for Individual and family counseling has increased exponentially. Independent Living did not make the

list for 2018.

20. Insert into the chart below the top 10 Service Interventions Provided for youth admitted to detention alternative programs (“Total” column of Table 7), beginning with the Service Intervention most often provided, for 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of Service Intervention Provided					
2015			2018		
Rank	Service Intervention Provided	Total	Rank	Service Intervention Provided	Total
1	Individual Counseling	305	1	Counseling/Individual	114
2	Counseling/Family	290	2	Counseling/Family	108
3	Intensive Supervision	249	3	Academic Education	68
4	Electronic Monitoring	227	4	Case Management	27
5	Academic Education	213	5	Advocacy	23
6	Supervision	196	6	Community Service Planning/Monitoring	16
7	Role Model/Mentor	182	7	Child Care Services	9
8	Advocacy	159	8	After School Program	9
9	Case Management Services	126	9	Counseling/Group	7
10	Recreational/Socialization	98	10	Crisis Intervention	1

21. How has the ranking of Service Interventions Provided changed between 2015 and 2018? Describe in terms of those Service Interventions Provided that have moved up in rank the most.

Individual Counseling remains the number one service intervention provided from 2015 and 2018, and Academic Education and Family Counseling remain in the top 5 services need from 2015 and 2018. Advocacy was ranked 8th in 2015 and has moved up to number 5 in 2018.

IMPLICATIONS FOR JUVENILE DETENTION PLAN

Extent of Need

22. Taken collectively, what do the answers to Question 1 (overall change in detention admissions), Question 7 (change in average daily population), and Question 13 (change in detention alternative admissions) tell you about how your County’s overall need for secure detention beds and detention alternative programs has changed in recent years?

Overall, admissions into detention have declined from 2015 to 2018 by -13.6% in 2015. Total admissions into detention were 242 by 2018. The number of overall admissions into

detention had decreased to 209. In 2015 there were 224 male admissions into detention by 2018 that number was decreased to 190 male admissions. Admissions amongst females saw a slight increase of 5.6% from 2015 (18) to 2018 (19). However 2018 does reflect a significant decrease in female admission from 2017 in which 34 female admissions were reported.

In 2015, the average length of stay for youth in a detention facility was 34.8 days with an average daily population of 22.3. In 2018, the average length of stay increased to 36.1 days. The overall change in Average Length of Stay from 2015 to 2018 was 3.7%. In 2015, the Average Daily Population of Passaic County youth in detention was 27.8 days. The overall change in average daily population from 2015 to 2018 was 24.7%.

Nature of Need

23. Based on the answers to Question 5 (detention admissions by race/ethnicity and gender), Question 12 (description of the typical detained youth), Question 14 (race/ethnicity and gender of youth admitted to detention as compared to youth admitted to detention alternatives), Question 15 (age of youth admitted to detention as compared to age of youth admitted to detention alternatives), Questions 16 and 17 (top ten problem areas and change in problem areas), Questions 18 and 19 (interventions needed but not available), and Questions 20 and 21) (interventions provided), what are the characteristics of youth and the service needs that you must account for or address programmatically through your County's juvenile detention plan?

Overall, admissions into detention has declined by -13.6% from 2015 to 2018. Two groups have experienced an increase in admissions into detention since 2015, white youth admissions increased by 7.7% with 13 admissions in 2015 to 14 total admissions in 2018. The 7.7% rate change is reflective in the spike of juvenile admissions of white youth in 2017(22). Youth identified as other experienced the highest increase of 600%. Black youth have experienced a steady decline in admissions since 2015, black youth were second in overall numbers decreased with 89 while Hispanic youth experienced the largest raw number decline with 99

When looking at race and gender, most of the youth in detention are Black or Hispanic males. Youth from Paterson and Passaic make up a large population of youth admissions into detention. Youth in detention from Passaic County are most often placed there after a violation of probation or second-degree offense, more often involving robbery or FTA's.

In 2018, there was a total of 197 Passaic County youth admitted to detention alternative. This included 181 males and 16 females. Sixty-three (63) of the youth admitted to detention alternatives were African American, 15 were White, 110 Hispanic and 5 youth were identified as other. In the same year there were 190 males admitted into detention and 19 females. In, comparison 91.8% of those admitted to detention alternatives were male and 8.2% female, while 95% of those admitted to detention were male and 5% were female. There are slight variations between detention and detention alternatives when examined by race/ethnicity. In 2018, 42.58% of admissions to detention were Black youth and 31.98% of admissions to detention alternatives were Black youth. White youth accounted for 6.7% of admissions to detention center and 29.55% of admissions to detention alternatives. Hispanic youth made up 47.37% of detention admissions, and 55.84% of alternative admissions.

Role Model/Mentor services ranked last in 2015 and has moved to number 1 on the list in 2018. The need for Individual and family counseling has increased exponentially. Independent Living did not make the list for 2018.

24. Looking at your answer to Question 6, what does this information tell you collectively about the status of disproportionate minority contact and racial/ethnic disparities at this point of the juvenile justice continuum within your County?

In 2015, there were 849 youth referred to court, of those 242 were admitted into detention. 28.5% of youth referred to court were admitted into detention. In 2018, a total of 785 youth was referred to court with 209 of them being admitted into detention. The percent of youth referred to court who were admitted into detention was 26.6%. Referrals to court decreased by -7.5% from 2015 to 2018. Detention admissions decreased by -13.6% during the same time period.

There continues to be alarming disparities within the numbers when you begin to look at race and ethnicity. In 2018, of the 238 White youth who were referred to court, 14 of them were admitted into detention (5.9%). Of the 260 Black youth referred to court, 89 of them were admitted into detention (34.2%). Two hundred and sixty-three Hispanic youth were referred to court in 2018, and 99 of them were admitted into detention (37.6%).

Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need

25. Was additional data, not provided by the JJC, was used in your county's planning process? (If other data was used attach a copy.) If so, what does that data tell you about how your County's overall need for secure detention and detention alternative programs has changed in recent years and about the needs and characteristics of youth that should be addressed through your county's juvenile detention plan? Are there additional data that relates Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial and Ethnic Disparities?

No additional data was collected.

RECOMMENDATIONS

29. Looking at your answers to Questions 22, 23, and 25 what is the County’s juvenile detention plan to address problems and county trends. Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend. State how the CYSC plan to address the need and/or service gap.

What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
Supervision	JAMS data indicates electronic monitoring and supervision are among the most frequently provided services.	Electronic Monitoring Bracelet
Secure Detention, need for advocacy and expedite services to decrease length of stay.	JAMS data along with CJSSI indicates length of stay	Case Expediter, detention liaison to expand expediter’s role.
Substance abuse treatment.	JAMS data and key informant surveys indicated that substances abuse treatment is among the highest need for juveniles in detention alternatives.	Outpatient, in-home, telehealth treatment services.
Increase supervision during after school hours to expand educational, vocational, and aftercare options.	JAMS and key informant surveys indicate that substances abuse treatment is among the highest need for juveniles in detention alternatives.	Evening reporting, wellness drop-in centers, life skills, vocational programs, etc.
Delinquent complaints and technical violations of probation.	VOP rates, JAMS data, JDAI data	Role Model and mentoring services including but not limited to Youth Recovery Coaching programs.

Comments:

Continue to schedule regular provider trainings on topics of cultural competence for Passaic County Youth.

30. Looking at your answers to Questions 24 and 25, what recommendations or strategies would your county make with regards to Juvenile Detention policy and practice through the lens of race and ethnicity? What recommendations or strategies would your county consider to ensure similar outcomes for similarly situated youth?

Comments:

Continue to schedule regular provider trainings on topics of cultural competence for Passaic County Youth.

DISPOSITION ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

- When answering questions regarding trends, describe *whether* any change has occurred, the *direction* of any change (e.g., increase/up, decrease/down), and the *size* of any change (e.g., small, moderate, large).
- When answering questions regarding rank orders, draw comparisons between categories (e.g., using terms like least/smallest, most/largest).

NATURE & EXTENT OF THE DISPOSED POPULATION

JUVENILES ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT

1. Looking at Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender (Cell C3) and Table 2: Juvenile Cases Adjudicated Delinquent with Probation & Incarceration Dispositions (Cell B4), describe the overall number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent and the number of cases with probation and incarceration dispositions in 2018.

In 2015, there were a total of 645 youth adjudicated delinquent. In 2018, the number of youth decreased by -28.5% to 461. In 2018, 19 youth were committed to JJC incarceration and 315 were disposed to probation supervision.

NATURE OF JUVENILES ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT IN 2018

2. Looking at Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender (Columns C and D), describe the number of males and the number of females adjudicated delinquent in 2018.

In 2015, there were 518 males and 127 female youth adjudicated delinquent. In 2018, the number of males decreased by -28.6% to 370 and female youth decreased -28.3% to 91

3. Insert into the chart below Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity (Table 3, Columns C and D), beginning with the group that had the greatest number of adjudications in 2018.

Ranking of Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race for 2018			
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
1	Hispanic	170	36.9%

2	Black	162	35.1%
3	White	113	24.5%

4	Other	16	3.5%
---	-------	----	------

4. Insert into the chart below Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age (Table 5, Columns C and D), beginning with the group that had the greatest number of adjudications in 2018.

Ranking of Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age Group for 2018			
Rank	Age Group	Number	Percent
1	15-16	143	46.1%
2	17	93	30.0%
3	13-14	62	20%
4	11-12	12	3.9%
5	6-10	0	0
6	18 and over	0	0

SUMMARY OF THE NATURE OF JUVENILES ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT IN 2018

5. Looking at your answers to Questions 2 through 4, summarize what this information tells you about the nature of juveniles adjudicated delinquent in 2018.

In 2018, males were adjudicated more frequently than females by a 4 to 1 ratio. Hispanic youth were adjudicated delinquent most frequently, followed closely by Black youth. White youth only made up a quarter of delinquent adjudications. 46.1% of all youth adjudicated delinquent were between the ages of 15-16.

CHANGE IN JUVENILES ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT BETWEEN 2015 and 2018

6. Looking at Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender (Cell E3) and Table 2: Juvenile Cases Adjudicated Delinquent with Probation & Incarceration Dispositions (Cell C4), describe the overall change in juveniles adjudicated delinquent and cases with probation and incarceration dispositions between 2015 and 2018.

The overall number of Youth Adjudicated Delinquent decreased -by 28.5% from 2015 to 2018. Male youth contributed to 80.3% of all adjudicated delinquent youth which exhibits no change from 2015.

The number of JJC commitments increased from 13 in 2015 to 19 in 2018, an increase of 46.2%. Probation dispositions however saw a -49.2% decrease over the same period, from 645 to 315.

7. Looking at Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender (Column E), describe the change in the number of males and the number of females adjudicated delinquent between 2015 and 2018.

The overall number of Youth Adjudicated Delinquent decreased by -28.5% from 2015 to 2018. The number of Male (-28.6%) and female (-28.3%) youth adjudicated respectively were within .3% of the overall youth decrease.

➤ **For Question 8, use Table 3: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race.**

8. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race (Column E), from largest to smallest between 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race Between 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Race	% Change	Number
1	White	-32.3%	113
2	Hispanic	-31.2%	170
3	Black	-28.0%	162
4	Other	-5.9%	16

- For Question 9, use Table 5: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age.

9. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age (Column E) from largest to smallest between 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age Between 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Age Groups	% Change	Number
1	15-16	-472.0%	143
2	13-14	287.5%	62
3	11-12	140%	12
4	6-10	-100%	0
5	17	57.6	93
6	18 and over	0	0

SUMMARY OF THE CHANGE IN THE NATURE OF JUVENILES ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT BETWEEN 2015 and 2018

10. Using the answers from Questions 6-9, describe how the nature of juveniles adjudicated delinquent changed between 2015 and 2018.

The overall number of Youth Adjudicated Delinquent decreased -by 28.5% from 2015 to 2018. Male youth contributed to 80.3% of all adjudicated delinquent youth which exhibits no change from 2015.

The number of JJC commitments increased from 13 in 2015 to 19 in 2018, an increase of 46.2%. Probation dispositions however saw a -49.2% decrease over the same period, from 645 to 315.

Delinquent Adjudications saw a decline across all race/ethnicities. Hispanic and White youth delinquent adjudication declined by -31.2% and -32.3% respectively. Black youth saw a -28.0% decrease in

the same time period.

Disproportionate Minority Contact and Racial and Ethnic Disparities

11. Using the data in Table 4 (Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity), compare and describe the number of Juvenile Arrests to the number of Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity between 2015 and 2018.

In 2015, the number of white youth arrested totaled 1,150, and 14.5% of them were adjudicated delinquent. In 2017 there were 1,191 white youth arrested and 9.5% of them were adjudicated delinquent. In 2015 there were 759 black youth arrested and 29.6% of them were adjudicated delinquent. In 2017 there were a total of 625 juvenile arrests amongst black youth with 25.9% of them being adjudicated delinquent. In 2015, the number of Hispanic youth arrested totaled 931 with 247 or 26.5% of them being adjudicated delinquent. In 2017, the number of Hispanic youth arrested totaled 1,033 with 16.5% of them being adjudicated delinquent. Comparing juvenile arrest across race and ethnicity reveals some disparities. 25.9% of the arrest amongst black youth leads to an adjudication of delinquency, in comparison to their white peers who are arrested at an amount almost twice that of black youth 1,119 and 625, respectively.

Probation Placements

12. Using the data in Table 6 (Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity), describe the overall change in the Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2015 and 2018.

From 2015 to 2018 the number of probation placements decreased from 539 in 2015 to 310 in 2018, a -42.5% decrease. The decrease in probation placements was similar across race and ethnicity. White youth placed on probation decreased by -50.4%. Black youth placed on probation decreased by -35.3% in the same time period. Hispanic youth placed on probation decreased by -46.6%.

13. Insert into the chart below the number column (Table 6, Column C), Probation Placements by race/ethnicity beginning with the group that had the greatest number of placements in 2018.

Ranking of Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity, 2018		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number
1	Black	119
2	Hispanic	117
3	White	64
4	Other	10

14. Insert into the chart below the % change in Table 6 (Column E), Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest % change between and 2018.

Ranking of Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2015 and 2018		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	% Change
1	White	-50.4%
2	Hispanic	-46.6%
3	Other	42.9%
4	Black	-35.3%

15. Using the information in the ranking chart above, what does this information tell you about your county’s Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2015 and 2018? How has Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity changed since 2018?

From 2015 to 2018 the number of probation placements decreased significantly from 539 in 2015 to 310 in 2018. The decrease in probation placement was consistent across race/ethnicity. White youth experienced the greatest change during that three-year time frame (-50.4%), while Black youth saw the smallest rate change (-35.3%).

Disproportionate Minority Contact and Racial and Ethnic Disparities

16. Using the data in Table 7 (Juvenile Probation Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity), compare and describe the number of juvenile adjudications to the number of probation placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2015 and 2018.

From 2015 to 2018 there was a decrease in the percent of Youth adjudicated delinquent who were placed on probation from 82.2% in 2015 to 67.2% in 2018. The decrease is evident across race/ethnicity with White youth experienced the highest percentage change (-50.4) while Black youth saw a percentage change of (-35.3) in the same time period.

- **For Questions 17-20 use Table 8 (Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity) and Table 9 (Secure Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity)**

Secure Placements

17. Using the data in Table 8 (Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity, Column H), describe the overall change in Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2015 and 2018.

In 2015, there were 34 youth sent to secure placements, and in 2018 that number decreased to 21. The number of white youth (1) sent to secure placement remained the same from 2015 to 2018. In 2015, 17 black youth were sent to secure placement, and in 2018 the number decreased to 13. Hispanic youth were sent to secure placement decreased by -56.3% to 7 from 16 in 2015.

18. Insert into the chart below the number of Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity beginning with the group that had the greatest number of secure placements in 2018.

Ranking of Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity, 2018		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number
1	Black	13
2	Hispanic	7
3	White	1
4	Other	0

19. Insert into the chart below the % change in Table 8 (Column E) Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest % change between 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity, 2018		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	% Change
1	Hispanic	-56.3%
2	Black	-23.5%

3	White	0%
4	Other	0%

20. Using the information in the ranking charts above, what does this information tell you about your county's Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2015 and 2018? How has Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity changed since 2018?

In 2015 and 2018 Hispanic and black youth accounted for 97.1% and 95.2% of the overall secure placements. In 2015, there were 34 youth sent to secure placements, and in 2018 the number decreased to 21. In 2015, 17 black youth were sent to secure placements and in 2018 that number decreased to 13. Hispanic youth were sent to secure placement decreased by half from 16 to 7.

Disproportionate Minority Contact and Racial and Ethnic Disparities

21. Using the data in Table 9 (Secure Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity), compare and describe the number of Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent to the number of Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2015 and 2018.

In 2015, there were a total of 656 Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent, only 5.2% of those Juvenile Adjudications resulted in secure confinement. In 2018, there was a decrease in Juvenile Adjudications -29.7% from 656 in 2015 to 461 in 2018. Of the 461 Juvenile Adjudicated Delinquent only 21 of them resulted in secure confinement.

JUVENILE AUTOMATED MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JAMS)

- **For Questions 22- 31 use Disposition Data Worksheet and the JAMS data from the JAMS packet.**

22. Looking at Data Worksheet Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender (Cells C1 and C2, 2018) and comparing this information to JAMS Table 6: Total Intakes by Gender, 2018, describe any differences or similarities between juveniles adjudicated delinquent and juveniles in dispositional option programs by gender. 8% of all Black youth adjudicated resulted in secure confinement in comparison to .9% of white youth.

Jams Table 6 was not included in the JJC provided data sets. Instead of these reports the County selected the following methodology to capture this information for questions #22,23,24 and 25. The County generated JAMS reports for 2018 by program, gender and race, then isolated those programs that provide services at the disposition point of continuum.

In 2018, 120 youth were served in disposition programs, of these 107 were males and 13 were females. Females made up a total of 10.83% of the total number of youths admitted to disposition programs. The percentage of adjudications for female was 19.7% which was the exact same percentage in 2015. Females appear to be underrepresented in the number of intakes to disposition programs.

23. Looking at Data Worksheet Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender (Cells D1 and D2) and comparing this information to JAMS Table 6: Total Intakes by Gender, 2018 (Female and Male for Each Program), describe any differences or similarities between the gender of youth adjudicated delinquent and the gender of youth served in any given dispositional option program.

Jams Table 6 was not included in the JJC data sets. See above for data methodology. Drug and

alcohol evaluation programs admitted 16 males and 4 females. Life Skills admitted 17 males and 1 female.

24. Looking at Data Worksheet Table 3: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 (Column C) and comparing this information to JAMS Table 3: Total Intakes by Race/Ethnicity, 2018, describe any differences or similarities between juveniles adjudicated delinquent and juveniles in dispositional option programs by race/ethnicity.

JAMS Table 3 was not included in the JJC provided data sets. Of the 120 youths served in YSC disposition programs in 2018, 50.83% were Hispanic, 10.83% were black and only 6.667% were white youth. In 2018, males were adjudicated delinquent more frequently than females. Hispanic youth were adjudicated delinquent most frequently.

25. Looking at Data Worksheet Table 3: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity (Column D) and comparing this information to JAMS Table 3: Total Intakes by

Race/Ethnicity, 2018 (Total for Each Program), describe any differences or similarities between the race of youth adjudicated delinquent and the race/ethnicity of youth served in any given dispositional option program.

JAMS Table 3 was not included in the JJC provided data sets. Data from all disposition programs representing racial differences were like the averages.

26. Looking at Data Worksheet Table 5: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age (Column C) and comparing this information to JAMS Table 4: Average Age of Intake Population, 2018, describe any differences or similarities between juveniles adjudicated delinquent and juveniles in dispositional option programs by age.

The two data sets compared are collected and reported differently. JAMS report average age across all admissions to each of the dispositional options. Court reports of juvenile adjudicated delinquent are reported by number of youths with each of the six pre-defined age groups. These two different reporting structures do not provide enough information for a full comparison of these two groups of youth.

27. Looking at Data Worksheet Table 4: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age (Column C) and comparing this information to Table 4: Average Age, 2018, describe any differences or similarities between the age of youth adjudicated delinquent and the age of youth served in any given dispositional option program.

Three dispositional programs reported an average age at intake was 17 years old, the other two programs reported an average age of 16. For juveniles adjudicated delinquent, 46.1% of those were between the age 15 and 16. 30% of youth adjudicated delinquent were 17 years of age.

28. Looking at the “Total” column of Table 6: Problem Areas by Program, 2018, the chart below shows the top ten Problem Areas for youth served in dispositional option programs, from largest to smallest.

Ranking of Problem Areas by Program					
2015			2018		
Rank	Problem Areas	Total	Rank	Problem Areas	Total
1	Personality/Behavior	286	1	Personality/Behavior	206
2	Peer Relations	228	2	Peer Relations	119
3	Vocational Skill/Employment	159	3	Family Circumstances/Parenting	103
4	Attitudes/Orientation	132	4	Attitudes/Orientation	99
5	Family Circumstances	125	5	Vocational Skills/Employment	97
6	Education	87	6	Education	39
7	Substance Abuse	48	7	Substance Abuse	11

8	Teen Pregnancy/Parenting	5	8	Other	0
9	Medical Problems	3	9	Other	0

10	N/A	3	10	Other	0
----	-----	---	----	-------	---

29. Looking at the “Total” column of Table 7: Service Interventions Provided, 2018, rank the top ten service interventions provided to youth in dispositional option programs, from largest to smallest.

Ranking of Service Interventions Provided					
2015			2018		
Rank	Service Interventions Provided	Total	Rank	Service Interventions Provided	Total
1	Counseling/Individual	104	1	Urine Monitoring	56
2	Counseling/Group	101	2	Supervision	50
3	Counseling/Family	92	3	Legal Services	46
4	Academic Education	88	4	Role Model/Mentor	35
5	Urine Monitoring	88	5	Counseling/Individual	34
6	Decision Making Skills	84	6	Counseling/Family	33
7	Electronic Monitoring	83	7	Counseling/Group	31
8	Intensive Supervision	79	8	Electronic Monitoring	29
9	Life Skills Training	73	9	Recreation/Socialization	25
10	Supervision	73	10	Academic Education	24

30. Looking at your answers to Questions 28 and 29, describe the extent to which identified problem areas of juveniles are currently being addressed by service interventions provided in dispositional option programs.

In 2018, problem areas identified included Personality/Behavior, Peer Relations, Family Circumstances/Parenting, Attitudes/Orientation and Vocational Skills/Employment. Interventions provided generally address the behavior, with Urine Monitoring, Supervision and Legal Services as the top three interventions provided. Recreation/Socialization and Academic Education were ranked 9 and 10, respectively.

31. Looking at the “Total” column of Table 8: Service Intervention Needed, 2018, rank the top ten dispositional option program service areas that were identified, from largest to smallest.

Ranking of Service Interventions Needed					
---	--	--	--	--	--

2015			2018		
Rank	Service Interventions Needed	Total	Rank	Service Interventions Needed	Total

1	Academic/Education	63	1	Urine Monitoring	56
2	Counseling/Individual	60	2	Supervision	50
3	Advocacy	54	3	Life Skills Training	46
4	Counseling/Family	52	4	Role Model/Mentor	35
5	Decision Making Skills	49	5	Counseling/Individual	34
6	Counseling/Group	47	6	Counseling/Family	33
7	Life Skills Training	44	7	Counseling/Group	31
8	Community Service Planning/Monitoring	34	8	Decision Making Skills Training	29
9	Case Management Services	24	9	Recreation/Socialization	25
10	Electronic Monitoring	22	10	Academic/Education, After School Program, Electronic Monitoring,	24 each

IMPLICATIONS FOR DISPOSITIONAL OPTIONS PLAN

Extent of Need

32. What does the answer to Question 6, 12 and 17 (overall change in disposed population) tell you about how your County's overall need for dispositional option programs has changed in recent years?

The overall number of Youth Adjudicated Delinquent decreased -by 28.5% from 2015 to 2018. Male youth contributed to 80.3% of all adjudicated delinquent youth which exhibits no change from 2015.

The number of JJC commitments increased from 13 in 2015 to 19 in 2018, an increase of 46.2%. Probation dispositions however saw a -49.2% decrease over the same period, from 645 to 315.

From 2015 to 2018 the number of probation placements decreased from 539 in 2015 to 310 in 2018, a -42.5% decrease. The decrease in probation placements was similar across race and ethnicity. White youth placed on probation decreased by -50.4%. Black youth placed on probation decreased by -35.3% in the same time period. Hispanic youth placed on probation decreased by -46.6%.

With the increase in VOP's and youth committed to secure placement and Detention with VOPS's and low-level offenses, there is an indication that community disposition need continued support. This shall ensure youth are receiving the necessary support and services to rehabilitate and reduce recidivism. Family Court and Probation in Passaic County will have an overwhelming need for additional community options for youth at this point in the continuum.

Nature of Need

33. Based on the answers to Question 5 (nature of disposed population, 2018), Question 10,15 and 20 (change in the nature of the disposed population between 2015 and 2018), Questions 22, 24, and 26 (nature of youth in dispositional option programs as compared to youth adjudicated delinquent by gender, race, and age), and Question 28 (top ten problem areas), what are the characteristics of youth that seem reasonable to address programmatically through your County's dispositional options plan?

In 2018, Males were adjudicated more frequently than females by a 4 to 1 ratio. Hispanic youth were adjudicated delinquent most frequently, followed closely by Black youth. White youth only made up a quarter of delinquent adjudications. 46.1% of all youth adjudicated delinquent were between the ages of 15-16.

The overall number of Youth Adjudicated Delinquent decreased -by 28.5% from 2015 to 2018. Male youth contributed to 80.3% of all adjudicated delinquent youth which exhibits no change from 2015.

The number of JJC commitments increased from 13 in 2015 to 19 in 2018, an increase of 46.2%. Probation dispositions however saw a -49.2% decrease over the same period, from 645 to 315.

Delinquent Adjudications saw a decline across all race/ethnicities. Hispanic and white youth delinquent adjudication declined by -31.2% and -32.3% respectively. Black youth saw a -28.0% decrease in the same time period.

From 2015 to 2018 the number of probation placements decreased significantly from 539 in 2015 to 310 in

2018. The decrease in probation placement was consistent across race/ethnicity. white youth experienced the greatest change during that three-year time frame (-50.4%), while Black youth saw the smallest rate change (-35.3).

Jams Table 6 was not included in the JJC provided data sets. Instead of these reports the County selected the following methodology to capture this information for questions #22,23,24 and 25. The county generated JAMS reports for 2018 by program, gender and race, then isolated those programs that provide services at the disposition point of continuum.

In 2018, 120 youth were served in disposition programs, of these 107 were males and 13 were females. Females made up a total of 10.83% of the total number of youths admitted to disposition programs. The percentage of adjudications for female was 19.7% which was the exact same percentage in 2015. Females appear to be underrepresented in the number of intakes to disposition programs.

JAMS Table 3 was not included in the JJC provided data sets. Of the 120 youths served in YSC disposition programs in 2018, 50.83% were Hispanic, 10.83% were black and only 6.667% were white youth. In 2018, males were adjudicated delinquent more frequently than females. Hispanic youth were adjudicated delinquent most frequently.

The two data sets compared are collected and reported differently. JAMS report average age across all admissions to each of the dispositional options. Court reports of juvenile adjudicated delinquent are reported by number of youths with each of the six pre-defined age groups. These two different reporting structures do not provide enough information for a full comparison of these two groups of youth.

Services at this point in the continuum will need to target our growing Hispanic Population, and cultural competence and sensitivity. Services must target the highest problem areas including Personality/Behavior, Peer Relations and Family Circumstances/Parenting

34. Looking at your answer to Question 11, 16 and 21, what does this information tell you collectively about the status of disproportionate minority contact and racial/ethnic disparities at this point of the juvenile justice continuum within your county?

In 2015, the number of white youth arrested totaled 1,150, and 14.5% of them were adjudicated delinquent. In 2017 there were 1,191 white youth arrested and 9.5% of them were adjudicated delinquent. In 2015 there were 759 black youth arrested and 29.6% of them were adjudicated delinquent. In 2017 there were a total of 625 juvenile arrests amongst black youth with 25.9% of them being adjudicated delinquent. In 2015, the number of Hispanic youth arrested totaled 931 with 247 or 26.5% of them being adjudicated delinquent. In 2017, the number of Hispanic youth arrested totaled 1,033 with 16.5% of them being adjudicated delinquent. Comparing juvenile arrest across race and ethnicity reveals some disparities. 25.9% of the arrest amongst black youth leads to an adjudication of delinquency, in comparison to their white peers who are arrested at an amount almost twice that of black youth 1,119 and 625, respectively.

From 2015 to 2018 there was a decrease in the percent of Youth adjudicated delinquent who were placed on probation from 82.2% in 2015 to 67.2% in 2018. The decrease is evident across race/ethnicity with White youth experienced the highest percentage change (-50.4) while Black youth saw a percentage change of (-

35.3) in the same time period. In 2015, there were a total of 656 Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent, only 5.2% of those Juvenile Adjudications resulted in secure confinement. In 2018, there was a decrease in Juvenile Adjudications -29.7% from 656 in 2015 to 461 in 2018. Of the 461 Juvenile Adjudicated Delinquent only 21 of them resulted in secure confinement. In Passaic County we are looking into developing Unique dispositional options for African American and Hispanic males. Develop dispositional options that discourage recidivism and encourage community and civic engagement. Provide trainings on culture and race, implicit bias, culture competence, ACES etc. for all stakeholders

Other Data Reviewed for Extent and Nature of Need - Disposition

35. Was additional data, not provided by the JJC, used in your county's planning process? (If other data was attach a copy.)

What does any other available data tell you about how your County's overall need for dispositional option programs has changed in recent years and what are the characteristics of youth that seem reasonable to address programmatically through your County's dispositional options plan? Are there additional data that relates to Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial and Ethnic Disparities?

Youth and provider survey 's were conducted. Youth and provider surveys are attached.

RECOMMENDATIONS

36. Looking at your answers to Questions 32, 33 and 35, state the problem or county trends to be addressed. Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend. State how will the CYSC address the problem or county trend.

What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend.	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
Disproportionate percentage of Hispanic Male representation of disposition youth.	JAMS report and data worksheets provided by JJC	Provide disposition programs designed for this population. Expand assessment tools
Lack of mentoring services due to challenges of single parents' homes and minimal supervision.	Youth Surveys.	Develop programs which offer role models and relationship building opportunities with youth.
Transportation services barriers inhibit youth engagement in services, specifically up-county.	Youth Survey's	Identifying transportation resources /options and links connecting up-county and down county youth to services.
Substances Abuse and Misuse.	JAMS reports rank substance abuse among the top priority needs, also Based on the amount of TASC evaluations provided.	Services to assess and offer treatment and recovery support opportunities.
Effect of childhood trauma on delinquency	Provider surveys and OJJDP Data.	Expand education, services and treatment options specifically targeting trauma.
Services to address mental and behavioral health	Youth provider surveys. JAMS reports indicate personality and behavioral health as primary needs.	Continue to provide youth in dispositional programs with services to improve decision making and development of positive behavioral supports.
Sex Offense and Risk	JAMS reports based off referrals	Sexual behavior education, evaluation and treatment to incuse the use of technology

Comments:

Looking at your answers to Questions 34 and 35 what recommendations or strategies would your county make with regards to Dispositional Options policy and practice through the lens of race and ethnicity? What recommendations or strategies would your county consider to ensure similar outcomes for similarly situated youth? *In 2015 there were 759 back youth arrested and 29.6% of them were adjudicated delinquent. In 2017 there were a total of 625 juvenile arrests amongst black youth with 25.9% of them being adjudicated delinquent. In 2015, the number of Hispanic youth arrested totaled 931 with 247 or 26.5% of them being adjudicated delinquent. In 2017, the number of Hispanic youth arrested totaled 1,033 with 16.5% of them being adjudicated delinquent. Comparing juvenile arrest across race and ethnicity reveals some disparities. 25.9% of the arrest amongst black youth leads to an adjudication of delinquency, in comparison to their white peers who are arrested at an amount almost twice that of black youth 1,119 and 625, respectively.*

From 2015 to 2018 there was a decrease in the percent of Youth adjudicated delinquent who were placed on probation from 82.2% in 2015 to 67.2% in 2018. The decrease is evident across race/ethnicity with White youth experienced the highest percentage change (-50.4) while Black youth saw a

percentage change of (-35.3) in the same time period. In 2015, there were a total of 656 Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent, only 5.2% of those Juvenile Adjudications resulted in secure confinement. In 2018, there was a decrease in Juvenile Adjudications -29.7% from 656 in 2015 to 461 in 2018. Of the 461 Juvenile Adjudicated Delinquent only 21 of them resulted in secure confinement. Unique dispositional options are desired for African American and Hispanic males. Develop dispositional options that discourage recidivism and encourage community and civic engagement. Provide trainings on culture and race, implicit bias, culture competence, ACES etc. for all stakeholders.

37.

Comments:

The commission should continue to make trainings available and continue dialogues with the judiciary, detention staff, and staff of detention alternatives to seek ways to continuously ensure improved outcomes with similarly situated youth. The established Education, Training and Advocacy committee is looking to address these issues.

REENTRY ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

- When answering questions regarding trends, describe *whether* any change has occurred, the *direction* of any change (e.g., increase/up, decrease/down), and the *size* of any change (e.g., small, moderate, large).
- When answering questions regarding rank orders, draw comparisons between categories (e.g., using terms like least/smallest, most/largest).

NATURE & EXTENT OF REENTRY POPULATION

JUVENILE PROBATIONER ADMITTED TO JJC RESIDENTIAL & DAY PROGRAMS

1. Looking at Table 1: Juvenile Probationers Admitted to JJC Residential by Race/Ethnicity (Column E), describe how the overall change in the number of Juvenile Probationers admitted to Residential Community Homes by Race/Ethnicity has changed from 2015 and 2018.

In 2015 there were zero Youth from Passaic County who were admitted into JJC residential programs. In 2018 13 youth were admitted into JJC residential programs.

2. Insert into the chart below the number column (Column C) Juvenile Probationers Admitted by Race/Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest number of admissions in 2018.

Ranking of Juvenile Probationers Admitted by Race/Ethnicity, 2018		
Rank	Race/Ethnicity	Number
1	Hispanic	7
2	Black	3
3	White	2
4	Other	1

3. Insert into the chart below the % change in Table 1 (Column E) Juvenile Probationers Admitted by Race/Ethnicity, beginning with the group that had the greatest % change between 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of Releases by Race/Ethnicity, 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Group	% Change	Number
1	Hispanic	∞	7
2	Black	∞	3
3	White	∞	2
4	Other	∞	1

4. Using the ranking tables above, what does this information tell you about the Juvenile Probationers Admitted in the year 2018? How has Juvenile Probationers Admitted by Race/Ethnicity changed since 2015?

In 2015 there were zero Passaic County youth admitted into any JJC residential programs. That number saw a significant increase in 2018 in which a total of 13 Passaic County youth were admitted into JJC residential programs. The increase is evident across all race/ethnicity groups with Hispanic youth experiencing the largest raw number increase from 2015 to 2018. Percentage/rate change is not applicable since there were zero admissions in 2015.

JUVENILES RELEASED TO PROBATION REENTRY SUPERVISION

PROBATIONERS RELEASED IN 2018

5. Looking at Table 2: Juvenile Probationers Released by Program Type (Columns C and D), describe the overall number of juvenile probationers released and juvenile probationers released from each type of program in 2018.

In 2018 there were a total of 3 youth who were released from residential programs. There were no kids who were released from a day program, as JJC no longer has any day programs.

6. Looking at Table 3: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Race and Gender and Table 4: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Age, describe the nature of juvenile probationers released in 2018 in terms of Race (Table 2, Cells F1-F4), Gender (Table 2, Cells D5 and E5) and Age (Table 3, Cells D1-D4).

In 2018 there were 3 male youth who were released from JJC residential programs, the only other race/ethnic group represented in Table 3 were Hispanic Males.

➤ For Questions 7, use Table 5: Offenses of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers by Type.

7. Insert into the chart below the Offense of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers by Type (Columns C and D), beginning with the offense type that has the greatest number in 2018.

Probationers Ranking of Offenses by Type for 2018			
Rank	Offense Type	Number	Percent
1	VOP	15	42.9%
2	Persons	10	28.6%
3	Property	5	14.3%
4	Weapons	2	5.7%
5	Public Order	2	5.7%
6	CDS	1	2.9%

8. Looking at Table 6: Juvenile Probationers Released from Specialized Programs (Cells B1 and B2), describe the number of juveniles released from Pinelands and from Drug Treatment Programs in 2018.

N/A

SUMMARY OF THE NATURE OF PROBATIONERS RELEASED IN 2018

9. Using the answers to Questions 5-8, summarize what this information tells you about the nature of juveniles released to Probation in 2018.

In 2018 there were a total of 3 youth who were released from residential programs. There were no kids who were released from a day program.

Passaic county Youth particularly Black and Hispanic Male youth represent 100% of JJC residential programs, black and Hispanic youth attribute for 95.2% of all youth committed and admitted into JJC. With many Black and Hispanic youth on probation the 42.9% VOP rate is a cause of concern.

CHANGE IN PROBATIONERS RELEASED BETWEEN 2015 and 2018

10. Looking at Table 2: Juvenile Probationers Released by Program Type (Column E), describe the overall change in the number of juvenile probationers released between 2015 and 2018
- and the number of juvenile probationers released from each type of program between 2015 and 2018.

In 2018 there were 3 youth released from probation residential programs, there were zero youth released from probations residential programs in 2015. 2015 and 2018 respectively saw zero youth released from day programs.

- **For Questions 11, use Table 3: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Race and Gender.**

11. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Probationers Released (Cells I1-I4), from largest to smallest between 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of Juvenile Probationers Released by Race Between 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Race	% Change	Number
1	Hispanic	14.3%	2
2	Black	0.0%	1
3	White	∞	0
4	Other	∞	0

- **For Questions 12, use Table 4: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Age.**

12. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Probationers Released by Age (Cells E1-E4), from largest to smallest between 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of Juvenile Probationers Released by Age Between 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Age	% Change	Number
1	14 and under	∞	0
2	15-16	∞	0
3	17-18	∞	3
4	19 and over	∞	0

- **For Questions 13, use Table 5: Offenses of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers by Type.**

13. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Offenses by Type (Cells E1-E6), from largest to smallest between 2015 and 2018.

Probationers Ranking of Offenses by Type Between 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Offense Type	% Change	Number
1	Persons	900%	10
2	Property	400%	5
3	VOP	275.0%	15
4	Weapons	-85.7%	2
5	CDS	-83.3%	1
6	Public Order	-71.4%	2

14. Looking at Table 6: Juvenile Probationers Released from Specialized Programs (Cells C1 and C2), describe the change in the number of juveniles released from Pinelands and from Drug Treatment Programs between 2015 and 2018.

In 2015 and in 2018 respectively there were zero Passaic County youth to be released from specialized programs

SUMMARY OF THE CHANGE IN PROBATIONERS RELEASED BETWEEN 2015 and 2018

15. Using the answers from Questions 10-14 and the information in Table 3, Cells G5 and H5 (which provides information on probationers released by gender), describe how the nature of juvenile probationers released to Probation changed between 2015 and 2018.

In 2015 there were no youth released from JJC residential programs. In 2018 there were 8 Black male youth and 6 Hispanic Male youth released from JJC residential programs.

JUVENILES COMMITTED TO JJC

16. Using the data in Table 7 (Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC by Race/Ethnicity), describe the overall change in commitments by Race/Ethnicity between 2015 and 2018.

While there was -38.2 % decrease in the overall number of youth committed to JJC from 2015 to 2018, commitments of White youth remained the same from 2015 to 2018. All other race/ethnic groups saw a decrease in raw number and percentage rate with Hispanic youth experiencing the largest percentage change with -56.3% with Black youth following at -23.5%.

JUVENILES RELEASED TO PAROLE SUPERVISION

COMMITTED JUVENILES RELEASED IN 2018

17. Looking at Table 8: Committed Juveniles Released by Departure Type (Columns C and D), describe the overall number of committed juveniles released and committed juveniles released by departure type in 2018.

Overall, there were 14 youth released, of those 8 were granted parole and 6 were released to Post Incarceration parole supervision.

18. Looking at Table 10: Committed Juveniles Released by Race and Gender and Table 11: Committed Juveniles Released by Age, describe the nature of committed juveniles released in 2018 in terms of Race (Table 10, Cells F1-F4), Gender (Table 10, Cells D5 and E5), and Age (Table 11, Cells D1-D4).

In 2018 there were 8 Hispanic youth 6 Black youth who were committed and released. 3 of those youth were between the ages of 17-18 with the remaining youth being over the age of 19.

19. Insert into the chart below the Offenses of Committed Juveniles by Type of Table 12 (Columns C and D), beginning with the offense type that has the greatest number in 2018.

Committed Juveniles Ranking of Offenses by Type for 2018			
Rank	Offense Type	Number	Percent
1	VOP	15	42.9%
2	Person	10	28.6%
3	Property	5	14.3%
4	Weapons	2	5.7%
5	Public Order	2	5.7%
6	CDS	1	2.9%

20. Looking at Table 13: Committed Juveniles with a Sex Offense Charge in their Court History

(Cell B1), describe the number of juveniles with a sex offense charge in 2018.

In 2018, there were zero Passaic County Youth who were committed with a sex offense charge.

21. Looking at Table 9: Average Length of Stay (LOS) of Committed Juveniles Released (Cell B1), describe the length of stay of committed juveniles released in 2018.

For youth released in 2018, the average length of stay was 28.39 months.

SUMMARY OF THE NATURE OF COMMITTED JUVENILES RELEASED IN 2018

22. Using the answers to Questions 17-21, summarize what this information tells you about the nature of juveniles released to Parole in 2018.

Overall, there were 14 youth who were granted parole and 6 were released to Post Incarceration parole supervision. In 2018 there were 8 Hispanic youth 6 Black youth who were committed and released. 3 of those youth were between the ages of 17-18 with the remaining youth being over the age of 19. For youth released in 2018, the average length of stay was 28.39 months. Fifteen of the youth released were on VOP 42.9% of all offense types. Person offenses were the second largest offense type among Passaic County Youth at 10 or 28.6%

CHANGE IN COMMITTED JUVENILES RELEASED BETWEEN 2015 and 2018

23. Looking at Table 8: Committed Juveniles Released by Departure Type (Column E), describe the overall change in the number of committed juveniles released between 2015 and 2018 and in the number of committed juveniles released by departure type between 2015 and 2018.

In 2015, there 5 youth granted parole and 8 were released to Post Incarceration parole supervision. In 2018, there were 8 youth granted parole while 6 were sent to Post Incarceration parole supervision.

➤ **For Questions 24 use Table 10: Committed Juveniles Released by Race and Gender.**

24. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Committed Juveniles Released (Cells I1-I4), from largest to smallest between 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of Committed Juveniles Released by Race, 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Race	% Change	Number

1	Black	0.0%	6
---	-------	------	---

2	Hispanic	∞	8
3	White	∞	0
4	Other	∞	0

➤ For Questions 25, use Table 11: Committed Juveniles Released by Age.

25. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Committed Juveniles Released by Age (Cells E1-E4), from largest to smallest between 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of Committed Juveniles Released by Age, 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Age	% Change	Number
1	19 and over	120%	11
2	15-16	100%	0
3	17-18	-57.6%	3
4	14 and under	∞	0

➤ For Questions 26, use Table 12: Offenses of Committed Juveniles by Type.

26. Insert into the chart below the % Change in Offenses by Type (Cells E1-E6), from largest to smallest between 2015 and 2018.

Committed Juveniles Ranking of Offenses by Type: Offenses Experiencing an Increase Between 2015 and 2018			
Rank	Offense Type	% Change	Number
1	Persons	900%	10
2	Property	400%	5
3	VOP	275.0%	15
4	Weapons	-85.7%	2
5	CDS	-83.3%	1
6	Public Order	-71.4%	2

27. Looking at Table 13: Committed Juveniles with a Sex Offense Charge in their Court History (Cell C1), describe the change in the number of juveniles with a sex offense charge between 2015 and 2018.

In 2015, one Passaic County youth was committed to JJC with a sex offense charge. In 2018 there were zero youth who were committed to JJC on sex charges

28. Looking at Table 9: Average Length of Stay (LOS) of Committed Juveniles Released (Cell C1), describe the change in length of stay of committed juveniles between 2015 and 2018.

In 2015, the average length of stay for youth released from JJC Commitment was 17.32 months In 2018, the average length of stay was 28.39 months.

SUMMARY OF THE CHANGE IN COMMITTED JUVENILES RELEASED BETWEEN 2015 and 2018

29. Using the answers from Questions 23-28 and the information in Table 10, Cells G5 and H5 (which provides information on committed juveniles released by gender), describe how the nature of committed juvenile releases has changed between 2015 and 2018.

In 2015, there were 5 granted parole and 8 were released to Post Incarceration parole supervision. In 2015, one Passaic County youth was committed to JJC with a sex offense charge. In 2018 there were zero youth who were committed to JJC on sex charges.

JUVENILE AUTOMATED MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JAMS)

➤ **For Questions 30- 40, use JAMS data tables from the JAMS packet.**

30. Looking at the “Total” in Table 1 (Total Intakes by Program, 2018), and comparing this information with your answers to Question 5 (overall number of probationers released), and Question 19 (overall number of committed juveniles released), describe any differences or similarities between probationers and committed juveniles released to probation or parole supervision and admissions to reentry programs, in terms of overall number of admissions.

In 2018, there were 3 youth admitted into a reentry program, in that same year 13 youth were committed.

31. Looking at the “Total” for each gender in Table 2 (Total Intakes by Gender, 2018), the “Total” column in Table 3 (Total Intakes by Race, 2018), and Table 4 (Average Age by Program, 2018) and comparing this information with your answers to Question 6 (characteristics of probationers) and Question 20 (characteristics of committed juveniles), describe any differences or similarities between probationers and committed juveniles

released to probation or parole supervision and admissions to reentry programs, in terms of race, gender, and age of youth admitted.

In 2018 there were a total of 4 intakes completed for youth on the Re-Entry continuum, all male youth. Of the total 4 intakes two youth were white males while African American and Hispanic males contributed for intake respectively in the same calendar year.

In 2018 there were 8 Black male youth who were released from JJC residential programs, the only other race/ethnic group represented in Table 3 were Hispanic Males. There were 6 Hispanic Male youth who were released from JJC residential programs.

In 2018, there were zero Passaic County Youth who were committed with a sex offense charge.

The average age for re-entry participants was 17 years old.

32. Insert into the chart below the “Total” column of Table 6 (Problem Areas by Program), the top ten problem areas for youth as identified by the Juvenile Automated Management System (JAMS), from largest to smallest for calendar years 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of Problem Areas by Program					
2015			2018		
Rank	Problem Areas	Total	Rank	Problem Areas	Total
1	Personality/Behavior	5	1	Substance Abuse	6
2	Attitudes/Orientation	2	2	Family Circumstances/Parenting	4
3	Family Circumstances/Parenting	2	3	Personality/Behavior	4
4	Education	1	4	Vocational Skills	1
5	Peer Relations	1	5	Peer Relations	1
6	Vocational Skills/Employment	1	6	Other	0
7	N/A	1	7	Other	0
8	Other	0	8	Other	0
9	Other	0	9	Other	0
10	Other	0	10	Other	0

33. How has the ranking of Problem Areas changed between 2015 and 2018? Describe in terms of those Problem Areas that have moved up in rank the most.

In 2015 the highest-ranked problem area was Personality/Behavior, in 2018 the highest rated problem area was Substance Abuse. In 2015 Substances Abuse was not rated as a problem area at all. Family Circumstances remained in the top three of problem areas identified as well as Personality/Behavior.

34. Insert into the chart below the “Total” column of Table 8 (Service Intervention Needed, But Not Available), the top ten reentry program service areas that were identified as unavailable by the JAMS, from largest to smallest for calendar years 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of Service Interventions Needed					
2015			2018		
Rank	Service Interventions Needed	Total	Rank	Service Interventions Needed	Total
1	N/A		1	N/A	
2			2		
3			3		
4			4		
5			5		
6			6		
7			7		
8			8		
9			9		
10			10		

35. How has the ranking of Service Interventions Needed changed between 2015 and 2018? Describe in terms of those Service Interventions Needed that have moved up in rank the most.

N/A there was only one program providing reentry services for youth and provider did not enter this information into JAMS

36. Insert into the chart below the “Total” column of Table 7 (Service Interventions Provided), the top ten service interventions provided to youth, as identified by the JAMS for calendar years 2015 and 2018.

Ranking of Service Interventions Provided					
2015			2018		
Rank	Service Interventions Provided	Total	Rank	Service Interventions Provided	Total
1	N/A		1	Vocational/Job Readiness/Job Skills (GED)	2
2			2	Counseling/Individual Services	2
3			3	Case Management Services	2
4			4	Role Model/Mentor	1

5			5	Decision Making Skills	1
6			6	Other	0
7			7	Other	0
8			8	Other	0
9			9	Other	0
10			10	Other	0

37. How has the ranking of Service Interventions Provided changed between 2015 and 2018?
Describe in terms of those Service Interventions Provided that have moved up in rank the most.

2015 Data was not available. The Highest Rated Service interventions for 2018 were Vocational/Job readiness Services, followed by Counseling/Individual Services (2) and Case management Services (2).

IMPLICATIONS FOR REENTRY PLAN

Extent of Need

38. Using information from your answers to Question 16 (overall change in probationers released to probation) and Question 26 (overall change in committed juveniles released to parole), describe how your County's need for reentry programs has changed in recent years.

There was -38.2 % decrease in the overall number of youths committed to JJC from 2015 to 2018, commitments of White youth remained the same from 2015 to 2018. All other race/ethnic groups saw a decrease in raw number and percentage rate with Hispanic youth experiencing the largest percentage change with -56.3% with Black youth following at -23.5%.

The number of youths committed for Weapons offenses declined by -85.7%, for CDS offenses, the decline was -83.3%. Weapons offenses saw the largest raw number decline from 14 in 2015 to 2 in 2018. Three offense categories experienced significant increases VOP (+275%), Property (400%) and Persons offenses (+900%)

Nature of Need

39. Based on the answers to Question 10 (summary of the nature of probationers released to probation in 2018), Question 23 (summary of the nature of committed juveniles released to parole in 2018), Question 16 (summary of the change in probationers released between 2015 and 2018), Question 30 (summary of the changed in committed juveniles released between 2015 and 2018), Question 32 (characteristics of youth released to probation or parole vs. characteristics of youth admitted to reentry programs), and Question 33 and 34 (top ten problem areas and change in problem areas), what are the characteristics of youth that seem reasonable to address programmatically through your County's reentry plan?

In 2018 there were 3 youth released from probation residential programs, in comparison to 2015 where there were zero youth released from probations residential programs. The years 2015 and 2018 respectively saw zero youth released from day programs

In 2015, there were 5 youth granted parole and 8 were released to Post Incarceration parole supervision. In 2018, there were 8 youth granted parole while 6 were released to Post Incarceration parole supervision.

There was -38.2 % decrease in the overall number of youth's committed to JJC from 2015 to 2018, commitments of White youth remained the same from 2015 to 2018. All other race/ethnic groups saw a decrease in raw number and percentage rate with Hispanic youth experiencing the largest percentage change with -56.3% with Black youth following at -23.5%.

Other Data Reviewed for Extent and Nature of Need – Reentry

40. Was additional data, not provided by the JJC, used in your county’s planning process? (If other data was used attach a copy.)

What do any other available data tell you about how your County’s overall need for reentry programs has changed in recent years and what are the characteristics of youth that seem reasonable to address programmatically through your County’s reentry plan? Are there additional data that relates Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial and Ethnic Disparities?

No other data was considered for this topic.

RECOMMENDATIONS

41. Looking at your answers to Questions 38, 39 and 40, state the problems and county trends that need to be addressed. Cite the data that indicates the problem or need. State how the CYSC plan to address the problem or county trend.

What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend.	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
Lack of services for youth coming out of JJC commitment/programs on adult convictions who are excluded from adult services due to the ages which are below 20.	JJC intake Data.	Extend reentry services to include any youth coming out of JJC commitment/programs regardless of status.
Lack of Community-Based case management and support services	Reentry MDT reports	Support development of community programs and services returning from secure placement.

Comments:

42. Looking at your answers to Questions 18 and 44 what recommendations or strategies would your county make with regards to Reentry policy and practice through the lens of race and ethnicity? What recommendations or strategies would your county consider to ensure similar outcomes for similarly situated youth?

Comments:

At this point in the continuum there is little variation in terms of race and ethnicity between those youth ordered to secure detention and those offered detention alternatives. The commission must continue to make trainings available and continue dialogue with the judiciary, detention staff and staff of detention alternative to seek ways to continually ensure outcomes for similarly situated youth.

VISION

Passaic County

The types of programs listed, should represent what your County's ideal Continuum of Care would look like, regardless of funding limitations.

PREVENTION

Delinquency Prevention Programs are strategies and services designed to increase the likelihood that youth will remain free from initial involvement with the formal or informal juvenile justice system. The goal of delinquency prevention is to prevent youth from engaging in anti-social and delinquent behavior and from taking part in other problem behaviors that are pathways to delinquency. Primary Delinquency Prevention programs are those directed at the entire juvenile population without regard to risk of involvement in the juvenile justice system. Secondary Delinquency Prevention programs are those directed at youth who are at higher risk of involvement in the juvenile justice system than the general population. Given this goal, Delinquency Prevention programs developed through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing services that address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

PREVENTION				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	After School Prevention and Parenting Programs	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Parenting Support and Education Programs	Yes	No	No
3	Conflict resolution including anti-bullying training	No	No	Yes
4	Social and Emotional Learning (including Mentoring, awareness raising regarding disproportionate numbers of Hispanics and African Americans in juvenile justice systems)	No	No	Yes
5	Life Skills Training (including financial literacy, career development, access to resources)	Yes	Yes	Yes

DIVERSION

The Diversion stage of the juvenile justice system offers alleged juvenile offenders an opportunity to avoid arrest and/or prosecution by providing alternatives to the formal juvenile justice system process. The goal of Diversion is to provide services and/or informal sanctions to youth who have begun to engage in antisocial and low level delinquent behavior in an effort to prevent youth from continuing on a delinquent pathway. Youth who do not successfully complete a diversion program may ultimately have their case referred for formal processing by the juvenile court. Given this goal, Diversion programs developed through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing services and/or informal sanctions that address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

LAW ENFORCEMENT				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	Paterson Stationhouse Program	Yes	Yes	No
2	Passaic Stationhouse Program	Yes	Yes	No
3	Clifton Stationhouse Program	No	No	Yes
4	Regional Stationhouse Program	No	No	Yes
5	County-wide/Low level Repeat Offense Stationhouse Program	No	No	Yes

FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION UNIT (FCIU)				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	FCIU	Yes	Yes	Yes
2				
3				
4				
5				

FAMILY COURT (DIVERSION)				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	Teen Court	No	No	Yes
2	Restorative Justice	No	No	Yes

3	Drug Court	No	No	Yes
4	Implicit/Explicit Bias Training	No	No	Yes
5				

DETENTION

“Detention” is defined as the temporary care of juveniles in physically restricting facilities pending court disposition (N.J.A.C. 13:92-1.2).

An objective of detention is to provide secure custody for those juveniles who are deemed a threat to the physical safety of the community and/or whose confinement is necessary to insure their presence at the next court hearing (N.J.A.C. 13:92-1.3). For the purpose of this plan a limited amount of funding may be provided to support court ordered evaluations for adjudicated youth who reside in the detention center, if all other resources have been exhausted.

DETENTION				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	Detention Liaison	No	No	Yes
2	Sex offender evaluations	Yes	Yes	No
3	Substance abuse evaluations	Yes	Yes	No
4	Psychiatric, psychological evaluations, neuro psychological and assessments	No	No	Yes
5	Transportation services	No	No	Yes

DETENTION ALTERNATIVES

Detention Alternative Programs provide supervision to juveniles who would otherwise be placed in a secure detention facility while awaiting their adjudicatory hearing, expanding the array of pre-adjudication placement options available to the judiciary. Detention Alternative Programs/Services are not to be provided in the detention center. These programs are designed to provide short-term (30 – 60 days) supervision sufficient to safely maintain appropriate youth in the community while awaiting the final disposition of their case. As such, these programs help to reduce the overall detention population and relieve detention overcrowding and its related problems where it exists.

DETENTION ALTERNATIVES				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently	Program / Service Currently Funded by	Program / Service is not meeting need

		Exists	County	therefore is a Gap
1	High Supervision Home Detention	Yes	Yes	No
2	Case Expediter	Yes	Yes	No
3	Evening Reporting	Yes	Yes	No
4	Substance Abuse Misuse Treatment	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Role models as Youth Recovery Coaches	No	No	Yes
6	Wellness Drop-in Center	No	No	Yes
7	Athletic League	No	No	Yes

DISPOSITION

Disposition is the phase of the juvenile justice system where youth adjudicated delinquent are ordered by the court to comply with specific sanctions, supervision, and services as a consequence for their delinquent behavior. In New Jersey, the range of dispositions available to the court include but are not limited to restitution/fines, community service, probation, and commitment to the Juvenile Justice Commission. For youth disposed to a term of probation supervision, among the conditions of probation that might be imposed by the court is the completion of a Dispositional Option Program. The structure of these Dispositional Option Programs varies, but common among these options are intensive supervision programs, day and evening reporting centers, and structured day and residential programs. Given this goal, Disposition programs developed through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing sanctions, supervision, and services that address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

DISPOSITION				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	Disposition programs designed to address disproportionate involvement of Hispanic and African American males	No	No	Yes
2	Mentoring Programs	No	No	Yes
3	Substance abuse misuse evaluations and treatment programs	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Sex offender evaluations and treatment	Yes	Yes	No
5	Life Skills Development training	Yes	Yes	Yes
6	Early childhood trauma and delinquency assessments and training	No	No	Yes
7	Mental and behavioral health assessments and training	Yes	No	Yes

REENTRY

For the purposes of this plan, the use of the term Reentry only applies to committed youth paroled from a Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC) facility and supervised by the JJC’s Office of Juvenile Parole and Transitional Services and to juveniles disposed to a JJC program as a condition of probation and supervised by the Department of Probation. Reentry is a mechanism for providing additional support during this transitional period in order to foster the successful reintegration of juveniles into their communities. Given this goal, Reentry programs developed through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing services to youth, regardless of their age, that address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

REENTRY				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	Reentry community options program	Yes	No	Yes
2	Independent living program for returning youth	No	No	Yes
3	Job readiness training for returning youth	No	No	Yes
4	Waiver youth program	No	No	Yes
5	Transitional specialist for returning youth	No	No	Yes

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION DATA WORKSHEETS

DRAFT- NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION JUNE 8, 2020

DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 1. Total County Population by Gender, 2015, 2017 and 2018

	2015		2017		2018		% Change 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	
Males	245,544	48.7%	245,374	48.7%	245,542	48.8%	0.0%
Females	259,044	51.3%	258,320	51.3%	257,768	51.2%	-0.5%
TOTAL POPULATION	504,588	100%	503,694	100%	503,310	100%	-0.3%

Source: <https://datacenter.kidscount.org/data#NJ/5/0/char/0>

Table 2. County Youth Population (ages 10-17) by Gender, 2015, 2017 and 2018

	2015		2017		2018		% Change 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	
Males (ages 10-17)	27,412	51.1%	23,651	47.5%	26,878	50.9%	-1.9%
Females (ages 10-17)	26,256	48.9%	26,115	52.5%	25,884	49.1%	-1.4%
TOTAL YOUTH POPULATION (ages 10-17)	53,668	100%	49,766	100%	52,762	100%	-1.7%

Source: *Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 2015-2018*

Table 3. Total County Youth Population (ages 10-17) by Race, 2015 and 2018

Race	2015		2018		% Change 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	
White	41,400	75.6%	39,988	75.8%	-3.4%
Black	8,969	16.4%	8,429	16.0%	-6.0%
Other*	4,360	8.0%	4,345	8.2%	-0.3%
Total Youth Population	54,729	100.0%	52,762	100.0%	-3.6%

Source: Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 2015-2018

*See Required Data and Methodology Section

Table 4. Total County Youth Population (ages 10-17) by Ethnicity, 2015 and 2018

Ethnicity	2015		2018		% Change 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	
Hispanic	25,780	47.5%	26,085	49.4%	1.2%
Non -Hispanic	28,494	52.5%	26,677	50.6%	-6.4%
Total Youth Population	54,274	100.0%	52,762	100.0%	-2.8%

Source: Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 2015-2018

NATURE AND EXTENT OF DELINQUENCY

Table 5. County Juvenile Arrests by Offense Category, 2015, 2017 and 2018

Offense Categories*	2015			2017			2018			% Change in Number of Arrests 2015-2018
	Number	% of All Juvenile Arrests	Rate per 1,000 youth	Number	% of All Juvenile Arrests	Rate per 1,000 youth	Number	% of All Juvenile Arrests	Rate per 1,000 youth	
Violent Offenses	276	14.4%	5.14	132	7.8%	2.7	126	8.4%	2.4	-54.3%
Weapons Offenses	76	4.0%	1.4	87	5.1%	1.7	64	4.3%	1.2	-15.8%
Property Offenses	238	12.4%	4.4	199	11.7%	4.0	141	9.4%	2.7	-40.8%
Drug/Alcohol Offenses	251	13.1%	4.7	291	17.1%	5.8	348	23.3%	6.6	38.6%
Special Needs Offenses	31	1.6%	0.6	17	1.0%	0.3	14	0.9%	0.3	-54.8%
Public Order & Status Offenses	926	48.3%	17.3	839	49.3%	16.9	703	47.0%	13.3	-24.1%
All Other Offenses	120	6.3%	2.2	138	8.1%	2.8	100	6.7%	1.9	-16.7%
GRAND TOTAL OF JUVENILE ARRESTS	1,918	100%	35.7	1,703	100%	34.2	1,496	100%	28.4	-22.0%

Source: Uniform Crime Report (New Jersey), 2015 and 2018

*See Required Data and Methodology Section

Table 6. Total County Youth Population compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race, 2015 and 2018

Race	2015			2018			% Change 2015-2018	
	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests	% of Youth Population Arrested	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests	% of Youth Population Arrested	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests
White	40,657	1,150	2.8%	39,988	1,191	3.0%	-1.6%	3.6%
Black	8,785	759	8.6%	8,429	625	7.4%	-4.1%	-17.7%
Other*	4,360	9	0.2%	3,797	25	0.7%	-12.9%	177.8%
Total	54,729	1,918	3.5%	52,762	1,841	3.5%	-3.6%	-4.0%

Source: Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 2015-2018

*See Required Data and Methodology Section

Source: Uniform Crime Report (New Jersey), 2015 and 2018

Table 7. Total County Youth Population compared to Juvenile Arrests by Ethnicity, 2015 and 2018

Ethnicity	2015			2018			% Change 2015-2018	
	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests	% of Youth Population Arrested	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests	% of Youth Population Arrested	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests
Hispanic	25,235	931	3.7%	26,805	1,033	3.9%	6.2%	11.0%
Non-Hispanic	28,433	987	3.5%	26,677	808	3.0%	-6.2%	-18.1%
Total Youth Population	54,274	1,918	3.5%	52,762	1,841	3.5%	-2.8%	-4.0%

Source: Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2018

Source: Uniform Crime Report (New Jersey), 2015 and 2018

Table 8. Violence, Vandalism, Weapons, and Substance Abuse in County Schools, 2015-2016 & 2017-2018

School Based Incidences	2015-2016		2017-2018		% Change in School Based Incidents
	Number	% of Total Incidences	Number	% of Total Incidences	
Incidents of Violence	424	52.5%	506	55.1%	19.3%
Incidents of Vandalism	56	6.9%	69	7.5%	23.2%
Incidents of Weapons	35	4.3%	62	6.8%	77.1%
Incidents of Substances	293	36.3%	281	30.6%	-4.1%
TOTAL SCHOOL BASED INCIDENCES	808	100%	918	100%	13.6%

Source: New Jersey Department of Education, 2015-2016 & 2017-2018

NATURE & EXTENT OF COMMUNITY FACTORS THAT PUT YOUTH AT RISK

**Table 9. Enrollment in and Dropouts from County Schools,
Last 2 Years for Which Data are Available**

Academic Indicators	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	% Change Over Years
Total Enrollment	0	0	0	#DIV/0!
Total Dropouts*	0	0	0	#DIV/0!

Source: New Jersey Department of Education, 2015-2016, 2016-2017 and 2017-2018.

*Dropout rates on the DOE website are only available for 2015-2016.

**Table 10. Community Indicators of Children At Risk
Last Years for Which Data Are Available**

Community Indicators	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	% Change
Children Receiving TANF (Welfare)	5,773	4,799	3,838	2,762	 	-52%
Children receiving NJ SNAP (formerly food stamps)	51,738	51,768	49,346	49,733	 	-4%
Child abuse/neglect substantiations	624	518	337	 	 	-46%
Births to Girls (ages 10-19)	388	341	336	 	 	-13%

Source: <https://datacenter.kidscount.org/data#NJ/5/0/char/0>

DIVERSION DATA WORKSHEETS

DRAFT- NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION JUNE 8, 2020

NATURE & EXTENT OF DIVERTED CASES

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Table 1. Police Disposition of Juveniles Taken into Custody by Dispositions Type, 2015 and 2016

Disposition Type	2015				2016		% Change in Number of Dispositions 2015-2016
	Number	% of Total Disposition			Number	% of Total Disposition	
Cases Handled Within Department & Released	1,084	56.5%			873	48.3%	-19.5%
Referred to Juvenile Court or Probation Department	821	42.8%			907	50.2%	10.5%
Referred to Welfare Agency	1	0.1%			16	0.9%	1500.0%
Referred to Other Police Agency	3	0.2%			1	0.1%	-66.7%
Referred to Criminal or Adult Court	9	0.5%			9	0.5%	0.0%
TOTAL POLICE DISPOSITION OF JUVENILES	1918	100%			1806	100%	-5.8%

Source: Uniform Crime Report (New Jersey), 2015 and 2018

FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION UNIT (FCIU)

Table 2. FCIU Caseload by Category, 2015, 2017 and 2018

Categories	2015		2017		2018		% Change in Number of Cases 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total Caseload	Number	% of Total Caseload	Number	% of Total Caseload	
Serious threat to the well-being/physical safety of juvenile	529	30.3%	658	38.0%	589	36.2%	11.3%
Serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile	964	55.2%	898	51.8%	774	47.5%	-19.7%
Unauthorized absence by a juvenile for more than 24 hours	21	1.2%	20	1.2%	4	0.2%	-81.0%
Truancy	67	3.8%	74	4.3%	86	5.3%	28.4%
Disorderly/Petty Disorderly Persons offense diverted to FCIU	7	0.4%	4	0.2%	1	0.1%	-85.7%
Other	159	9.1%	78	4.5%	174	10.7%	9.4%
TOTAL CASELOAD	1747	100%	1732	100%	1628	100%	-6.8%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, 2015, 2017 and 2018.

Table 3. FCIU Petitions Filed by Petition Type, 2015, 2017 and 2018

Petition Types	2015		2017		2018		% Change in Number of Petitions Filed 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total Petitions Filed	Number	% of Total Petitions Filed	Number	% of Total Petitions Filed	
Juveniles/Family Crisis	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	#DIV/0!	-100.0%
Out-of-Home	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
TOTAL PETITIONS FILED	2	100%	1	100%	0	#DIV/0!	-100.0%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, 2015, 2017 and 2018.

Table 4a. FCIU Referrals by Referral Type, 2015, 2017 and 2018*

Referrals Types	2015		2017		2018		% Change in Number of Petitions Filed 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total Referrals Filed	Number	% of Total Referrals Filed	Number	% of Total Referrals Filed	
Referrals made to DYFS	31	2.8%	12	2.5%	29	6.6%	-6.5%
Referrals made to Substance Abuse Program	174	15.6%	5	1.1%	3	0.7%	-98.3%
Referrals made to Other Outside Agencies	913	81.7%	457	96.4%	410	92.8%	-55.1%
TOTAL REFERRALS	1118	100%	474	100%	442	100%	-60.5%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System 2015 and 2018.

*multiple referrals for one case can be reported

Table 4b. Total Referrals (New Filings) to Juvenile Court by Race/Ethnicity, 2015 and 2018

Race/Ethnicity	2015		2018		% Change 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total Referrals	Number	% of Total Referrals	
White	240	28.3%	238	30.3%	-0.8%
Black	288	33.9%	260	33.1%	-9.7%
Hispanic	308	36.3%	263	33.5%	-14.6%
Other*	13	1.5%	24	3.1%	84.6%
Total Referrals	849	100.0%	785	100.0%	-7.5%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System 2015 and 2018.

*See required Data and Methodology

Table 4c. Total Referrals (New Filings) to Juvenile Court compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity, 2015 and 2018

Race/Ethnicity	2015			2018			% Change 2015-2018	
	Juvenile Arrests**	Referrals to Court	% of Arrests Referred to Court	Juvenile Arrests**	Referrals to Court	% of Arrests Referred to Court	Juvenile Arrests**	Referrals to Court
White	1,150	240	20.9%	1,191	238	20.0%	3.6%	-0.8%
Black	759	288	37.9%	625	260	41.6%	-17.7%	-9.7%
Hispanic	931	308	33.1%	1,033	263	25.5%	11.0%	-14.6%
Other*	9	13	144.4%	25	24	96.0%	177.8%	84.6%
Total	1,918	849	44.3%	1,841	785	42.6%	-4.0%	-7.5%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System 2015 and 2018.

*** See required Data and Methodology

Table 5a. Total Juvenile Cases Diverted by Race/Ethnicity, 2015 and 2018

Race/Ethnicity	2015		2018		% Change 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total Cases Diverted	Number	% of Total Cases Diverted	
White	78	39.0%	26	38.8%	-66.7%
Black	53	26.5%	16	23.9%	-69.8%
Hispanic	67	33.5%	24	35.8%	-64.2%
Other*	2	1.0%	1	1.5%	-50.0%
Total Cases	200	100.0%	67	100.0%	-66.5%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System 2015 and 2018.

*See required Data and Methodology

Table 5b. Total Juvenile Cases Diverted compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity, 2015 and 2018

Race/Ethnicity	2015			2018			% Change 2015-2018	
	Juvenile Arrests**	Cases Diverted	% of Arrests Diverted	Juvenile Arrests**	Cases Diverted	% of Arrests Diverted	Juvenile Arrests**	Cases Diverted
White	1,150	78	6.8%	1,191	26	2.2%	3.6%	-66.7%
Black	759	53	7.0%	625	16	2.6%	-17.7%	-69.8%
Hispanic	931	67	7.2%	1,033	24	2.3%	11.0%	-64.2%
Other*	9	2	22.2%	25	1	4.0%	177.8%	-50.0%
Total	1,918	200	10.4%	1,841	67	3.6%	-4.0%	-66.5%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System 2015 and 2018.

*** See required Data and Methodology

**DETENTION
DATA WORKSHEETS**

DRAFT- NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION JUNE 8, 2020

Table 1. Juvenile Detention Admission by Race and Gender, 2015, 2017 and 2018.

Race	2015			2017			2018			% Change in Admissions by Race and Gender 2015-2018		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
White	11	2	13	17	5	22	10	4	14	-9.1%	100.0%	7.7%
Black	113	10	123	81	18	99	82	7	89	-27.4%	-30.0%	-27.6%
Hispanic	99	6	105	93	11	104	91	8	99	-8.1%	33.3%	-5.7%
Other	1		1	6	-	6	7	-	7	600.0%	0.0%	600.0%
Total Admissions	224	18	242	197	34	231	190	19	209	-15.2%	5.6%	-13.6%

Source: Juvenile Detention Statistics Report, 2015, 2017 and 2018.

Table 2. Juvenile Detention Admissions compared to Referrals to Court by Race/Ethnicity, 2015 and 2018

Race/Ethnicity	2015			2018			% Change 2015-2018	
	Referrals To Court	Detention Admissions	% of Referrals Admitted to Detention	Referrals To Court	Detention Admissions	% of Referrals Admitted to Detention	Referrals To Court	Detention Admissions
White	240	13	5.4%	238	14	5.9%	-0.8%	7.7%
Black	288	123	42.7%	260	89	34.2%	-9.7%	-27.6%
Hispanic	308	105	34.1%	263	99	37.6%	-14.6%	-5.7%
Other*	13	1	7.7%	24	7	29.2%	84.6%	600.0%
Total	849	242	28.5%	785	209	26.6%	-7.5%	-13.6%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2015 and 2018

*See required Data and Methodology

Table 3. Juvenile Detention Population, 2015, 2017 and 2018

Categories	2015	2017	2018	% Change 2015-2018
Average Length of Stay	34.8	39.4	36.1	3.7%
Average Daily Population	22.3	23.8	27.8	24.7%
Approved Capacity	242			-100.0%
Percent of Approved Capacity				#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Detention Statistics Report, 2015, 2017 and 2018.

DISPOSITION DATA WORKSHEETS

DRAFT- NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION JUNE 8, 2020

Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender, 2015 and 2018

Gender	2015		2018		% Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Male	518	80.3%	370	80.3%	-28.6%
Female	127	19.7%	91	19.7%	-28.3%
Total Juveniles	645	100%	461	100%	-28.5%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2015 and 2018

Table 2: Juvenile Cases Adjudicated Delinquent with Probation & Incarceration Dispositions, 2015 and 2018

Disposition	2015 Number	2018 Number	% Change in Dispositions 2015-2018
01 - JJC Committed	13	19	46.2%
02 - Short-Term Commitment	0	0	#DIV/0!
03 - 14 - Probation*	645	315	-51.2%
Total	658	334	-49.2%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2015 and 2018

** See Required Data & Methodology Section*

Table 3: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race, 2015 and 2018

Race	2015		2018		% Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
White	167	25.5%	113	24.5%	-32.3%
Black	225	34.3%	162	35.1%	-28.0%
Hispanic	247	37.7%	170	36.9%	-31.2%
Other *	17	2.6%	16	3.5%	-5.9%
Total	656	100.0%	461	100.0%	-29.7%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2015 and 2018

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 4. Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity, 2015 and 2018

Race/Ethnicity	2015			2018			% Change 2015-2018	
	Juvenile Arrests**	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	% of Arrest Adjudicated Delinquent	Juvenile Arrests**	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	% of Arrest Adjudicated Delinquent	Juvenile Arrests**	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent
White	1,150	167	14.5%	1,191	113	9.5%	3.6%	-32.3%
Black	759	225	29.6%	625	162	25.9%	-17.7%	-28.0%
Hispanic	931	247	26.5%	1,033	170	16.5%	11.0%	-31.2%
Other*	9	17	188.9%	25	16	64.0%	177.8%	-5.9%
Total	1,918	656	34.2%	1,841	461	25.0%	-4.0%	-29.7%

Source: Uniform Crime Report (New Jersey), 2015 and 2018

Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2015 and 2018

*/** See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 5: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age, 2015 and 2018

Age Group	2015		2018		% Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
6 - 10	1	0.9%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
11 - 12	5	4.7%	12	3.9%	140.0%
13 - 14	16	15.1%	62	20.0%	287.5%
15 - 16	25	23.6%	143	46.1%	472.0%
17	59	55.7%	93	30.0%	57.6%
18 and over*	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
Total	106	100%	310	100%	192.5%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2015 and 2018

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 6: Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity, 2015 and 2018

Race/Ethnicity	2015		2018		% Change in Probation Placements, 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total Probation Placements	Number	% of Total Probation Placements	
White	129	23.9%	64	20.6%	-50.4%
Black	184	34.1%	119	38.4%	-35.3%
Hispanic	219	40.6%	117	37.7%	-46.6%
Other *	7	1.3%	10	3.2%	42.9%
Total	539	100.0%	310	100.0%	-42.5%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, Relative Rate Index data, 2015 and 2018

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 7: Juvenile Probation Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity, 2015 and 2018

Race/Ethnicity	2015			2018			% Change 2015-2018	
	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Probation Placements	% of Adjudications placed on Probation	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Probation Placements	% of Adjudications placed on Probation	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Probation Placements
White	167	129	77.2%	113	64	56.6%	-32.3%	-50.4%
Black	225	184	81.8%	162	119	73.5%	-28.0%	-35.3%
Hispanic	247	219	88.7%	170	117	68.8%	-31.2%	-46.6%
Other*	17	7	41.2%	16	10	62.5%	-5.9%	42.9%
Total	656	539	82.2%	461	310	67.2%	-29.7%	-42.5%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2015 and 2018

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 8: Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity, 2015 and 2018

Race/Ethnicity	2015		2018		% Change in Secure Placements 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total Secure Placements	Number	% of Total Secure Placements	
White	1	2.9%	1	4.8%	0.0%
Black	17	50.0%	13	61.9%	-23.5%
Hispanic	16	47.1%	7	33.3%	-56.3%
Other *	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
Total	34	100.0%	21	100.0%	-38.2%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2015 and 2018

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 9. Secure Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent, by Race/Ethnicity, 2015 and 2018

Race/Ethnicity	2015			2018			% Change 2015-2018	
	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Secure Placements	% of Adjudications resulted in Secure Confinement	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Secure Placements	% of Adjudications resulted in Secure Confinement	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Secure Placements
White	167	1	0.6%	113	1	0.9%	-32.3%	0.0%
Black	225	17	7.6%	162	13	8.0%	-28.0%	-23.5%
Hispanic	247	16	6.5%	170	7	4.1%	-31.2%	-56.3%
Other*	17	-	0.0%	16	-	0.0%	-5.9%	#DIV/0!
Total	656	34	5.2%	461	21	4.6%	-29.7%	-38.2%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2015 and 2018
Juvenile Justice Commission, 2015 and 2018

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

REENTRY DATA WORKSHEETS

DRAFT- NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION JUNE 8, 2020

PROBATIONERS

Table 1: Juvenile Probationers Admitted to JJC Residential by Race/Ethnicity, 2015 & 2018

Race/Ethnicity	2015		2018		% Change in Probationers Admitted, 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total Probationers Admitted to JJC	Number	% of Total Probationers Admitted to JJC	
White	0	#DIV/0!	2	15.4%	#DIV/0!
Black	0	#DIV/0!	3	23.1%	#DIV/0!
Hispanic	0	#DIV/0!	7	53.8%	#DIV/0!
Other *	0	#DIV/0!	1	7.7%	#DIV/0!
Total	0	#DIV/0!	13	100.0%	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2015 & 2018

** See Required Data & Methodology Section*

Table 2: Juvenile Probationers Released by Program Type, 2015 & 2018

Program Type	2015		2018		% Change in Released by Program Type 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Day Program	0	#DIV/0!	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
Residential	0	#DIV/0!	3	100.0%	#DIV/0!
Total Releases	0	#DIV/0!	3	100.0%	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2015 & 2018

Table 3: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Race and Gender, 2015 & 2018

Race	2015			2018			% Change in Probationers Released by Race and Gender 2015-2018		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
White	0	0	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black	0	0	0	8	0	8	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic	0	0	0	6	0	6	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Releases	0	0	0	14	0	14	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2015 & 2018

Table 4: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Age, 2015 & 2018

Age	2015		2018		% Change in Release by Age 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
14 and under	0	#DIV/0!	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
15 - 16	0	#DIV/0!	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
17 - 18	0	#DIV/0!	3	100.0%	#DIV/0!
19 and over	0	#DIV/0!	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
Total	0	#DIV/0!	3	100%	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2015 & 2018

Table 5: Offenses of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers by Type, 2015 & 2018

Type	2015		2018		% Change in Offenses by Type 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Persons	0	#DIV/0!	10	28.6%	#DIV/0!
Weapons	0	#DIV/0!	2	5.7%	#DIV/0!
Property	0	#DIV/0!	5	14.3%	#DIV/0!
CDS	0	#DIV/0!	1	2.9%	#DIV/0!
Public Order	0	#DIV/0!	2	5.7%	#DIV/0!
VOP	0	#DIV/0!	15	42.9%	#DIV/0!
Total	0	#DIV/0!	35	100.0%	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2015 & 2018

Table 6: Juvenile Probationers Released from Specialized Programs, 2015 & 2018

Program Type	2015	2018	% Change in Probationers Release from Specialized Programs 2015-2018
	Number	Number	
Pinelands	0	0	#DIV/0!
Drug Treatment *	0	0	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2015 & 2018

* See Required Data & Methodology

COMMITTED JUVENILES

Table 7: Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC by Race/Ethnicity, 2015 & 2018

Race/Ethnicity	2015		2018		% Change in Committed Juveniles Released, 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC	Number	% of Total Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC	
White	1	2.9%	1	4.8%	0.0%
Black	17	50.0%	13	61.9%	-23.5%
Hispanic	16	47.1%	7	33.3%	-56.3%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
Total	34	100.0%	21	100.0%	-38.2%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2015 & 2018

Table 8: Committed Juveniles Released by Departure Type, 2015 & 2018

	2015		2018		% Change in Release by Departure Type 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Released to Parole Supervision*	5	38.5%	8	57.1%	60.0%
Recalled to Probation	8	61.5%	6	42.9%	-25.0%
Total Releases	13	100.0%	14	100.0%	7.7%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2015 & 2018

* See Required Data & Methodology

Table 9: Average Length of Stay (LOS) of Committed Juveniles Released, 2015 & 2018

	2015	2018	% Change in Average Length of Stay 2015-2018
	Number	Number	
Average LOS in Months	17.32	28.39	63.9%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2015 & 2018

Table 10: Committed Juveniles Released by Race and Gender, 2015 & 2018

Race	2015			2018			% Change in Committed Juveniles Released by Race and Gender 2015-2018		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
White	0	0	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black	6	0	6	1	0	1	-83.3%	#DIV/0!	-83.3%
Hispanic	7	0	0	3	0	3	-57.1%	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Releases	13	0	6	4	0	4	-69.2%	#DIV/0!	-33.3%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2015 & 2018

Table 11: Committed Juveniles Released by Age, 2015 & 2018

Age	2015		2018		% Change in Release by Age 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
14 and under	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
15 - 16	1	7.7%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
17 - 18	7	53.8%	3	21.4%	-57.1%
19 and over	5	38.5%	11	78.6%	120.0%
Total Releases	13	100.0%	14	100.0%	7.7%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2015 & 2018

Table 12: Offenses of Committed Juveniles by Type, 2015 & 2018

Type	2015		2018		% Change in MSCO by Type 2015-2018
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Persons	1	3.0%	10	28.6%	900.0%
Weapons	14	42.4%	2	5.7%	-85.7%
Property	1	3.0%	5	14.3%	400.0%
CDS	6	18.2%	1	2.9%	-83.3%
Public Order	7	21.2%	2	5.7%	-71.4%
VOP	4	12.1%	15	42.9%	275.0%
Total	33	100.0%	35	100.0%	6.1%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2015 & 2018

Table 13: Committed Juveniles with a Sex Offense Charge in their Court History, 2015 & 2018

	2015	2018	% Change in Sex Offense History 2015-2018
Sex Offense*	1	0	-100.0%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2015 & 2018

* See Required Data & Methodology