

Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice

DATA RESOURCE GUIDE

FISCAL YEAR 2012



Data Resource Guide

Fiscal Year 2012

Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice
Mark A. Gooch, Director
January 2013



This guide fulfills the mandates set forth in §§ 2.2-222, 16.1-309.3, and 66-13 of the *Code of Virginia*, which specify data collection and reporting requirements for the Department of Juvenile Justice.

These mandates are combined in Item 399, Paragraph G of the Appropriations Act, Chapter 2, 2012 Acts of the General Assembly.



Table of Contents

1	<i>Introduction and Overview</i>	1
	Agency Mission, Vision, and Values	1
	Agency Description	1
	Terminology	3
	Changes to the DRG	8
	Reporting Requirements	8
	Regional Map	9
	Juvenile Justice System Flow Chart	10
	Steps in the Juvenile Justice System	10
	Types of Juvenile Dispositions	11
	Juveniles in Circuit Court	11
2	<i>Programs and Services</i>	13
	CSUs	13
	VJCCA	19
	Detention Centers	22
	JCCs	25
	Division of Education	34
	Halfway Houses	36
3	<i>Forecasts</i>	39
	Juvenile Local-Responsible (Detention Center) Population	39
	Juvenile State-Responsible (JCC) Population	40
4	<i>Recidivism</i>	45
	DJJ's Study of Juvenile Reoffending	45
	Reoffense Rates for JCC Releases and Probation Placements	46
5	<i>Program Evaluations</i>	55
	DJJ Mentoring Initiative	55
	Re-Entry Services	55
	Classification	55
	Male WERP	55
	REACH	56
	VJCCA	57
	MHSTP	57
	Treatment Needs	58
	Ongoing Program Evaluation Efforts	61
6	<i>Expenditures and Staffing</i>	63
	Expenditures	63
	Staffing	64
7	<i>Appendices</i>	67
	Appendix A: Miscellaneous/Other Offenses	67
	Appendix B: DAI	68
	Appendix C: YASI	70
	Appendix D: JCC Operating Capacities and Guidelines for Placements	72
	Appendix E: Initial Classification Custody Designation Form	73
	Appendix F: Custody Reclassification Form	74





1 Introduction and Overview

The Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) provides services to juveniles and families by operating 32 court service units (CSUs); six juvenile correctional centers (JCCs), including the Reception and Diagnostic Center (RDC); and two halfway houses. DJJ also regulates three locally-operated CSUs and 23 detention centers.

Agency Mission, Vision, and Values

In September 2012, DJJ reexamined and revised its mission, vision, and values:

Mission

DJJ protects the public by preparing court-involved youth to be successful citizens.

Vision

DJJ is committed to excellence in public safety by providing effective interventions that improve the lives of youth, strengthening both families and communities within the Commonwealth.

Values

The values of DJJ are referred to as Knowledge and PRIDE:

Knowledge: We stay on the cutting edge of effective juvenile justice by keeping abreast of facts, information, data, and best practices as they become available. To achieve the agency's mission, we apply this knowledge with competence according to laws, regulations, policies, and procedures. The youth, families, and communities we work with are our first priority.

Professionalism: As representatives and ambassadors of DJJ, we always adhere to our standards of conduct by behaving responsibly, appropriately, and with discipline.

Respect: We treat everyone equitably and impartially, recognizing the diversity of individuals and their viewpoints. We are aware of body language, tone, and words during our conversations. We acknowledge the issues of others and always strive for a clear solution. The "Golden Rule" is standard operating procedure: treat others the way you wish to be treated.

Integrity: We are honest, truthful, and non-judgmental in all our professional interactions. We follow policy and procedures and accept responsibility for our actions. Our decisions are ethical and always honor confidentiality.

Dedication: We are fully committed to fulfilling the agency's mission. We serve as ambassadors of the agency, representing it with loyalty, enthusiasm, and perseverance. We can see the "big picture" and routinely make personal sacrifices for the good of the agency. We play as a team.

Effective Communication: We are good listeners. When we communicate with our clients, courts, customers, and colleagues, we do so clearly and concisely in a timely manner. Our communications are respectful, accurate, constructive, candid, and relevant, offering well-considered solutions.

Agency Description

To accomplish its mission, DJJ provides an integrated approach to juvenile justice. It brings together current research and best practices to better understand and modify delinquent behavior; to meet the needs of offenders, victims, and communities; and to manage activities and resources in a responsible and proactive manner.

DJJ responds to court-involved juveniles using a balanced approach that provides (i) protection of public safety by control of juveniles' liberty through community supervision and secure confinement; (ii) a structured system of incentives and graduated sanctions in both institutional and community settings to ensure account-



ability for juveniles' actions; and (iii) a variety of services and programs that build skills and competencies (e.g., substance abuse treatment, support for academic and vocational education, aggression management treatment) to enable juveniles to become law-abiding members of the community upon release from DJJ's supervision.

DJJ is committed to the principle that the greatest impact on juvenile offending may be realized by focusing resources on those juvenile offenders with the highest risk of reoffending and by addressing the individual criminogenic risk factors that contribute to the initiation and continuation of delinquent behavior. Using a set of research-based and consensus-based instruments at different decision points within the juvenile justice system, DJJ classifies juveniles into different levels of risk. These points include the initial decision to detain, the assignment to various levels of community probation or parole supervision, and the classification of committed juveniles to guide appropriate placement within the institutional setting.

In addition to the matching of the most intensive resources to those juveniles with the highest risk, DJJ recognizes that successful outcomes require services that are individualized to the needs of juveniles, families, and communities. The presence of specific risk factors are assessed and addressed in order to increase the likelihood of successful outcomes. Issues implicated in juvenile offending include gang involvement, substance abuse, aggression, truancy, and other school-related problems. The application of appropriate social control and sanctioning strategies such as electronic monitoring, urine drug testing, and various levels of supervision are also matched to the juvenile's individualized circumstances. Incentives such as early release from supervision, extended curfew, and recreational outings with volunteers are used to reward success and improve the chances of long-term behavior change.

Over the past several years, DJJ has greatly enhanced its ability to effectively plan for and manage juveniles, programs, services, and other resources. DJJ designed an electronic data management system and used the data generated and reported to better understand the juvenile population, activities in relation to those juveniles, and methods to become more effective and efficient. DJJ's electronic data management system is comprised of modules covering the full range of institutional and community-based activities. DJJ's philosophy is that sound management of public resources and adherence to its core mission are enhanced through data-based decision-making.

While DJJ has the primary responsibility for many aspects of Virginia's juvenile justice system, collaborative

partnerships with state and local agencies and programs as well as private sector service providers are the cornerstone of the DJJ integrated approach. Local governments and commissions operate secure detention centers and an array of services addressing each aspect of the balanced approach. Within each community, DJJ works with law enforcement, behavioral health providers, schools, social services, and other agencies. Securing services from private providers assists DJJ in meeting the needs of juvenile offenders, their families, and communities. At the state level, DJJ works with other executive, legislative, and judicial branch agencies in a similar manner.

Through the application of the integrated approach to juvenile justice, DJJ continues to make a difference in the lives of citizens and communities across the Commonwealth. Through responsible resource management, performance accountability, and sound intervention strategies, DJJ strives to improve and meet the changing demands of juvenile justice.

Acronyms and terms used throughout the report are defined on the next several pages. All terms are referred to by their acronyms throughout the report.



Terminology

Acronyms and terms used in the report are defined below. Terms are referred to by their acronyms throughout the report.

Acronyms

ADP: Average Daily Population

ASU: Administrative Segregation Unit

AWOL: Absent Without Leave or Permission

BADGE: Balanced Approach Data
Gathering Environment

BSU: Behavioral Services Unit

CCD: Child Care Days

CCRC: Central Classification and Review Committee

CEST: Classification and Evaluation
Services Team (at RDC)

CHINS: Child in Need of Services

CHINS^{Sup}: Child in Need of Supervision

CPMT: Community Policy and Management Team

CSA: Comprehensive Services Act for
At-Risk Youth and Families

CSU: Court Service Unit

CTE: Career and Technical Education

CTST: Classification and Treatment
Services Team (at JCCs)

DAI: Detention Assessment Instrument

DCE: Virginia Department of Correctional Education

DCJS: Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services

DJJ: Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice

DMC: Disproportionate Minority Contact

DOC: Virginia Department of Corrections

DOJ: United States Department of Justice

DOL: United States Department of Labor

DR/CW: Domestic Relations and Child Welfare

DRG: Data Resource Guide

ERD: Early Release Date

FAPT: Family Assessment and Planning Teams

FY: Fiscal Year

GED: General Educational Development

ICJ: Interstate Commission for Juveniles

ICN: Intake Case Number

ICRC: Institutional Classification
and Review Committee

ISU: Intensive Services Unit

J&DR: Juvenile and Domestic Relations

JCC: Juvenile Correctional Center

JCO: Juvenile Correctional Officer

JDAI: Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative

JP: Juvenile Profile

JROTC: Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps

JTS: Juvenile Tracking System

LMS: Learning Management System

LOS: Length of Stay

LRD: Late Release Date

MHSTP: Mental Health Services Transition Plan

MAYSI: Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument

OJJDP: United States Office of Juvenile
Justice and Delinquency Prevention

PO: Probation/Parole Officer

Post-D: Post-Dispositional

Pre-D: Pre-Dispositional

RDC: Reception and Diagnostic Center

REEP: Re-entry to Education and Employment Project

RSAT: Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Program

SHOCAP: Serious and Habitual Offender
Comprehensive Action Program

SIR: Serious Incident Report



SOP: Standard Operating Procedure

TDO: Temporary Detention Order

VCC: Virginia Criminal Code

VCIN: Virginia Criminal Information Network

VCSC: Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

VJCCCA: Virginia Juvenile Community
Crime Control Act

VSP: Virginia State Police

WERP: Work/Education Release Program

YASI: Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument

Definitions

Admission: the physical arrival of a juvenile at a facility when he or she is officially entered into the facility's population count.

Adjudication: the findings of a court on whether a juvenile is innocent or not innocent based on the evidence presented at the adjudicatory hearing. If the juvenile is found not innocent, he or she is adjudicated delinquent for that offense.

Adjudicatory Hearing: a court hearing on the merits of a petition filed (alleging a delinquent act, CHINS, or CHINSup) to determine whether a juvenile is innocent or not innocent.

Blended Sentence: the sentencing option for a juvenile convicted in circuit court, which combines a juvenile disposition with an adult sentence. Section 16.1-272 of the *Code of Virginia* allows the circuit court to impose an adult sentence with a portion of that sentence to be served in a JCC and provides that the judge may suspend the adult sentence pending successful completion of the juvenile disposition.

Certification: when, after a preliminary hearing, a judge determines there is probable cause for a juvenile 14 years of age or older charged with a violent juvenile felony, jurisdiction for the case is transferred to circuit court for a trial as an adult. If the juvenile is charged with capital murder, first or second degree murder, lynching, or aggravated malicious wounding, the case is automatically certified to circuit court for trial. If the juvenile is charged with any other violent juvenile felony, the case may be

certified to circuit court based on the discretion of the Commonwealth's Attorney. Any juvenile convicted in circuit court after certification will be treated as an adult in all future criminal cases. See § 16.1-269.1 of the *Code of Virginia*.

CHINS: a child whose behavior, conduct, or condition presents or results in a serious threat to (i) the well-being and physical safety of that child or, (ii) if under the age of 14, the well-being and physical safety of another person. To meet the definition of CHINS, there must be a clear and substantial danger to the life or health of the child or another person, and the intervention of the court must be found to be essential to provide the treatment, rehabilitation, or services needed by the child or the child's family. See § 16.1-228 of the *Code of Virginia*.

CHINSup: a child who (i) is habitually and without justification absent from school despite opportunity and reasonable efforts to keep him or her in school, (ii) runs away from his or her family or lawful custodian on more than one occasion, or (iii) escapes from or leaves a court-ordered residential placement without permission. See § 16.1-228 of the *Code of Virginia*.

Commitment: a court order at a dispositional hearing placing a juvenile in the custody of DJJ for a determinate or indeterminate period of time. To be eligible for commitment, a juvenile must be 11 years of age or older and adjudicated delinquent or convicted of a felony offense, a Class 1 misdemeanor and a prior felony, or four Class 1 misdemeanors that were not part of the same incident. See § 16.1-278.8 of the *Code of Virginia*. A commitment to DJJ differs from an admission to RDC. An admission to RDC may occur days or weeks after the juvenile is committed to DJJ (during which time he or she is held in secure detention). A single admission to RDC could be the result of multiple commitments to DJJ (for example, a juvenile may be committed to DJJ by more than one court). For these reasons, the number of commitments to DJJ in a FY may be different from the number of admissions to RDC.

CSU: a locally- or state-operated entity that provides services to a juvenile court, including intake, investigations and reports, probation, parole, case management, and other related services in the community.

Delinquent Offense: an act committed by a juvenile that would be a felony or misdemeanor if committed by an adult, designated under state law, a local



ordinance, or federal law. Delinquent offenses do not include status offenses.

Detainment: the first admission of a continuous detention stay. A new detainment is not counted if a juvenile is transferred to another detention center or has a change in dispositional status before being released.

DAI: a detention screening tool used by CSU intake officers to guide detention decisions using objective criteria. See Appendix B.

Detention Hearing: a judicial hearing held pursuant to § 16.1-250 of the *Code of Virginia* that determines whether a juvenile should be placed in detention, continue to be held in detention, or be released with or without conditions until an adjudicatory hearing.

Detention Center: a local or regional secure residential facility that has construction fixtures designed to prevent escape and to restrict the movement and activities of juveniles held in lawful custody. Detention centers may house juveniles both pre-dispositionally and post-dispositionally. See §§ 16.1-248.1, 16.1-278.8, and 16.1-284.1 of the *Code of Virginia*.

Determinate Commitment: the commitment of a juvenile, 14 years of age or older, to DJJ as a serious juvenile offender. The court specifies the length of the commitment, has continuing jurisdiction over the juvenile, and must conduct periodic reviews if the juvenile remains in direct care for longer than 24 months. A juvenile may be committed to DJJ as a serious juvenile offender for up to seven years, not to exceed the juvenile's 21st birthday. See § 16.1-285.1 of the *Code of Virginia*.

Direct Care: the time during which a resident, who is committed to DJJ pursuant to §§ 16.1-272, 16.1-278.8 (A)(14), and 16.1-278.8 (A)(17) of the *Code of Virginia*, is under the supervision of staff in a juvenile residential facility operated by DJJ or an alternative residential placement.

Disposition: a court order determining what will happen to a juvenile adjudicated delinquent.

Dispositional Hearing: a hearing in juvenile court which occurs after the juvenile is adjudicated delinquent. During this hearing, the court may impose treatment services and sanctions. The dispositional hearing is similar to a sentencing hearing

in a criminal court. See § 16.1-278.8 of the *Code of Virginia*.

Diversion: the handling of a juvenile intake complaint in an informal manner rather than through the official court process. The intake officer must develop a plan for the juvenile that may include counseling, informal supervision, restitution, community service, and other programs. The juvenile and his parents must agree to the diversion plan. Informal supervision is limited to 90 days for truancy and 120 days for all other offenses. The following complaints may not be diverted: an alleged violent juvenile felony; a complaint after a prior diversion or adjudication on a felony offense; and a second or subsequent truancy complaint. See §§ 16.1-227 and 16.1-260 of the *Code of Virginia*.

Domestic Relations: matters before the juvenile court having to do with the family and child welfare, including child custody, visitation, paternity, and other petitions delineated in § 16.1-241 of the *Code of Virginia*. Criminal and delinquent matters are not included.

FY: the time period measured from July 1st of one year to June 30th of the following year. For example, FY 2012 begins July 1, 2011, and ends June 30, 2012.

Group Home: a juvenile residential facility that is a community-based, home-like single dwelling or its acceptable equivalent. Placements can be pre-D or post-D.

Halfway House: a residential facility housing juveniles in transition from direct care to the community. Services provided include independent living and employment skills.

Indeterminate Commitment: the commitment of a juvenile to DJJ in which the juvenile's LOS is calculated based on statutory requirements and the LOS Guidelines. The commitment may not exceed 36 continuous months except in cases of murder or manslaughter or extend past a juvenile's 21st birthday. See §§ 16.1-285 and 16.1-278.8 (A)(14) of the *Code of Virginia*.

Intake Case: a juvenile with one or more intake complaints involving a delinquent act, a CHINS, or a CHINSup.

Intake Complaint: a request for the processing of a petition to initiate court action in a juvenile court. An



intake officer at the CSU decides whether to file a petition initiating formal court action.

JCC: a secure facility operated by DJJ where 24 hour-per-day care is provided to juveniles committed to DJJ. Services provided during this period include supervision, education, treatment services, recreational services, and a variety of special programs.

LOS Guidelines: a framework established by the Board of Juvenile Justice, as mandated by § 66-10 of the *Code of Virginia*, to determine the length of time a juvenile indeterminately committed to DJJ will remain in direct care. Factors that affect a juvenile's LOS include the seriousness of the offense, the juvenile's offense history, the juvenile's behavior while in direct care, and the juvenile's progress toward completing treatment goals.

Major Offender: a juvenile who is indeterminately committed to DJJ for an offense of murder, attempted murder, voluntary manslaughter, involuntary manslaughter, rape, aggravated sexual battery, forcible sodomy, object sexual penetration, armed robbery, carjacking, malicious wounding of a law enforcement officer, aggravated malicious wounding, felonious injury by mob, abduction, felonious poisoning, adulteration of products, or arson of an occupied dwelling. A major offender requires administrative review before being released.

Parole: a period of supervision and monitoring of a juvenile in the community following his or her release from commitment.

Petition: a document filed with the juvenile court by the intake officer, initiating formal court action. Petitions may allege that a juvenile is delinquent, a CHINS, a CHINSup, or an abused or neglected child; may be for domestic relations purposes; or may be for other actions over which the juvenile court has jurisdiction (e.g., protective orders, work permits, a minor seeking judicial consent for medical procedures).

Post-D Detention with Programs: the ordering of a juvenile by a judge to a detention center for up to six months with structured programs of treatment and services intended to maintain and build community ties. To be eligible for post-D detention, a juvenile must be 14 years of age or older and found to have committed a non-violent juvenile felony or a Class 1 or Class 2 misdemeanor offense that is punishable by confinement in a state or local

secure facility. See §§ 16.1-278.8 (A)(16) and 16.1-284.1 (B) of the *Code of Virginia*.

Post-D Detention without Programs: the ordering of a juvenile by a judge to a detention center for up to 30 days without special programs provided. To be eligible for post-D detention, a juvenile must be 14 years of age or older and found to have committed a non-violent juvenile felony or a Class 1 or Class 2 misdemeanor offense that is punishable by confinement in a state or local secure facility. Sections 16.1-284.1, 16.1-291, and 16.1-292 of the *Code of Virginia* provide additional statutory criteria that need to be satisfied prior to detainment.

Pre-D Detention: the confinement in a detention center of a juvenile awaiting a dispositional or adjudicatory hearing. To be eligible for pre-D detention, the judge, intake officer, or magistrate must find probable cause establishing that the juvenile committed a Class 1 misdemeanor or a felony offense. In addition, the juvenile must be a clear and substantial threat to another person, the property of others, or to himself. Section 16.1-248.1 of the *Code of Virginia* provides the criteria under which a juvenile may be detained prior to disposition.

Pre-D and Post-D Reports: documents prepared (i) within the timelines established by approved procedures when ordered by the court, (ii) for each juvenile placed on probation supervision, (iii) for each juvenile committed to DJJ or placed in post-D detention with programs, or (iv) upon written request from another CSU when accompanied by a court order. The report must include the identifying and demographic information for the juvenile, including current offense and prior court involvement; social, medical, psychological, and educational information about the juvenile; information about the juvenile's family; and dispositional and treatment recommendations if permitted by the court.

Probable Cause: there is a reasonable amount of suspicion, supported by the circumstances, sufficiently strong to justify a prudent person's belief that the facts are likely true.

Probation: the court-ordered disposition placing a juvenile under the supervision of a CSU in the community for a specified length of time and requiring compliance with specified rules and conditions.

Psychotropic Medication: drugs that affect the mind, perception, behavior, or mood. Common types in-



clude antidepressants, anxiolytics or anti-anxiety agents, antipsychotics, and mood stabilizers.

Quarter: a three-month time period of a FY. For example, the first quarter of FY 2012 begins July 1, 2011, and ends September 30, 2011.

REACH: a behavior modification program instituted in the JCCs that involves concepts of responsibility, empowerment, achievement, change, and hope. The program focuses on identifying desired behaviors, tracking inappropriate behaviors, providing feedback, and using a system of phases through which juveniles can advance.

Recidivism Rate: the percentage of individuals who commit another offense, measured in this document by (i) Rearrest- a petition filed at intake for a new delinquent complaint or an adult arrest for a new criminal offense, (ii) Reconviction- a delinquent adjudication or guilty conviction for a delinquent or criminal offense, and (iii) Reincarceration- a return to a JCC or an incarceration in an adult facility after having been previously released from a JCC.

Region: in order to manage the use of community resources statewide, DJJ divides Virginia into six geographical regions.

Resident: a juvenile residing in a JCC, detention center, halfway house, or group home on a 24 hour-per-day basis.

Serious Juvenile Offender: a juvenile who is committed to DJJ and given a determinate commitment. See § 16.1-285.1 of the *Code of Virginia*.

Shelter Care: a facility or emergency shelter specifically approved to provide a range of services, as needed, on an individual basis not to exceed 90 days. See § 16.1-248.1 of the *Code of Virginia*.

Status Offense: an act prohibited by law that would not be an offense if committed by an adult, such as truancy, curfew violation, or running away.

TDO: issuance or an order by a judge, magistrate, or special justice for the involuntary inpatient mental health treatment of a juvenile, after an in-person evaluation by a mental health evaluator, when it is found that (i) because of mental illness, the minor (a) presents a serious danger to himself or others to the extent that a severe or irreversible injury is likely to result, as evidenced by recent acts or threats, or (b) is experiencing a serious deteriora-

tion of his ability to care for himself in a developmentally age-appropriate manner, as evidenced by delusional thinking or by a significant impairment of functioning in hydration, nutrition, self-protection, or self-control; and (ii) the minor is in need of inpatient treatment for a mental illness and is reasonably likely to benefit from the proposed treatment. A TDO is for a brief period of time (up to 96 hours) for treatment and evaluation and pending a subsequent review of the admission (the minor may be released or involuntarily committed at the hearing). See Article 16 of Chapter 11 of Title 16.1 of the *Code of Virginia* (§ 16.1-335 et seq.).

Transfer: when juvenile court, after consideration of specific statutory factors, determines the juvenile court is not the proper court for the proceedings involving a juvenile 14 years of age or older at the time of the offense who is accused of a felony, other than a violent juvenile felony, and transfers jurisdiction to the circuit court.

Transfer Hearing: a hearing in juvenile court wherein the juvenile court judge determines whether the juvenile court should retain jurisdiction or transfer the case for criminal proceedings in circuit court. A transfer hearing is initiated by the attorney for the Commonwealth filing a motion in the juvenile court for a hearing. The judge must determine that the act would be a felony if committed by an adult and examine issues of competency, the juvenile's history, and specific statutory factors. Any juvenile convicted in circuit court after transfer will be treated as an adult in all future criminal cases. See § 16.1-269.1 of the *Code of Virginia*.

Violent Juvenile Felony: any of the delinquent acts enumerated in §§ 16.1-269.1 (B) and 16.1-269.1 (C) of the *Code of Virginia* when committed by a juvenile 14 years of age or older. The offenses include murder, felonious injury by mob, abduction, malicious wounding, malicious wounding of a law enforcement officer, felonious poisoning, adulteration of products, robbery, carjacking, rape, forcible sodomy, and sexual object penetration. See § 16.1-228 of the *Code of Virginia*.

YASI: a validated tool which provides an objective classification of an individual's risk of reoffending by assessing both static and dynamic risk and protective factors in 10 distinct functional domains. See Appendix C.



Changes to the DRG

DJJ has published the DRG annually since 2001. After some initial modifications in the early years, the DRG has remained substantially unchanged. While this stability has allowed users to easily navigate the report from year to year, it has also limited the data presented.

A plan to revamp the DRG began shortly after last year's publication. A user questionnaire was distributed and completed by various stakeholders in order to guide the development of the new report. The responses to these questionnaires indicated that staff use the DRG for many necessary job functions, including tracking data and trends within their locality or facility, comparing their system to statewide trends, evaluating staff performance according to their employee work profiles, and guiding decisions concerning services and operations.

The current DRG has many similarities to previous editions and continues to fulfill the reporting mandates. However, several components were revised in order to provide more accessible data and explanations, utilize available technology, and limit printing costs:

- » A review of all queries was completed, resulting in potential data changes from previous reports. Methodology changes are noted where applicable.
- » Descriptions of the agency and its programs and services were edited to reduce unnecessary information and redundancies.
- » Locality-specific CSU data are no longer presented in printed form. Instead, the locality-specific data will be available online.
- » Detention-specific data and some statewide detention data are not included. See page 22 for further explanation of changes to detention data.
- » JCC-specific data are no longer presented in printed form. Instead, the JCC-specific data will be available online.
- » Some sections were created or expanded (e.g., forecasts, program evaluations) to provide a better overview of DJJ and its services.
- » Percentages less than 0.1% are presented as 0.0%.

Future Direction

DJJ's Legislative and Research Unit is currently working to create an online adaptation of the DRG, called the Data Resource Center (DRC). This interactive online application will allow users to easily find information while reducing the need for printed material. Locality- and facility-specific data will be available in a format that will allow for easier comparisons and trend analyses.


Reporting Requirements

The DRG fulfills the mandates set forth in §§ 2.2-222, 16.1-309.3, and 66-13 of the *Code of Virginia*, which specify data collection and reporting requirements for DJJ. These mandates are combined in Item 399, Paragraph G of the Appropriations Act, Chapter 2, 2012 Acts of the General Assembly. The reporting requirements include juvenile offender demographics and characteristics, services provided, and recidivism rates.



Regional Map

DJJ's operations are organized in six regions, each overseen by a regional program manager who reports to the Deputy Director of Operations. The regions are geographically divided into Central, Eastern, Northern, Northwestern, Southern, and Western and include CSUs, JCCs, and halfway houses. These regions have been in place since June 2011.




Central	Eastern	Northern
CSU 9, 12, 13, 15 JCC Oak Ridge, RDC	CSU 1, 2, 2A, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 JCC Hanover HH* Hampton Place	CSU 17A, 17F, 18, 19, 20L, 20W, 31 JCC Culpeper
Northwestern	Southern	Western
CSU 14, 16, 26 JCC Beaumont	CSU 6, 10, 11, 24 JCC Bon Air	CSU 21, 22, 23, 23A, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30 HH* Abraxas House

* HH is an abbreviation for halfway house.



Juvenile Justice System Flow Chart



Steps in the Juvenile Justice System

Intake

- » When an offense is committed, a parent, a citizen, an agency representative, or law enforcement personnel may seek to have a complaint filed against a juvenile with an intake officer.
- » When the juvenile has contact with law enforcement, he or she may be taken into custody (arrested), summoned and released until a hearing on the matter, or counseled and released with no further action taken.
- » The intake officer reviews the circumstances of the complaint to determine whether probable cause exists.
- » If there is insufficient probable cause, the complaint is resolved with no further action.
- » If probable cause exists, the intake officer has the discretion to informally process or divert the case, file a petition to initiate court action, or file a petition with an order placing the juvenile in detention. If the intake officer does not file a petition on a felony or Class 1 misdemeanor offense, the complaining party may appeal this decision to the magistrate.

Petition and Detention

- » The filing of a petition initiates official court action on the complaint.
- » If the intake officer releases the juvenile, the next court appearance is the juvenile's arraignment, where he or she is informed of the offenses charged in the petition, asked to enter a plea, and advised of his or her right to an attorney. The juvenile does not have a right to an attorney at the arraignment hearing.
- » If the juvenile is detained pending the hearing, a detention hearing must be held within 72 hours of the detainment. At the detention hearing, the juvenile has a right to an attorney and is arraigned on the offenses charged in the petition. The judge decides whether to hold the juvenile in secure juvenile detention or release, with or without conditions, until the adjudication.

Adjudication or Trial

- » When a juvenile is adjudicated in juvenile court, he or she has all Constitutional protections afforded in criminal court (e.g., the rights to an attorney, to have witnesses, to cross-examination, against self-incrimination), with the exception of a right to a jury trial. All charges must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt.
- » If the judge finds the juvenile to be delinquent, the case is usually continued to another day for the judge to make a dispositional decision. The judge's adjudication and dispositional decision may be appealed by either party to the circuit court for a *de novo* (like new) review.
- » When a juvenile is tried in circuit court as an adult, the case is handled in the same manner as a trial of an adult. The conviction and sentencing in circuit court may be appealed by either party to the Court of Appeals.



Types of Juvenile Dispositions

- » Defer adjudication and/or disposition for a specified period of time, with or without probation supervision, to consider dismissing the case if the juvenile exhibits good behavior during the deferral period.
- » Impose a fine, order restitution, and/or order the juvenile to complete a public service project.
- » Suspend the juvenile's driver's license or impose a curfew on the juvenile.
- » Order the juvenile and/or the parent to participate in programs or services.
- » Transfer legal custody to an appropriate individual, agency, organization, or local board of social services.
- » Place the juvenile on probation with specified conditions and limitations that may include required participation in programs or services.
- » Place the juvenile in a juvenile secure detention center for 30 days or less.
- » Place the juvenile in a post-D program in a juvenile secure detention center for a period not to exceed six months.
- » Commit the juvenile to DJJ for an indeterminate or determinate period of time.

Juveniles in Circuit Court

Consideration for Trial in Circuit Court

A case involving a juvenile 14 years old or older accused of a felony may be certified or transferred to circuit court where the juvenile would be tried as an adult under one of the five following circumstances:

Mandatory Certification: If a juvenile is charged with capital murder, first or second degree murder, murder by lynching, or aggravated malicious wounding, he or she receives a preliminary hearing in juvenile court. If probable cause is found, the juvenile will automatically be certified for trial as an adult, and the case is sent to the circuit court. The certification is not appealable.

Prosecutorial Discretionary Certification: When a juvenile is charged with a violent juvenile felony as defined in § 16.1-228 of the *Code of Virginia* that does not require mandatory certification, the prosecution may request certification. The juvenile will receive a preliminary hearing in juvenile court. If probable cause is found, the juvenile is certified for trial as an adult, and the case is sent to the circuit court. The certification is not appealable.

Transfer: When a juvenile is charged with a felony offense, the prosecutor may ask a juvenile court judge to transfer the case to circuit court for trial as an adult. The juvenile court judge receives a transfer report documenting each of the factors that the court must consider in the hearing (e.g., age, seriousness and number of alleged offenses, amenability to treatment and rehabilitation, availability of dispositional alternatives, prior juvenile record, mental capacity and emotional maturity, educational record, etc.). The judge decides whether the juvenile is a proper person to remain in the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. If not, the case goes to the circuit court. The decision to transfer the case may be appealed by either party.

Direct Indictment: In cases proceeding under mandatory or prosecutorial discretionary certification, if the juvenile court does not find probable cause, the attorney for the Commonwealth may seek a direct indictment in the circuit court on the instant offense and all ancillary charges. The direct indictment is not appealable.

Waiver: A juvenile 14 years old or older charged with a felony may waive the jurisdiction of the juvenile court with the written consent of counsel and have the case heard in the circuit court.

Trial of Juveniles in Circuit Court

Juveniles whose cases are transferred to circuit court are tried in the same manner as adults, but juveniles may not be sentenced by a jury. A conviction of a juvenile as an adult precludes the juvenile court from taking jurisdiction of such juvenile for any subsequent offenses committed by that juvenile and any pending allegations of delinquency that had not been disposed of by the juvenile court at the time of the criminal conviction. If a juvenile is not convicted in circuit court, jurisdiction over that juvenile for any future alleged delinquent behavior is returned to the juvenile court.

Sentencing of Juveniles in Circuit Court

Circuit court judges may sentence juveniles transferred or certified to their courts to juvenile or adult sentences, including adult prison or jail time, or both. When sentenced to both a juvenile and an adult sentence, it is called a "blended sentence" through which the court orders the juvenile to serve the beginning of his or her sentence in a JCC and a later portion in an adult correctional facility.





2 Programs and Services

CSUs

The Community Programs Section of DJJ's Division of Operations is responsible for providing a continuum of community-based services to juvenile offenders. The following briefly describes these services:

Juvenile Intake

Intake services are available 24 hours a day at each of the 35 CSUs across the state. The intake officer on duty has the authority to receive, review, and process complaints for delinquency cases and status offenses.

Based on the information gathered, a determination is made whether a petition should be filed to initiate proceedings in the J&DR district court. For appropriate juveniles, the intake officer may develop a diversion plan which may include informal supervision and referrals to community resources. If a petition is filed, the intake officer must decide whether the juvenile should be released to a parent/guardian or another responsible adult, placed in a detention alternative, or detained pending a court hearing. Decisions by intake officers concerning detention are guided by the completion of the DAI. Implemented in November 2002, the DAI guides detention decisions using standard criteria. (See Appendix B.) An evaluation of the initial implementation of this instrument was completed in 2004, and a validation study was completed in 2006.

Investigations and Reports

Pre-D reports, also called social histories, constitute the majority of the reports completed by CSU personnel. These reports describe the social adjustment and circumstances of juveniles. Some are court-ordered prior to disposition while others are completed following placement on probation as required by Board of Juvenile Justice regulations and DJJ procedures. A risk assessment instrument is completed at the same time as the social history, classifying the juveniles according to their relative risk of reoffending. Beginning in 2008, DJJ began the process of implementing the YASI, an enhanced risk and needs assessment tool. (See Appendix C for an outline

of YASI items.) The information in the social history and risk assessment provides the basis for CSU personnel to develop appropriate service plans for the juvenile and the family, determine the level of supervision needed based on risk classification, and recommend the most appropriate disposition for the case to the court.

Other reports and records completed by CSU personnel may include substance abuse evaluations, case summaries to the FAPTs under the CSA, commitment packets for RDC, ICJ reports, transfer reports, and ongoing case documentation.

DR/CW Investigations

In addition to handling delinquency, CHINS, and CHINSup complaints, CSUs provide intake services for DR/CW complaints. These complaints include support, family abuse, determination of custody (permanent and temporary), abuse and neglect, termination of parental rights, visitation rights, paternity, and emancipation. In some CSUs, services such as treatment referral, supervision, and counseling are provided in adult cases of domestic violence. Although the majority of custody investigations for the court are performed by the local department of social services, some CSUs perform investigations to provide recommendations to the court on parental custody and visitation based on the best interests of the child and criteria defined in the *Code of Virginia*.

Probation

Juvenile probation in Virginia strives to achieve a balanced approach, focusing on the principles of community protection (public safety), accountability, and competency development. DJJ provides a risk-based system of probation, with those juveniles classified as highest risk to reoffend receiving the most intensive supervision levels. Juveniles may receive family and individual counseling, other community services, vocational services, or specialized educational services.



Parole

Upon release from state commitment, most offenders are placed on parole supervision. With planning initiated when a juvenile is committed to DJJ, parole supervision is designed to assist in the successful transition back to the community. Parole builds on the programs and services the juvenile received during the period of secure confinement. Parole supervision is also organized around the balanced approach. Protection of public safety is emphasized through a level system of supervision based on the juvenile's assessed risk of reoffending and adjustment to rules and expectations. The period of parole varies according to the juvenile's needs, risk level, offense history, and adjustment. Supervision may last until the juvenile's 21st birthday.

Parole officers are assigned to offenders to provide case management services, facilitate appropriate transitional services, and monitor adjustment in the community. Juveniles may receive family and individual counseling, other community services, vocational services, or specialized educational services. These programs are provided statewide by a network of approved vendors from which the CSUs purchase services for paroled juveniles and their families.

ICJ

ICJ provides for the cooperative supervision of probationers and parolees moving from state to state. It also serves delinquent and status offenders who have absconded, escaped, or run away, endangering their own safety or the safety of others. ICJ ensures that member states are responsible for the proper supervision or return of juveniles, probationers, and parolees. It provides the procedures for (i) supervision of juveniles in states other than where they were adjudicated delinquent or found guilty and placed on probation or parole supervision and (ii) returning juveniles who have escaped, absconded, or runaway from their home state. All states within the United States except Georgia are current members.

Additional information on ICJ, including ICJ history, forms, and manuals can be found at www.juvenile-compact.org.

Intake Complaints, FY 2010–2012

DR/CW Complaints	2010	2011	2012
Custody	66,940	68,173	69,949
Support/Desertion	20,443	20,500	20,687
Protective Order	14,246	14,039	15,298
Visitation	36,042	38,001	38,224
<i>Total DR/CW Complaints</i>	<i>137,671</i>	<i>140,713</i>	<i>144,158</i>
Juvenile Complaints			
Felony	14,856	12,632	13,143
Class 1 Misdemeanor	33,424	31,440	29,571
Class 2-4 Misdemeanor	5,593	5,377	5,416
CHINS/CHINSup (Status)	10,747	9,901	10,202
Other			
TDO	725	694	581
Technical Violations	8,787	8,431	8,290
Traffic	1,197	1,271	1,239
Other	1,538	1,464	1,424
<i>Total Juvenile Complaints</i>	<i>76,867</i>	<i>71,210</i>	<i>69,866</i>
<i>Total Complaints</i>	<i>214,538</i>	<i>211,923</i>	<i>214,024</i>

- » 67.4% of total intake complaints were DR/CW complaints in FY 2012, and 32.6% were juvenile complaints.
- » DR/CW complaints increased from 137,671 in FY 2010 to 144,158 in FY 2012, an increase of 4.7%.
- » Juvenile complaints decreased from 76,867 in FY 2010 to 69,866 in FY 2012, a decrease of 9.1%.
- » 18.8% of juvenile complaints in FY 2012 were felony complaints.

Juvenile Intake Dispositions, FY 2012

Intake Disposition	2012
Petitions	
Petition Filed	52.2%
Unsuccessful Diversion with Petition	1.7%
Detention Order with Petition	16.5%
Detention Order Only	1.1%
Resolved	7.8%
Diverted	
Open Diversion	4.0%
Successful Diversion	8.4%
Unsuccessful Diversion with No Petition	0.3%
Other	8.0%
<i>Total Juvenile Complaints</i>	<i>69,866</i>

- » A petition was filed for 52.2% of juvenile complaints.
- » 20.5% of juvenile complaints were resolved or diverted without a petition being filed.

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. Any changes to data after the date of download are not reflected in this report. Intake data are not comparable to previous reports due to the inclusion of all TDOs as juvenile and not DR/CW complaints.



Each intake case is comprised of one or more intake complaints. One juvenile intake case may represent a juvenile with multiple offenses, indicating multiple complaints. In FY 2012, there was an average of 1.3 juvenile intake complaints per case.

Juvenile Intake Case Demographics, FY 2010-2012

Demographics	2010	2011	2012
Race			
Black	44.3%	43.6%	42.5%
White	49.3%	50.0%	49.6%
Asian	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%
Other	5.3%	5.4%	6.9%
Ethnicity - Hispanic	7.3%	7.6%	7.7%
Sex			
Male	67.4%	67.2%	67.9%
Female	32.6%	32.8%	32.1%
Age			
8-12	5.8%	6.2%	6.7%
13	6.6%	7.1%	7.2%
14	11.7%	11.7%	12.2%
15	18.1%	17.7%	17.3%
16	24.2%	23.9%	23.5%
17	28.7%	28.2%	28.4%
18-20	3.7%	3.8%	3.7%
Missing	1.3%	1.3%	1.2%
<i>Total Juvenile Intake Cases</i>	<i>56,776</i>	<i>53,226</i>	<i>51,892</i>


- » White juveniles had the highest percentage of intake cases, remaining between 49% and 50% since FY 2010.
- » Hispanic juveniles have comprised 7% and 8% of all intake cases since FY 2010.
- » Males had a higher percentage of juvenile intake cases than females, remaining between 67% and 68% since FY 2010.
- » The most common age for juvenile intake cases was 17, remaining between 28% and 29% of all intake cases since FY 2010.
- » Over half of all juvenile intake cases since FY 2010 were 16 or 17 year-olds.

Workload Information, FY 2012

Completed Reports	Count	Activity	ADP
Pre-D Reports	3,067	Probation	5,279
Post-D Reports	2,542	Intensive Prob.	326
Transfer Reports	144	Parole	326
Custody Investigations	46	Direct Care	783

- » Most completed reports were pre- or post-D social history reports. In FY 2012, 3,067 pre-D reports were completed, and 2,542 post-D reports were completed.
- » Probation, including intensive probation, had the highest ADP (5,605) in FY 2012.
- » Parole had an ADP of 326 in FY 2012.

Completed Initial Risk Assessments, FY 2012*



* Risk assessment data are not comparable to previous reports due to the exclusion of same-day duplicate cases. However, data may include multiple initial assessments for the same juvenile if completed on different days.

- » The most common risk level for completed initial YASI risk assessments was "Low."

The YASI is a validated tool that assesses risk, needs, and protective factors to help develop case plans for juveniles. While the graph above shows only the initial assessment information, the YASI is used to reassess juveniles at regular intervals.



Juvenile Complaints and Offenses, FY 2012*

Offense Category	Felony Juvenile Intake Complaints	Misdemeanor Juvenile Intake Complaints	Total Juvenile Intake Complaints	New Probation Case Offenses	Commitment Offenses
Delinquent					
Abusive Language	N/A	1.1%	0.5%	0.6%	0.2%
Alcohol	N/A	7.3%	3.5%	3.7%	1.2%
Arson	2.5%	0.7%	0.8%	1.2%	0.3%
Assault	9.5%	25.5%	14.0%	17.9%	14.3%
Burglary	18.0%	N/A	3.3%	5.7%	10.8%
Disorderly Conduct	N/A	5.6%	2.7%	2.9%	1.3%
Escape	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
Extortion	1.0%	0.5%	0.4%	0.8%	0.1%
Family	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Fraud	4.0%	1.0%	1.2%	1.4%	1.6%
Gangs	1.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.8%
Kidnapping	0.8%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%
Larceny	35.2%	17.2%	14.8%	18.0%	19.5%
Murder	0.3%	N/A	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%
Narcotics	4.7%	11.4%	6.4%	7.3%	2.5%
Obscenity	1.1%	1.0%	0.7%	0.5%	1.6%
Obstruction of Justice	0.3%	3.0%	1.5%	2.2%	1.2%
Robbery	6.9%	N/A	1.3%	2.0%	10.1%
Sexual Abuse	4.8%	0.5%	1.1%	2.5%	4.8%
Sexual Offense	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%
Telephone	N/A	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
Trespassing	0.1%	5.8%	2.8%	2.4%	1.4%
Vandalism	6.6%	10.5%	6.3%	8.2%	7.7%
Weapons	1.7%	2.8%	1.7%	2.8%	3.2%
Misc./Other	0.4%	1.7%	2.8%	1.7%	0.6%
Technical					
Contempt of Court	N/A	N/A	5.7%	3.1%	1.6%
Failure to Appear	N/A	N/A	1.5%	0.5%	0.3%
Parole Violation	N/A	N/A	0.4%	0.1%	1.6%
Probation Violation	N/A	N/A	5.4%	3.2%	9.6%
Traffic					
Traffic	1.0%	5.5%	4.9%	2.2%	1.9%
Status/Other					
Civil Commitment	N/A	N/A	0.8%	0.0%	N/A
CHINS	N/A	N/A	3.4%	0.7%	N/A
CHINSup	N/A	N/A	8.0%	6.6%	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A	3.3%	1.3%	N/A
Total Offenses	12,960	33,605	69,866	16,855	1,820

- » 66.7% of juvenile intake complaints were for delinquent offenses, 13.0% were for technical offenses, 4.9% were for traffic offenses, and 15.4% were for status offenses.
- » 82.4% of new probation offenses were for delinquent offenses, 6.8% were for technical offenses, 2.2% were for traffic offenses, and 8.6% were for status offenses.
- » 84.9% of offenses that resulted in commitment were for delinquent offenses, 13.2% were for technical offenses, and 1.9% were for traffic offenses.
- » Larceny was the most common offense among intake complaints.
 - » Larceny was the most common offense among felony intake complaints.
 - » Assault was the most common offense among misdemeanor intake complaints.
- » Larceny was the most common offense among new probation cases.
- » Larceny was the most common offense that resulted in commitment. See page 31 for most serious offense data.
- » Offense categories for pre-D detention are not presented. See page 23 for an explanation.

There are several methods for determining the most serious offense of a juvenile intake case, including the guidelines of DJJ's DAI and the VCSC.

* Total juvenile intake complaints include felonies, misdemeanors, and other offenses, so the sum of felony and misdemeanor counts may not add to the total count. Traffic offenses may be delinquent (if felonies or misdemeanors) or non-delinquent, but all are captured under "Traffic."



Juvenile Cases by Most Serious Offense, FY 2012

Offense Severity	Juvenile Intake Cases	New Probation Cases	Commitments
DAI Ranking			
Felony			
Against Persons	4.5%	14.6%	47.6%
Weapons/Narcotics	0.8%	2.1%	3.2%
Other	9.5%	24.0%	31.6%
Class 1 Misdemeanor			
Against Persons	15.4%	20.0%	8.5%
Other	26.3%	20.7%	6.0%
Prob./Parole Violation	7.3%	0.3%	2.3%
Court Order Violation	6.7%	2.1%	0.0%
Status Offense	17.7%	10.3%	0.0%
Other	11.8%	5.9%	0.2%
Missing	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
VCSC Ranking			
Person	21.5%	34.2%	54.4%
Property	23.4%	33.9%	35.7%
Narcotics	7.0%	8.0%	2.5%
Other	48.1%	23.9%	6.9%
Missing	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%
<i>Total Juvenile Cases</i>	<i>51,892</i>	<i>5,417</i>	<i>563</i>

- » Most serious offenses by DAI ranking:
 - » Other class 1 misdemeanors were the highest percentage (26.3%) of juvenile intake cases.
 - » Other felonies were the highest percentage (24.0%) of new probation cases.
 - » Felonies against persons were the highest percentage (47.6%) of commitments.
- » Most serious offenses by VCSC ranking:
 - » Other offenses were the highest percentage (48.1%) of total juvenile intake cases.
 - » Person offenses were the highest percentage (34.2%) of new probation cases.
 - » Person offenses were the highest percentage (54.4%) of commitments.
- » 69.6% (36,098) of juvenile intake cases were detention-eligible. There were 7,433 pre-D statuses for a rate of 4.9 eligible intakes per pre-D detention status. (Detention count is not comparable to previous reports. See page 22 for an explanation.)

Time Frames

- » The average time from intake to adjudication in FY 2011 was 116 days. FY 2012 data are not available due to pending adjudications.
- » The average time from RDC's reception of commitment papers to RDC admission in FY 2012 was five days (excluding subsequent commitments).


Placements, Releases, and Average LOS, FY 2012*

	Probation	Parole
Placements	5,417	432
Releases	5,593	468
Average LOS (Days)	372	291

* Average LOS and releases are not comparable to previous reports due to changes in defining a continuous placement.

- » There were 176 fewer probation placements than releases in FY 2012.
- » There were 36 fewer parole placements than releases in FY 2012.
- » Average LOS on probation was 81 days longer than the average LOS on parole.

Pre-D Detention LOS Distribution (Days), FY 2012 Releases



- » The most common LOS in pre-D detention (42.9%) was between 4 and 21 days.
- » 25.2% of juveniles in pre-D detention had a LOS of 3 days or less.
- » 23.3% of juveniles in pre-D detention had a LOS of between 22 and 51 days (3 to 17 weeks).
- » Less than 10% of juveniles in pre-D detention had a LOS greater than 52 days (over 17 weeks).



CSU Trends, FY 2010-2012

Juvenile Intake Cases, New Probation Cases, Pre-D Detainments, and Commitments*

CSU	Juvenile Intake Cases			New Probation Cases			Pre-D Detention			Commitments		
	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012	2010	2011	2012
1	1,726	1,354	1,266	264	224	216	290	280	301	8	16	13
2	2,081	2,178	2,002	178	180	178	448	426	493	31	29	33
2A	359	306	366	48	52	63	74	38	49	12	4	3
3	1,220	1,285	936	79	112	110	148	161	140	16	23	22
4	2,130	1,759	1,839	222	195	180	436	443	462	34	54	53
5	787	681	679	73	82	56	152	132	146	19	17	17
6	750	692	757	60	42	44	165	149	168	10	12	10
7	3,173	2,489	2,417	198	149	161	532	448	464	34	39	39
8	1,811	1,567	1,540	73	77	87	230	255	257	28	29	28
9	1,462	1,410	1,267	57	63	67	273	300	214	19	20	23
10	1,244	1,121	1,129	121	88	70	229	229	195	5	6	4
11	1,317	996	935	70	103	80	267	238	227	35	26	26
12	4,095	4,348	4,032	166	145	159	639	609	649	37	39	30
13	1,673	1,760	1,527	216	240	211	454	424	544	49	40	39
14	2,419	2,356	2,513	357	346	393	987	827	827	54	42	36
15	3,676	3,259	3,352	270	290	238	872	720	749	39	42	26
16	1,836	1,884	2,004	269	240	296	321	287	328	20	31	21
17A	1,651	1,421	1,286	230	191	149	460	404	332	15	11	16
17F	91	124	84	6	24	7	36	20	20	0	0	0
18	1,072	977	730	140	153	111	202	189	132	4	4	9
19	4,720	4,664	4,353	587	627	530	628	678	637	30	18	17
20L	1,216	1,232	1,250	170	170	162	238	206	172	4	3	4
20W	302	282	200	97	139	62	80	53	44	4	3	1
21	598	510	439	112	131	122	74	98	57	11	11	11
22	1,288	1,211	1,175	145	127	148	306	275	264	24	23	18
23	1,102	1,305	1,081	23	51	39	212	251	183	6	1	0
23A	982	774	1,018	48	66	61	292	225	279	17	7	7
24	1,985	1,793	1,923	215	223	258	364	286	292	19	17	12
25	1,389	1,321	1,448	76	72	69	197	188	199	4	11	10
26	2,108	2,117	2,047	164	128	130	508	453	554	18	14	7
27	1,392	1,400	1,376	148	148	164	290	288	267	8	4	3
28	770	686	747	123	117	123	97	88	88	1	2	0
29	1,046	902	909	139	128	160	143	104	124	2	4	3
30	675	635	608	128	139	118	152	148	115	3	0	1
31	2,630	2,427	2,657	343	379	398	525	511	609	27	14	21
<i>Total</i>	<i>56,776</i>	<i>53,226</i>	<i>51,892</i>	<i>5,610</i>	<i>5,636</i>	<i>5,417</i>	<i>11,365</i>	<i>10,493</i>	<i>10,633</i>	<i>647</i>	<i>616</i>	<i>563</i>

* Individual CSU data for probation placements may not add to the statewide totals because some cases may have been open in two CSUs at the time of data collection. Pre-D detention data were collected by the CSU who made the decision to detain the juvenile, not the juvenile's detention location. Commitment data are not comparable to previous reports because commitment data exclude appealed, rescinded, and canceled JCC releases.

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. Any changes to data after the date of download are not reflected in this report. Intake data are not comparable to previous reports due to the inclusion of all TDOs as juvenile and not DR/CW complaints.



VJCCCA

In 1995, the Virginia General Assembly enacted the VJCCCA “to establish a community-based system of progressive intensive sanctions and services that correspond to the severity of offense and treatment needs” (§ 16.1-309.2 of the *Code of Virginia*). The purpose of VJCCCA is “to deter crime by providing immediate, effective punishment that emphasizes accountability of the juvenile offender for his actions as well as reduces the pattern of repeat offending.”

Since January 1996, funding has been allocated to each local governing body (an independent city or county) through a formula based on factors including number and types of arrests and average daily cost for serving a juvenile. In order to maintain their commitment to juveniles, participating localities must maintain the same level of contribution to these programs as they made in 1995.

Plan Development

To participate in VJCCCA, each jurisdiction must develop a plan for using the funding, and the plan must be approved by the Board of Juvenile Justice. Some localities have combined programs and funding across jurisdictions. Communities are given substantial autonomy and flexibility to address local juvenile offense patterns. Development of the plan requires consultation with judges, CSU directors, and CSA CPMTs (an interagency body that manages the expenditure of CSA state funding to serve children and families). The local governing body designates who will be responsible for managing the plan. In many of the localities, this responsibility has been delegated to the CSU.

All funding must be used to serve “juveniles before intake on complaints or the court on petitions alleging that the juvenile is a child in need of services, child in need of supervision or delinquent” (§ 16.1-309.2 of the *Code of Virginia*). Local governing bodies may provide services directly or purchase them from other public or private agencies. No specific types of programs or services are required, although a list of permissible activities is in place. The intent is for programs and services to be developed to fit the needs of each locality and its court-involved juveniles.

The localities’ plans and programs are audited by DJJ. The localities must also submit an annual program evaluation to DJJ. This evaluation provides updates on each locality’s programs to ensure that all programs are in line with the locality’s overall plan. VJCCCA evaluation

plans are discussed in more detail in the Program Evaluations section of this report.

Programs

Services generally fall into three broad categories: public safety, accountability, and competency development. Group homes represent a separate service type. Under public safety, typical programs include electronic monitoring and intensive supervision of juveniles in the community. In the accountability category, coordination and monitoring of court-ordered community service and restitution are the primary services. Competency development encompasses the largest array of services. These services include in-home, substance abuse and other forms of counseling, skill development programs, and academic support services. Locally- and privately-operated community juvenile group homes serve court-involved juveniles. Placements can either be through contracts with providers or directly funded through VJCCCA.

In FY 2012, the average cost for a VJCCCA residential placement was \$6,622 compared to \$790 for a non-residential placement. Non-residential services encompass a variety of programming from electronic monitoring, which is very inexpensive, to treatment services, which tend to be more expensive. It should also be noted that the average costs were calculated based on placements, meaning the number of juveniles receiving services.

Juveniles Served, FY 2012

	2012
Juveniles Placed	10,533
Total Program Placements	17,629
Average Placements per Juvenile	1.7
Juveniles Eligible for Detention	79.2%

- » During FY 2012, 10,530 juveniles were placed in VJCCCA programs for a total of 17,624 placements.
- » On average, there were 1.7 placements per juvenile.
- » 79.2% of juveniles placed in VJCCCA programs were eligible for detention.

VJCCCA services can be delivered before or after the disposition, and a delinquent adjudication is not required.



Placements by Service Type, FY 2012

Service Type	FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
Accountability	4,148	20.9%	3,695	19.2%	3,580	20.3%
Community Service	3,774	19.0%	3,388	17.6%	3,260	18.5%
Restitution / Restorative Justice	374	1.9%	307	1.6%	320	1.8%
Competency Development	7,783	39.2%	8,405	43.6%	6,595	37.4%
Academic Improvement Programs	35	0.2%	27	0.1%	23	0.1%
After-School or Extended Day	315	1.6%	495	2.6%	508	2.9%
Anger Management Programs	867	4.4%	901	4.7%	722	4.1%
Case Management	656	3.3%	1,572	8.2%	972	5.5%
Employment / Vocational	129	0.6%	101	0.5%	97	0.6%
Home-Based / Family Preservation	234	1.2%	189	1.0%	147	0.8%
Individual, Group, Family Counseling	183	0.9%	282	1.5%	194	1.1%
Law-Related Education	488	2.5%	432	2.2%	439	2.5%
Life Skills	95	0.5%	28	0.1%	64	0.4%
Mental Health Assessment	262	1.3%	209	1.1%	198	1.1%
Mentoring	135	0.7%	114	0.6%	75	0.4%
Parenting Skills	187	0.9%	112	0.6%	99	0.6%
Sex Offender Assessment	2	0.0%	1	0.0%	5	0.0%
Sex Offender Education / Treatment	11	0.1%	8	0.0%	4	0.0%
Shoplifting Programs	840	4.2%	838	4.3%	655	3.7%
Substance Abuse Assessment	2,650	13.3%	2,432	12.6%	1,598	9.1%
Substance Abuse Education / Treatment	694	3.5%	664	3.4%	795	4.5%
Group Homes	362	1.8%	395	2.0%	364	2.1%
Individually Purchased Services	303	1.5%	259	1.3%	342	1.9%
Public Safety	7,273	36.6%	6,528	33.9%	6,748	38.3%
Crisis Intervention and Shelter Care	1,157	5.8%	1,005	5.2%	1,029	5.8%
Intensive Supervision / Surveillance	1,384	7.0%	1,071	5.6%	1,022	5.8%
Outreach Det. / Electronic Monitoring	4,732	23.8%	4,452	23.1%	4,697	26.6%
<i>Total Placements</i>	<i>19,869</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>19,282</i>	<i>100.0%</i>	<i>17,629</i>	<i>100.0%</i>

» Public safety had the highest percentage of placements out of all service categories in FY 2012 and the second highest percentage of placements from FY 2010 to FY 2011.

» Outreach detention/electronic monitoring, a service type in the public safety category, had the highest percentage of total placements from FY 2010 to FY 2012.

» Competency development had the second highest percentage of placements out of all service categories in FY 2012 and the highest percentage of placements from FY 2010 to FY 2011.


» Community service, a service type in the accountability category, had the second highest percentage of total placements from FY 2010 to FY 2012

» There were 17,629 total placements in VJCCCA programs during FY 2012.

Both the state and localities fund VJCCCA services. State allocations for each locality are determined by a formula with the requirement that localities maintain the same levels of contribution as they made in 1995.



Expenditures, FY 2012



- » Localities paid over half of the total expenditures for VJCCCA programs.
- » VJCCCA funded the equivalent of 281.1 staff positions in FY 2012.

Each locality and program develops its own satisfactory completion criteria. A juvenile may also leave the program for unrelated reasons such as status changes, program closures, or juvenile relocations.

Juvenile Demographics, FY 2012

Demographics	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
Race			
Black	46.9%	45.0%	44.3%
White	48.0%	50.0%	49.7%
Asian	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%
Other	4.4%	4.4%	5.2%
Ethnicity - Hispanic	5.0%	5.2%	5.6%
Sex			
Male	68.6%	67.9%	68.6%
Female	31.4%	32.1%	31.4%
Age			
8-12	4.5%	5.4%	5.4%
13	5.7%	6.0%	6.6%
14	11.5%	12.1%	12.4%
15	19.2%	18.3%	18.6%
16	25.0%	24.8%	24.2%
17	28.8%	28.7%	27.9%
18-20	4.9%	4.4%	4.7%
Total Juveniles	11,438	11,092	10,533


- » White juveniles had the highest percentage of placements, remaining between 48% and 50% since FY 2010.
- » Hispanic juveniles remained between 5% and 6% of all juveniles placed since FY 2010.
- » More males were placed in VJCCCA programs than females. Males remained between 67% and 69% of all juveniles placed since FY 2010.
- » The most common age for juveniles placed in VJCCCA programs was 17, remaining between 27% and 29% of all juveniles placed since FY 2010. Over half of all juveniles placed since FY 2010 were 16 or 17 year-olds.

Placement Status, FY 2012

Dispositional Status	Residential	Non-Residential
Pre-D	1,058 (6.0%)	10,627 (60.3%)
Post-D	335 (1.9%)	5,609 (31.8%)

- » The majority of placements were pre-D and non-residential.
- » The second highest percentage of placements were post-D and non-residential.
- » Only 7.9% of placements were residential; 6.0% were pre-D and 1.9% were post-D.

Completion Status of Releases, FY 2012



- » 17,781 program placements were released in FY 2012.
- » 83.7% of releases had a satisfactory completion status.
- » 11.2% of releases had an unsatisfactory completion status.



Detention Centers

Secure detention centers provide temporary care for alleged juvenile delinquents who require secure custody pending a court appearance and for juvenile delinquents after disposition as ordered by a judge. Educational instruction (including remedial services) is mandatory within 24 hours of a juvenile being detained and is provided by the locality in which the detention facility is located (funded by the Department of Education). Program components include medical and mental health screening, recreational and religious activities, and parent/guardian visitation. The 23 secure detention centers are operated by local governments or multi-jurisdictional commissions. DJJ provides partial funding for construction and operations and serves as the certifying agency for these facilities.

The localities served by each detention center are shown in the map below. The City of Richmond operated the Richmond Juvenile Detention Center until April 2012 when it was closed. Juveniles from the City of Richmond requiring placement in a detention center are housed at other detention centers through agreements.

Many detention centers also provide secure custody and services for post-D delinquents as an alternative to state commitment pursuant to § 16.1-284.1 of the *Code of Virginia*. Juveniles may be sentenced to a post-D program for up to 180 days. Treatment services are coordinated by the detention center, the CSU, local mental health and social service agencies, and the juvenile's family.


These services are individualized to meet the specific needs of each juvenile.

Examples of services for post-D juveniles include anger management treatment, substance abuse education and treatment, life skills, vocational education, community service, and victim empathy. During FY 2012, 17 facilities had post-D programs: Blue Ridge, Chesapeake, Chesterfield, Fairfax, Highlands, James River, Loudoun, Lynchburg, Merrimac, New River Valley, Newport News, Norfolk, Northern Virginia, Northwestern, Rappahannock, Virginia Beach, and W.W. Moore. Out of 1,365 licensed secure detention beds on the last day of FY 2012, 218 beds were dedicated to post-D detention programs. Until its closing in April 2012, Richmond Juvenile Detention Center also operated a post-D detention program with five beds.

Detention Data

A detainment counts the first admission of a continuous detention stay. A new detainment is not counted if a juvenile is transferred to another detention center (e.g., for a court hearing in another jurisdiction) or has a change in dispositional status (e.g., from pre-D to post-D with programs) before being released.

Dispositional statuses are pre-D, post-D without programs, post-D with programs, and other and are counted for each new status or status change. The total number of dispositional statuses is higher than the total number of detainments since one detainment may have multiple dispositional statuses.



* Henrico County is served by both James River and Henrico Juvenile Detention Centers.

* The City of Richmond is served by Blue Ridge, Chesterfield, Crater, James River, Merrimac, and Rappahannock Juvenile Detention Centers.

* Culpeper County is served by Blue Ridge Juvenile Detention Center.




In previous reports, detention admissions counted each time a juvenile entered a detention center, transferred between detention centers, or changed dispositional status. For example, a juvenile detained at one detention center, transferred to another detention center, then changed from a pre-D to post-D status would have three admissions. Instead, detainments and dispositional statuses are presented separately in this report, and transfers between detention centers are not reported.

Finally, most serious detaining offense data are not available this year as they were in previous reports. Each intake case is assigned an ICN, so multiple complaints may be associated with one ICN. If a juvenile is detained, the ICN from the intake is also assigned to the detention admission. Previously, the most serious offense was determined using all offenses associated with the ICN for each detention admission; however, the ICN does not reflect any changes to the status of the individual offenses (e.g., *nolle prosequi*, dismissed, and amended) after the initial intake. This omission results in possible inaccuracies in the most serious detaining offense data. For example, if a detained juvenile had two complaints under one ICN but the most serious offense was dismissed, the most serious ICN offense would have been presented as the most serious detaining offense on subsequent admissions even though the other offense was the sole reason for the detainment. DJJ is working to improve data collection, but there is presently no mechanism available in the electronic data management system to correctly track these changes. Accordingly, most serious detaining offense data are not available this year.

A detainment counts the first admission of a continuous detention stay. A new detainment is not counted if a juvenile is transferred to another detention center or has a change in dispositional status before being released. Juveniles may be counted more than once if they have one or more additional detainments after being released from detention.

Detainments, FY 2010-2012



- » In FY 2012, 10,633 juveniles were detained in a juvenile detention center.
- » Detainments decreased 7.7% between FY 2010 and FY 2011 and increased 1.3% between FY 2011 and FY 2012.

Detainment Demographics, FY 2010-2012

Demographics	2010	2011	2012
Race			
Black	52.1%	52.0%	52.0%
White	42.0%	41.8%	41.4%
Asian	0.6%	0.7%	0.8%
Other	5.4%	5.5%	5.8%
Ethnicity - Hispanic	8.7%	8.8%	8.7%
Sex			
Male	76.3%	75.8%	76.6%
Female	23.7%	24.2%	23.4%
Age			
8-12	1.4%	1.7%	1.7%
13	3.3%	3.9%	4.4%
14	9.6%	10.1%	10.9%
15	19.0%	19.2%	18.6%
16	29.2%	29.0%	28.2%
17	37.0%	35.6%	35.8%
18-20	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%
Missing	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Total Detainments	11,365	10,493	10,633

- » Black juveniles were the highest percentage of detainments since FY 2010.
- » Hispanic juveniles have comprised between 8% and 9% of detainments since FY 2010.
- » More males than females have been detained each year since FY 2010.
- » Since FY 2010, 17 year-olds have been the age group with the highest percentage of detainments.
- » There were 363 weekend detainments.




DAI Scores at Detainment, FY 2010-2012*

DAI Scores	2010	2011	2012
0-9 (Release)	17.5%	16.6%	20.4%
10-14 (Detention Alternative)	23.2%	22.8%	24.9%
15+ (Secure Detention)	53.5%	53.8%	47.2%
Missing	5.8%	6.8%	7.5%


- * Data include only pre-D detainments recorded as non-judge-ordered.
- » Of the juveniles who were detained in FY 2012, 47.2% had a DAI score indicating secure detention.
 - » Of the juveniles who received a score of less than 15 in FY 2012, 34.0% had mandatory overrides.

ADP and Capacity, FY 2010-2012*




- * Capacity is as of the last day of the FY.
- » Detention centers have operated below capacity for the past three years.
 - » Capacity decreased by 60 beds in FY 2012 due to the closure of Richmond Juvenile Detention Center.

Detention Dispositional Statuses, FY 2012*




- * Juveniles with dispositional status changes during their detainment are counted in each dispositional status.
- » 61.6% of dispositional statuses were pre-D.
 - » 27.9% of dispositional statuses were post-D with programs and 2.8% were post-D without programs.
 - » 7.6% of dispositional statuses were other.

ADP by Dispositional Status, FY 2012*



- * Juveniles with dispositional status changes during their detainment are counted in each dispositional status.
- » Pre-D status had the highest ADP in FY 2012.

Average LOS (Days) by Dispositional Status, FY 2012 Releases*



- * Juveniles with dispositional status changes during their detainment are counted in each dispositional status. A release is counted when a juvenile's dispositional status is closed, even if a new status is opened and the juvenile remains in detention.

- » Post-D detention with programs had the longest average LOS (137.6 days) and the fewest releases (340) in FY 2012.
- » Pre-D detention without programs had an average LOS of 21.6 days and the most releases (7,496) in FY 2012.
- » Post-D detention without programs had the shortest average LOS (13.6 days) and 3,368 releases in FY 2012.
- » Other dispositional statuses had an average LOS of 44.7 days and 762 releases in FY 2012.



JCCs

The Institutional Programs Section of DJJ's Division of Operations is responsible for juvenile offenders committed to the state, ensuring that they receive treatment and educational services while in a safe and secure setting. It operates Beaumont JCC, Bon Air JCC, Culpeper JCC, Hanover JCC, Oak Ridge JCC, and RDC.

The JCCs had a combined operating capacity of 917 as of June 30, 2012. BSU, Central Infirmary, Youth Industries, Bon Air Complex Maintenance, the Health Services Unit, and the Food Services Unit provide support to the JCCs. DJJ's Division of Education, formerly the DCE, provides educational and vocational services to meet the needs of committed juveniles. (See page 34 for additional information.) Programs within the JCCs offer community reintegration and specialized services in a secure residential setting.

The utilization of facilities is continuously monitored in order to maintain therapeutic capacities within the facilities. Ongoing population management takes place through the movement of juveniles between facilities and housing units. When reviewing and adjusting the population for each facility, several factors are taken into consideration, such as housing capacity, staffing levels, and programming initiatives. Revisions to capacities and shifts in the population are considered in order to keep the treatment and educational needs of the juveniles at the forefront of DJJ's operations.

RDC

DJJ operates a centralized evaluation and classification process at RDC. This facility serves as the central intake facility for juveniles committed to DJJ. With the primary function of orientation, evaluation, and classification of juveniles, services provided at RDC include medical, psychological, behavioral, educational/vocational, and sociological evaluation and classification to determine appropriate treatment needs, security requirements, institutional placements, and LOSs. Juveniles are typically housed at RDC for four to eight weeks, depending on their individual needs. At the conclusion of the evaluation process, a team of evaluators meets to discuss each case to determine treatment needs, LOS, classification, re-entry services, mental health transitioning, and placement recommendations. From RDC, juveniles are transferred to their designated JCCs.

BSU

BSU is the organizational unit responsible for providing treatment services to juveniles at the JCCs. The primary

services provided by BSU staff include mental health, substance abuse, sex offender, and aggression management treatments, as well as intake psychological evaluations and exit risk assessments.

Mental Health Treatment: BSU conducts comprehensive psychological evaluations at RDC of all juveniles committed to DJJ. At each facility, BSU provides 24/7 crisis intervention; individual, group, and family therapy; mental status evaluations; case consultations and development of individualized behavior support protocols; program development and implementation; and staff training. Three JCCs have ISUs for juveniles whose mental health needs do not allow them to function effectively in the general population of the institution. Risk assessments are completed for all serious and major offenders when they are considered for release. Psychiatric services at each of the facilities include psychiatric evaluation and medication management.

Substance Abuse Treatment: Evidence-based substance abuse treatment services are provided in specialized treatment units and in the general population at each JCC. Treatment emphasizes motivation to change, drug and alcohol refusal skills, addiction and craving coping skills, relapse prevention, problem solving, effective communication, transition to the community, and other skills. Individualized treatment planning allows juveniles with co-occurring disorders or specialized needs to receive additional intervention, including individual, group, and family therapy. Females with substance abuse treatment needs participate in a specialized treatment unit program that is evidence-based and addresses gender-specific issues, including grief and loss, female sexuality, and trauma. Depending on individual needs, completion of substance abuse treatment services requires five weeks to six months.

Sex Offender Treatment: There are 112 beds in sex offender units across the JCCs. Evidence-based sex offender evaluation and treatment services are also provided in the general population depending on level of need. Juveniles in sex offender treatment units receive intensive treatment from a multi-disciplinary treatment team that includes a unit manager, counselor, psychologist, and social worker. Specialized sex offender treatment units offer an array of services, including individual, group, and family therapy. Each juvenile receives an individualized treatment plan that addresses programmatic goals, competencies, and core treatment activities. Successful completion of sex offender treatment may require 6 to 36 months depending on treatment needs, behavioral stability, and motivation of the juvenile. Median treatment time is approximately 18 months.

Aggression Management: Evidence-based aggression management treatment services are provided at each



of the JCCs. Juveniles receive treatment in specialized units as well as in the general population from multi-disciplinary treatment teams consisting of mental health professionals, institutional counselors, and security staff. Juveniles must complete core objectives that address anger control, moral reasoning, and social skills as well as demonstrate aggression management in their environment. Depending on individual needs, treatment completion generally requires approximately four months.

Health Services

The Health Services Unit provides quality health care services to juveniles confined in the JCCs. DJJ's approach to health care is to ensure services provided are clinically appropriate and medically necessary while emphasizing both prevention and wellness. Juveniles are provided information to encourage healthy lifestyle choices both now and in the future. DJJ maintains a staff of physicians, dentists, and nurses on-site who provide assessment, treatment, and care to meet the medical and dental needs of the population housed in the facilities. In addition, contracted psychiatrists and optometrists provide health care services to the residents at the JCCs and RDC. On-site staff are supplemented by a network of hospitals, physicians, and transport services, provided through contract, to ensure all medically necessary health care services delivered are consistent with the standards of the community.

Security and Operations

Security, which involves both public safety and the safety of the juveniles and staff, is facilitated by the JCOs in the field under SOPs that establish how facilities and services are to operate on a 24-hour basis.

As a safeguard for the juveniles, a grievance process is in place in the institutions through the Ombudsman Program. The purpose of the program is to provide a strong system of advocacy for committed juveniles. The program is staffed by an agency-wide ombudsman and grievance coordinators assigned to each JCC. By monitoring conditions of confinement and service delivery systems, the program helps identify and solve problems with potential to cause harm or impede rehabilitative efforts. It helps protect the rights of juveniles; promotes system accountability; and helps ensure safe, humane, and lawful living conditions. The ombudsman and grievance coordinators operate independently from the facilities in order to provide juveniles with an outlet for addressing issues for which they have expressed concern.

Case Management and Treatment Programs

Case management and treatment programs staff provide oversight of treatment needs, security requirements, LOS, institutional placements, and changes while in direct care. Staff monitor treatment and program delivery, facilitate psycho-educational groups using the New Freedom curriculum, assess progress achieved, set parameters for the programs, and manage classifications and residential placements. They are responsible for ensuring that all needed services (including mental health, substance abuse, sex offender, aggression management, and independent living skills development) are available and operational at the facilities, and they serve as a liaison between the field and the administrative offices for procedures and resources. These staff also work with the community to provide a transition and parole plan for re-entry.

Classification System

DJJ operates an objective classification system to enable staff to assess juveniles' appropriate security and custody levels and assign them to appropriate housing placements within a facility. The classification system also provides for periodic reviews of security, custody, and program placement in consideration of juveniles' needs and progress and for the reclassification of juveniles as appropriate. Juveniles are classified according to their need for structure (See Appendices E and F.):

- » Level I - low structure
- » Level II - medium structure
- » Level III - high structure
- » Level IV - intensive structure

Juveniles are assigned to facilities based on these classification levels, age, sex, and other factors. The need for specific treatment may override a classification level for facility placement, but the classification level is still taken into consideration for room assignments.

Re-Entry Programs

DJJ developed a four-year strategic plan in 2010 for the re-entry initiative with the mission to promote public safety and accountability by implementing a seamless plan of services for each offender for a successful transition and reintegration into the community. Juvenile re-entry programs begin with the premise that planning for release starts at RDC admission. Some re-entry programs already existed, and several additional re-entry programs were created to support the re-entry initiative.



WERP: WERP accommodates 12 male participants at RDC and provides education and work experience outside the JCC. The purpose of WERP is to afford juveniles opportunities to successfully transition back to the community by providing employability skills, job placement in the community, life skills training, and transitional living. Wages earned by WERP participants are initially used to pay any restitution, fines, or court costs, with any remaining wages credited to the juveniles' accounts.

Female Transition and WERP Unit: RDC operates a six-bed transition and WERP unit for its female population utilizing grant funds administered by DCJS. Female WERP residents and intake residents share a unit that has been modified to provide a specialized area for recreation and leisure. Each resident of the unit has an individual bedroom. The goals and objectives of this program are similar to the male WERP program.

Mentoring Project: DJJ, with the Virginia Mentoring Partnership, has developed a Mentoring Project funded by a DCJS-administered grant. The program, operated in the Richmond-metro area, pairs a juvenile with a mentor 120 days prior to release, and the mentor continues to meet with the juvenile for six months after release. Through this program, DJJ and the Virginia Mentoring Partnership aim to reduce recidivism by introducing effective interventions and providing juveniles with a structured and trusting relationship.

MHSTPs: For those juveniles with mental health needs, the institutional counselor, BSU therapist, parole officer, juvenile, juvenile's family, and community services providers collaborate to develop an MHSTP for the juvenile to provide a seamless transition from facility to community with no lapse in mental health services.

REACH: DJJ's behavior management program used in the JCCs provides juveniles with the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary for rehabilitation, positive growth, and behavioral change. The program focuses on identifying desired behaviors, tracking inappropriate behaviors, providing feedback, and using a system of phases through which juvenile can advance. The main premise behind REACH is to teach juveniles to make better, independent choices and decisions to provide for a positive transition following release.

Youth Industries: The Youth Industries Program was created to help participants overcome barriers to employment. Participants engage in employment provided both on the JCC grounds and in local communities through agreements with agencies of state and local government, private employers, foundations, and charitable organizations. Fields of study vary at each JCC and include horticulture, silk screening, offset printing, food services, immediate assembly, electrical, barbering,

embroidery, vinyl sign-making, and advertising and design. Youth Industries works with the state's One-Stop Centers to help secure employment and other needed services for these juveniles. If warranted, participating juveniles are modestly compensated based on work-training hours completed or receive an established piecework rate. Fields of study may also be integrated with an apprenticeship program.

Second Chance Act Grant for Re-Entry: DJJ, in partnership with Tidewater Youth Services Commission, received a grant award from the Office of Justice Programs at DOJ for a Juvenile Offender Re-Entry Demonstration Project. The project serves high- and moderate-risk parolees up to the age of 21 from the Tidewater area. The grant supports a comprehensive range of services and provides for graduated re-entry options to address challenges posed by re-entry and to reduce recidivism. The program is grounded in research-based principles and implements evidence-based modalities targeting criminogenic needs.

REEP: REEP is a cooperative initiative between DJJ and the Peninsula Area Worklink, a workforce investment board that serves the Hampton, Newport News, and Williamsburg areas. The One-Stop sites within Beaumont and Culpeper JCCs allow certain juveniles to participate in job training and to access job-search services. Upon release from custody, the juveniles are given opportunities for on-the-job training and apprenticeship programs through employers partnering with Peninsula Worklink. The goal of REEP is to have participants work full-time in stable jobs following their release, thereby improving community reintegration and lowering recidivism rates for this population.



LOS

Using guidelines issued by the Board of Juvenile Justice, DJJ establishes the LOS for indeterminately committed juveniles based on the severity of a juvenile's offense(s) and chronicity of criminal behavior. LOS categories are defined by an anticipated minimum and maximum number of months that the resident will remain with DJJ. The actual LOS may vary due to institutional offenses or failure to complete mandatory treatment.

Two tables are used in determining a juvenile's LOS:

1. Table I assigns the level of severity for (a) the most serious current committing offense and (b) the most serious prior offense. The resulting two numbers are combined in a pattern of (a)-(b) for further calculation.
2. Table II accounts for chronic offense behavior that may increase the juvenile's initial LOS calculation. The juvenile's entire delinquent and criminal histories, except the two offenses used in Table I, are examined; one point is assigned for each Class 1 misdemeanor, and two points are assigned for each felony. A chronicity score of less than 8 points does not affect LOS, a chronicity score of 8 to 11 points increases LOS by three months, and a chronicity score of 12 or more points increases LOS by six months.

Table I: Severity Level for Current and Prior Offenses*

Level	Type of Offense	Examples
Level 1	Class 1 Misdemeanors	Simple Assault; Petit Larceny
Level 2	Class 4, 5, and 6 Felonies; Unclassified felonies carrying a maximum sentence of 10 years	Unauthorized Use of an Auto; Possession of a Schedule I or II Substance; Voluntary and Involuntary Manslaughter
Level 3	Class 3 Felonies; Unclassified felonies carrying a maximum sentence of 20 years; Unclassified non-person felonies carrying a maximum sentence of more than 20 years	Burglary of Dwelling with Intent; Grand Larceny; Aggravated Involuntary Manslaughter
Level 4	Class 1 and 2 Felonies; Unclassified felony offenses against persons carrying a maximum sentence of more than 20 years	Armed Robbery; Rape; Murder

* Juveniles who have no past convictions are assigned Level 1 for the most serious prior offense.

Table II: Initial LOS Steps and Adjustments to Determine LOS Range


Offense Severity (Determines the initial LOS Step. The initial steps are followed by adjustments for chronic offense behavior.)	Release Dates Early - Late
1-1*	3 months - 6 months
1-2, 1-3, 2-1, 2-2 1-1, increased 3 months for chronicity	6 months - 12 months
1-1, increased 6 months for chronicity 1-2, 1-3, 2-1, 2-2, increased 3 months for chronicity	9 months - 15 months
1-4, 2-3, 2-4, 3-1, 3-2, 3-3 1-2, 1-3, 2-1, 2-2, increased 6 months for chronicity	12 months - 18 months
1-4, 2-3, 2-4, 3-1, 3-2, 3-3, increased 3 months for chronicity	15 months - 21 months
1-4, 2-3, 2-4, 3-1, 3-2, 3-3, increased 6 months for chronicity	18 months - 24 months
3-4, 4-1, 4-2, 4-3, 4-4	18 months - 36 months
3-4, 4-1, 4-2, 4-3, 4-4, increased 3 months for chronicity	21 months - 36 months
3-4, 4-1, 4-2, 4-3, 4-4, increased 6 months for chronicity	24 months - 36 months

* Juveniles may not stay more than 12 months without departmental review.




Commitments by Locality, FY 2012

The map indicates the distribution of commitments across the state in FY 2012. It also indicates the locations of the JCCs.



- » The City of Norfolk committed 53 juveniles during FY 2012, the most out of all localities in the state.
- » The Cities of Richmond and Newport News committed the second most juveniles during FY 2012 with 39 commitments each.

Capacity, ADP, Admissions, and Releases, FY 2004-2012*



*Data include alternative placements, which were available through FY 2009.

- » Due to facility closures, capacity decreased 22.6% between FY 2004 and FY 2012.
- » ADP decreased 30.0% between FY 2004 and FY 2012.
- » Admissions decreased 48.4% between FY 2004 and FY 2012.
- » Releases decreased 47.0% between FY 2004 and FY 2012.

Appealed, rescinded, and canceled commitments are not included except for in the ADP.



Capacity and ADP, FY 2012

Facility	Capacity	ADP On-Site	ADP Off-Site	ADP Total
Beaumont	284	236	3	238
Bon Air	193	186	1	187
Culpeper	144	132	1	134
Hanover	120	86	0	86
Oak Ridge	40	39	0	39
RDC	136	71	2	73
<i>Total</i>	<i>917</i>	<i>749</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>758</i>

- » Each JCC operated below capacity during FY 2012.
- » 82.7% of total capacity was occupied in FY 2012.

Admission Demographics, FY 2010-2012

Demographics	2010	2011	2012
Race			
Black	64.9%	65.3%	69.8%
White	27.8%	29.9%	26.2%
Asian	0.7%	0.7%	0.4%
Other	6.6%	4.1%	3.7%
Ethnicity - Hispanic	7.0%	5.0%	5.3%
Sex			
Male	94.9%	92.9%	91.7%
Female	5.1%	7.1%	8.3%
Age			
Under 14	1.2%	1.2%	1.8%
14	4.5%	4.4%	7.1%
15	13.6%	13.5%	17.0%
16	24.5%	30.4%	28.4%
17	44.2%	38.8%	36.5%
18	11.1%	10.3%	8.5%
19-20	1.0%	1.4%	0.6%
<i>Total Admissions</i>	<i>604</i>	<i>565</i>	<i>493</i>

- » Black juveniles had the highest percentage of admissions, increasing from 64.9% in FY 2010 to 69.8% in FY 2012.
- » Hispanic juveniles comprised between 5% and 7% of admissions since FY 2010.
- » More males than females were admitted; however, this percentage decreased from 94.9% in FY 2010 to 91.7% in FY 2012.
- » The age group with the highest percentage of admissions was 17 year-olds; however this percentage decreased from 44.2% in FY 2010 to 36.5% in FY 2012.
- » Over half of all admissions since FY 2010 were 16 and 17 year-olds.

Admissions by Most Serious Offense, FY 2012*

Most Serious Offense Severity	Determinate	Indeterminate	Total
DAI Ranking			
Felony			
Against Persons	89.5%	39.8%	48.5%
Weapons/Narcotics	3.5%	2.9%	3.0%
Other	7.0%	42.0%	35.9%
Class 1 Misdemeanor			
Against Persons	0.0%	6.6%	5.5%
Other	0.0%	5.7%	4.7%
Parole Violation	0.0%	2.7%	2.2%
Other	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%
VCSC Ranking			
Person	89.5%	46.2%	53.8%
Property	5.8%	43.7%	37.1%
Narcotics	1.2%	2.9%	2.6%
Other	3.5%	7.1%	6.5%
<i>Total Admissions</i>	<i>86</i>	<i>407</i>	<i>493</i>

* Data include offenses that occurred during a commitment and resulted in a recommitment.

- » Most serious offenses by DAI ranking:
 - » Felonies against persons were the highest percentage (89.5%) of admissions that resulted in a determinate sentence.
 - » Other felonies were the highest percentage (42.0%) of admissions that resulted in an indeterminate sentence.
 - » Felonies against persons were the highest percentage (48.5%) of admissions overall.
- » Most serious offenses by VCSC ranking:
 - » Person offenses were the highest percentage (89.5%) of admissions that resulted in a determinate sentence.
 - » Person offenses were the highest percentage (46.2%) of admissions that resulted in an indeterminate sentence, followed by property offenses (43.7%).
 - » Person offenses were the highest percentage of admissions overall (53.8%), followed by property offenses (37.1%).

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. Any changes to data after the date of download are not reflected in this report. Appealed, rescinded, and canceled commitments are not included except for in the ADP.



Admissions by Most Serious Offense, FY 2012*

Most Serious Offense Category	Determinate	Indeterminate			Overall		
	Felony	Felony	Misd.	Total	Felony	Misd.	Total
Alcohol	N/A	N/A	8.0%	1.0%	N/A	8.0%	0.8%
Arson	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.6%
Assault	14.0%	9.0%	50.0%	13.8%	10.0%	50.0%	13.8%
Burglary	3.5%	23.1%	N/A	19.7%	19.2%	N/A	16.8%
Disorderly Conduct	N/A	N/A	6.0%	0.7%	N/A	6.0%	0.6%
Escape	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%
Extortion	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%
Fraud	0.0%	2.9%	0.0%	2.5%	2.3%	0.0%	2.0%
Gangs	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.6%
Kidnapping	2.3%	0.9%	0.0%	0.7%	1.2%	0.0%	1.0%
Larceny	2.3%	23.4%	16.0%	21.9%	19.2%	16.0%	18.5%
Murder	5.8%	0.3%	N/A	0.2%	1.4%	N/A	1.2%
Narcotics	1.2%	3.2%	2.0%	2.9%	2.8%	2.0%	2.6%
Obscenity	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%
Obstruction of Justice	0.0%	0.6%	2.0%	0.7%	0.5%	2.0%	0.6%
Parole Violation	N/A	0.3%	0.0%	2.9%	0.2%	0.0%	2.4%
Robbery	59.3%	17.3%	N/A	14.7%	25.7%	N/A	22.5%
Sexual Abuse	11.6%	11.3%	0.0%	9.6%	11.3%	0.0%	9.9%
Sexual Offense	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	0.4%
Traffic	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	1.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.8%
Trespassing	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	0.5%	0.0%	4.0%	0.4%
Vandalism	0.0%	1.7%	8.0%	2.5%	1.4%	8.0%	2.0%
Weapons	0.0%	1.4%	4.0%	1.7%	1.2%	4.0%	1.4%
<i>Total Admissions</i>	86	346	50	407	432	50	493

* Data include offenses that occurred during a commitment and resulted in a recommitment.

* Determinate commitments can only be for felony offenses.


* Total indeterminate and overall admissions include felonies, misdemeanors, and other offenses, so the sum of felony and misdemeanor counts may not add to total count. The only "other" offenses were 11 indeterminate admissions for parole violations.

- » 17.4% of all admissions were determinate commitments, 82.6% were indeterminate commitments.
- » Robbery was the most serious offense category with the highest percentage of offenses that resulted in a determinate commitment.
- » 85.0% of most serious offenses that resulted in indeterminate commitments were felonies, 12.3% were misdemeanors.
- » Larceny was the most serious offense category with the highest percentage of felonies that resulted in an indeterminate commitment.
- » Assault was the most serious offense category with the highest percentage of misdemeanors that resulted in an indeterminate commitment.
- » Robbery was the most serious offense category with the highest percentage of all felonies.
- » Assault was the most serious offense category with the highest percentage of all misdemeanors.

If a juvenile has a determinate commitment, his or her LOS is decided by the court. A juvenile with an indeterminate commitment has an LOS that is calculated by DJJ using the LOS Guidelines. (See page 28.)



Admissions by Psychotropic Medication History and Symptoms of Mental Health Disorders, FY 2012*




* Includes juveniles who appear to have significant symptoms of mental health disorder, according to diagnostic criteria in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual, 4th edition (DSM-IV). Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), Conduct Disorder (CD), Oppositional Defiant Disorder (ODD), Substance Abuse Disorder, and Substance Dependence Disorder are not included.

- » The majority of juveniles had a history of psychotropic medication use (62.9%) and appeared to have significant symptoms of a mental health disorder, excluding those disorders listed above (62.3%).
- » A higher percentage of females than males had a history of psychotropic medication use and appeared to have significant symptoms of a mental health disorder, excluding those disorders listed above.
- » 93.9% of juveniles appeared to have significant symptoms of ADHD, CD, ODD, Substance Abuse Disorder, or Substance Dependence Disorder.
- » More males (94.5%) than females (87.8%) appeared to have significant symptoms of ADHD, CD, ODD, Substance Abuse Disorder, or Substance Dependence Disorder.

The majority of juveniles appear to have significant symptoms of a mental health disorder.

Juveniles assigned mandatory treatment needs may be held until their ERD if they do not complete the mandatory treatment, and juveniles assigned recommended treatment needs may be held until their LRD if they do not complete the recommended treatment. Sex offender treatment can have the greatest impact on the juvenile's LOS due to the length of the program.

Admissions by Treatment Needs, FY 2012




- » 96.5% of admissions had an aggression management treatment need. 66.3% of admissions had a mandatory treatment need.
- » 88.2% of admissions had a substance abuse treatment need. 39.1% of admissions had a mandatory treatment need.
- » 14.0% of admissions had a sex offender treatment need. 12.0% of admissions had a mandatory treatment need.
- » 78.5% of juveniles had a mental health treatment need. Mental health is not a mandatory or recommended treatment need that can affect LOS.

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. Any changes to data after the date of download are not reflected in this report. Appealed, rescinded, and canceled commitments are not included except for in the ADP.




Admissions by Assigned LOS (Months), FY 2012*



* Juveniles with multiple commitments for a single admission are counted once. The longest blended or determinate assigned LOS was selected, even if an indeterminate commitment assigned LOS was longer. If the juvenile had only indeterminate commitments, the longest LOS category was selected.

- » 82.5% of admissions are for indeterminate commitments.
- » Approximately half of admissions had an indeterminate assigned LOS between 6-12 months and 12-18 months.

Admissions by Initial Custody Classification Level, FY 2012



- » Over half (58.0%) of JCC admissions in FY 2012 had an initial custody classification level of IV.
- » Almost a quarter (22.7%) of JCC admissions in FY 2012 had an initial custody classification level of III.
- » 19.1% of JCC admissions in FY 2012 had an initial custody classification level of I or II.

Admissions by Average Actual LOS (Months), FY 2012*

Assigned LOS Category	Average Actual LOS	Releases	% of All Releases
3-6 months	7.9	26	4.6%
6-9 months	9.9	6	1.1%
6-12 months	8.1	98	17.3%
9-12 months	10.0	3	0.5%
9-15 months	7.8	13	2.3%
12-18 months	13.9	127	22.4%
15-21 months	15.0	38	6.7%
18-24 months	16.2	36	6.3%
18-36 months	25.5	74	13.0%
21-36 months	26.4	12	2.1%
24-36 months	24.7	10	1.8%
Total Indeterminate	15.1	447	78.7%
Blended	31.4	98	17.3%
Determinate	35.8	23	4.0%

* Juveniles with multiple commitments for a single admission are counted once. The longest blended or determinate assigned LOS was selected, even if an indeterminate commitment assigned LOS was longer. If the juvenile had only indeterminate commitments, the longest LOS category was selected.

* Four juveniles had subsequent commitments with an LOS category exceeding 36 months.

- » The average actual LOS for all juveniles regardless of their commitment type was 18.7 months.
- » Indeterminately committed juveniles comprised 78.7% of FY 2012 releases and their average actual LOS was 15.1 months.
- » Juveniles determinately committed comprised 17.3% of FY 2012 releases and their average actual LOS was 31.4 months.
- » 22.4% of FY 2012 releases had an assigned LOS of 12-18 months and their average actual LOS was 13.9 months.

Assigned LOS for indeterminate commitments are a range of time (e.g. 6-12 months). The first number in the range represents the juvenile's ERD, and the second number represents the juvenile's LRD.



Division of Education

Background on the DCE Merger

DCE was created in 1991 by the General Assembly and provided a broad array of educational programs in Virginia's adult and juvenile correctional facilities. In 2012, House Bill 1291 and Senate Bill 678, The Governor's Omnibus Government Reform bills, abolished DCE and the Board of Correctional Education, and Virginia's responsibility to provide committed juveniles with educational services was transferred to DJJ. These services are administered and supervised by a newly-created Division of Education within DJJ. The Division of Education is led by a superintendent that is responsible for ensuring DJJ's compliance with state and federal laws governing the provision of educational services and maintaining school accreditation with the Virginia Department of Education.

Overview on the Division of Education

The Division of Education has eight schools located in the six JCCs: Paul S. Blandford High School and Paul S. Blandford Annex at Beaumont JCC, Joseph T. Mastin High School and Joseph T. Mastin Annex at Bon Air JCC, Cedar Mountain High School at Culpeper JCC, John H. Smyth High School at Hanover JCC, W. Hamilton Crockford High School at Oak Ridge JCC, and W. Hamilton Crockford Annex at RDC. The schools are staffed by administrators and teachers who are licensed by the Virginia Department of Education.

Juveniles' school records are forwarded to RDC upon notification of the juvenile's commitment to DJJ. All juveniles that have not earned a high school diploma or GED are evaluated upon admission for placement in an educational program. Juveniles are enrolled in the grade, content courses, or program in accordance with their prior enrollment at their home school or detention center.

Juveniles on the high school graduation track can earn credits in classes at the middle school or high school level. All schools offer the core content subjects and various elective courses. With the exception of W. Hamilton Crockford High School, W. Hamilton Crockford High School Annex, and Cedar Mountain High School, juveniles are able to participate in an accelerated schedule that allows over-age, credit deficient students to catch up with their peers by earning credits more quickly than they would in their home schools. Juveniles take four credits in the fall term, four in the spring term, and two during the summer session, for a total of 10 credits earned in one school year. In addition, juveniles who are

18 years of age may enroll in classes that will prepare them to participate in GED testing.

The Division of Education offers CTE courses in approximately 26 different trade areas. Each program is designed to provide juveniles with the required job tasks and employability skills that will allow them to obtain and maintain employment when released from the facilities.

Division of Education Data

The Division of Education begins collecting data on juveniles when their educational evaluation is completed at RDC. Evaluations take place after admission; therefore, the data presented on juveniles in this section differs from data presented in the JCC section because it is reflective of when the juveniles were evaluated rather than when they were admitted.

RDC Educational Evaluations by Demographics, FY 2012


	1st Q	2nd Q	3rd Q	4th Q
Race				
Black	66.8%	69.1%	69.6%	69.0%
White	21.0%	21.3%	19.4%	21.0%
Other	12.2%	9.6%	11.0%	10.0%
Sex				
Female	4.9%	5.0%	6.2%	7.0%
Male	95.1%	95.0%	93.8%	93.0%
Age				
Under 14	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	2.0%
14-17	47.8%	48.6%	56.2%	56.0%
18-21	52.2%	51.4%	43.5%	42.0%
Total	615	582	582	571

- » Black juveniles had the highest percentage of evaluations during FY 2012. Evaluations of black juveniles increased from 66.8% in the first quarter to 69.0% in the fourth quarter.
- » More males were evaluated than females. The percentage of males evaluated remained between 93% and 96% of all evaluations during FY 2012.
- » The percentage of 14 to 17 year-olds evaluated increased from 47.8% in the first quarter to 56.0% in the fourth quarter. The percentage of 18 to 21 year-olds evaluated decreased from 52.2% in the first quarter to 42.0% in the fourth quarter.
- » 3.0% of educational evaluations in the third and fourth quarter of FY 2012 were for Hispanic juveniles. The Division of Education did not record Hispanic ethnicity until this time.

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. Any changes to data after the date of download are not reflected in this report. The count of RDC educational evaluations does not match the number of RDC admissions because juveniles with a high school diploma, a GED certificate, or recent testing scores are not evaluated.



RDC Educational Evaluations by Grade-Equivalent Score, FY 2012*



* Grade-equivalent scores were determined by the Woodcock-Johnson III. Grade-equivalent scores will appear approximately one-half grade levels lower than previous reports due to changes in data retrieval procedures. "Written Language" scores were previously reported as "Writing" scores.

- » Males and females tested approximately the same in reading.
- » Females tested higher than males in written language.
- » Males tested higher than females in math.

DCE was a separate agency from DJJ during FY 2012, but the juvenile components of DCE were merged with DJJ on July 1, 2012, to form DJJ's Division of Education.

Juveniles admitted to RDC are evaluated using the Woodcock-Johnson III tests unless they have a high school diploma, GED certificate, or recent testing scores.

RDC Educational Evaluations by Reading Grade-Equivalent Score, FY 2012*

	1st Q	2nd Q	3rd Q	4th Q
Below Grade 4	8.5%	16.3%	7.7%	18.5%
Grades 4 - 8	53.8%	51.1%	65.4%	57.4%
Grades 9 - 12	24.8%	21.7%	23.1%	14.8%
Above Grade 12	12.8%	10.9%	3.8%	9.3%
<i>Total</i>	<i>117</i>	<i>92</i>	<i>104</i>	<i>108</i>

* Grade-equivalent scores were determined by the Woodcock-Johnson III test.

- » The majority (57.0%) of evaluated juveniles scored between grades 4 and 8 in reading.
- » 21.1% of evaluated juveniles scored between grades 9 and 12 in reading.
- » 12.6% of evaluated juveniles scored below grade 4 in reading.
- » 9.3% of evaluated juveniles scored above grade 12 in reading.

RDC Educational Evaluations by Primary Disability Diagnosis, FY 2012*

	1st Q	2nd Q	3rd Q	4th Q
Emotional Disability	40.4%	40.7%	41.0%	39.0%
Hearing Impairment	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Intellectual Disability	2.1%	6.8%	3.0%	2.0%
Multiple Disabilities	2.1%	0.0%	3.0%	6.0%
Other Health Impairment	29.8%	37.3%	23.0%	27.0%
Section 504	8.5%	0.0%	1.5%	4.0%
Specific Learning Disability	17.0%	13.6%	28.0%	22.0%
<i>Total</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>49</i>

* Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 ensures protection for any student who has been identified with a physical or mental disability or has a history of a disability which substantially limits a major life activity.

- » Of the 493 juveniles admitted to RDC in FY 2012, 43.8% had a disability diagnosis.
- » The most common primary disability diagnosis was emotional disability, followed by other health impairment and specific learning disability.



Halfway Houses

In FY 2012, DJJ operated two juvenile halfway houses, Abraxas House in Staunton and Hampton Place in Norfolk, to address transitional needs of juveniles who were released from JCCs. A third halfway house, Discovery House, was in operation until June 10, 2010, and it is included in the FY 2010 data presented. The purpose of a halfway house is to provide transitional living for juveniles unable to return home or who would benefit from services in this type of placement. Juveniles learn independent living skills and are required to enroll in school, work toward a GED, or maintain gainful employment. Supportive services such as substance abuse relapse services and sex offender relapse treatment are provided by public or private service providers with the use of transitional service funds. Upon completion of residence at a halfway house, most juveniles return to their families or live independently. During FY 2012, juveniles were placed on parole supervision during their stay at the halfway houses. Between May and July of 2012, the halfway houses were closed for renovations, security upgrades, and staff training. New residents in FY 2013 remain under direct care status during their stay at the halfway houses.


Halfway houses provide transitional living for juveniles released from JCCs. Juveniles learn independent living skills and are required to enroll in school, work toward a GED, or maintain gainful employment.

Admission Demographics, FY 2010-2012

Demographics	2010	2011	2012
Race			
Black	57.7%	45.9%	72.7%
White	38.5%	48.6%	21.2%
Asian	0.0%	5.4%	6.1%
Other	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Ethnicity - Hispanic	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%
Sex			
Male	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Female	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Age			
16	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	21.2%	10.8%	6.1%
18	44.2%	27.0%	30.3%
19	26.9%	43.2%	33.3%
20	7.7%	18.9%	30.3%
Total Admissions	52	37	33


- » Black juveniles had the highest percentage of admissions in FY 2010 (57.7%) and FY 2012 (72.7%). White juveniles had the highest percentage of admissions in FY 2011 (48.6%).
- » 2.7% of admissions in FY 2011 were Hispanic juveniles. There were no Hispanic juveniles admitted in FY 2010 or FY 2012.
- » Only males can be admitted to halfway houses.
- » The majority of juveniles admitted to halfway houses are 18 years or older. This percentage increased from 78.8% in FY 2010 to 93.9% in FY 2012.

Admissions, FY 2010-2012



- » Between FY 2010 and FY 2012, admissions to halfway houses decreased 36.5%.
- » Between FY 2011 and FY 2012, admissions to halfway houses decreased 10.8%.

ADP and Capacity, FY 2012*



* ADP was calculated using the number of days the facilities were open during the FY.

- » During FY 2012, both halfway houses operated below capacity.

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. Any changes to data after the date of download are not reflected in this report.




Admissions by Most Serious Committing Offense, FY 2012

Most Serious Offense	
Offense Category	
Assault	6.1%
Burglary	12.1%
Parole Violation	6.1%
Robbery	48.5%
Sex Offense	24.2%
Vandalism	3.0%
DAI Ranking	
Felonies	
Against Persons	78.8%
Weapons/Narcotics	0.0%
Other	15.2%
Class 1 Misdemeanors	
Against Persons	0.0%
Other	0.0%
Parole Violation	6.1%
VCSC Ranking	
Person	78.8%
Property	15.2%
Narcotics	0.0%
Other	6.1%
<i>Total Admissions</i>	33

- » 48.5% of juveniles admitted to halfway houses committed robbery as their most serious offense.
- » Most serious offense on the DAI ranking: 78.8% of juveniles admitted to halfway houses committed a felony against persons offense.
- » Most serious offense on the VCSC Ranking: 78.8% of juveniles admitted to halfway houses committed a person offense.

Average LOS (Days), FY 2010-2012



- » The average LOS decreased from 139.5 days in FY 2011 to 120.2 days in FY 2012, a decrease of 13.8%.

Admissions, Releases, and Average LOS (Days) by Committing CSU, FY 2012

CSU	Admissions		Releases		Average LOS
	#	%	#	%	
1	0	0.0%	1	2.2%	315
2	9	27.3%	11	23.9%	119
2A	1	3.0%	1	2.2%	145
3	1	3.0%	1	2.2%	103
4	4	12.1%	7	15.2%	130
5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
7	7	21.2%	7	15.2%	79
8	4	12.1%	5	10.9%	94
9	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
10	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
11	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
12	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
13	2	6.1%	3	6.5%	136
14	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
15	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
16	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
17A	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
17F	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
18	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
19	0	0.0%	1	2.2%	177
20L	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
20W	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
21	1	3.0%	1	2.2%	21
22	1	3.0%	2	4.3%	143
23	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
23A	1	3.0%	1	2.2%	23
24	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
25	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
26	0	0.0%	3	6.5%	194
27	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
28	1	3.0%	1	2.2%	91
29	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
30	1	3.0%	1	2.2%	144
31	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
<i>Total</i>	33	100.0%	46	100.0%	120

- » The 2nd CSU had the most admissions and releases.
- » The longest average LOS was 315 days (approximately 10 months) in the 1st CSU.





3 Forecasts

Population forecasts in state and local correctional facilities are essential for criminal justice budgeting and planning in Virginia. The forecasts are used to estimate operating expenses and future capital needs and to assess the impact of current and proposed criminal justice policies. In order to fulfill the requirements of Item 379 of Chapter 3 of the 2012 Acts of Assembly (Special Session I), the Secretary of Public Safety completes offender population forecasts for the juvenile local-responsible (detention center) population, juvenile state-responsible (JCC) population, adult local-responsible jail population, and adult state-responsible inmate population.

To produce the forecasts, the Secretary of Public Safety utilizes an approach known as “consensus forecasting.” This process brings together policy makers, administrators and technical experts from all branches of state government. The Technical Advisory Committee is composed of experts in statistical and quantitative methods from several agencies. While individual members of the committee generate the prisoner forecasts, the Technical Advisory Committee as a whole carefully scrutinizes each forecast according to the highest statistical standards.

Forecasts selected are presented to the Liaison Work Group which evaluates the forecasts and provides guidance to the Technical Advisory Committee. The Liaison Work Group includes deputy directors and senior managers of criminal justice and budget agencies, as well as staff of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees.

Forecasts accepted by the Liaison Work Group are then presented to the Policy Committee. Led by the Secretary of Public Safety, the Policy Committee reviews the various forecasts, making any adjustments deemed necessary to account for emerging trends or recent policy changes, and selects the official forecast for each offender population. The Policy Committee is made up of lawmakers, agency directors, and other top officials and includes representatives of Virginia’s law enforcement, prosecutor, police, sheriff, and jail associations. Through the consensus process, a separate forecast is produced for each of the four major correctional populations.

The forecasts, approved in September 2012, were based on all of the statistical and trend information known at the time that they were produced. For many reasons, there is considerable uncertainty regarding the future growth or decline of Virginia’s correctional populations. For instance, the duration of the current economic downturn and the timing and pace of recovery are not known. The depth and length of the economic recession may influence the numbers and types of crimes committed in the Commonwealth. Additionally, with both state and local governments forced to reduce spending, there may be shifts in the prioritization and deployment of law enforcement resources. Furthermore, selected prison facilities have been closed and various community corrections programs have been eliminated or trimmed as a result of budget reductions. The availability of cocaine, reported to have declined during the last four years, could begin to increase once again. The forecast committees will continue to monitor the offender populations monthly in order to identify and analyze any changes as quickly as possible.


Summaries of the two juvenile population forecasts are presented in this section. For the full forecast report by the Secretary of Public Safety, see the Reports to the General Assembly on Virginia’s Legislative Information System.

Juvenile Local-Responsible (Detention Center) Population

The juvenile local-responsible offender population encompasses all juveniles held in locally-operated detention centers around the Commonwealth. Local governments or multi-jurisdictional commissions operate secure detention center programs throughout the Commonwealth. The programs provide safe and secure housing for juveniles accused of felonies or Class 1 misdemeanors. The Board of Juvenile Justice promulgates regulations and is responsible for licensure of these facilities. DJJ, based on funding included in the Appropriation Act, provides up to half the cost of construction of detention centers and provides a portion of the cost of operations. Historically, the majority of detention center



Juvenile Detention Center ADP and Forecast, FY 2003-2012*



* The data presented above does not match the official forecast report because data were updated since the official report was released.

capacity has been utilized for pre-D detention of juveniles pending adjudication, disposition, or placement. Post-D detention may serve as an alternative to state commitment and is used by the courts primarily for offenders with less serious offenses who require treatment in a secure setting. Post-D confinement cannot exceed 180 days. Post-D utilization typically represents about 15% of detention center capacity.

Between FY 2003 and FY 2005, detention center ADP decreased from 1,053 to 1,028 juveniles, then increased to 1,073 in FY 2006. The ADP has decreased each year since FY 2006. Between FY 2009 and FY 2010, the ADP decreased by 14.5% (the largest single-year decline) to 805 juveniles. In FY 2012, detention centers housed an average of 749 juveniles per day during the year. While individual facilities may vary, detention center capacity statewide has not been fully utilized in recent years.

Juveniles brought into a CSU charged with a felony, a Class 1 misdemeanor, violation of a court order, or a violation of probation/parole are eligible for placement in detention centers. The total number of juvenile intake cases has decreased in each of the last five years. In particular, the number of juveniles brought into a CSU who were eligible for detainment in a detention center decreased. Actual detention detainments decreased 30.4% between FY 2007 and FY 2012.

Detention Forecast

After careful evaluation of both the DJJ and the Department of Planning and Budget projections, the Policy Committee approved the DJJ projection as the official forecast of the juvenile detention center population in FY 2012. The Policy Committee did not identify indicators to suggest that the downward trend in the de-

tention center population is ending or reversing. It is anticipated that this population will continue to decline throughout the forecast horizon. The ADP for FY 2018 is projected to be 506 juveniles.

Juvenile State-Responsible (JCC) Population

The juvenile state-responsible offender population refers to the number of juveniles held in DJJ JCCs. This population has been decreasing since FY 2000. The population decreased from 882 at the end of FY 2009 to 813 at the close of FY 2010, a decrease of 7.8%. In FY 2012, the population decreased by 8.3% to 741 juveniles. Since FY 2003, admissions to JCCs have decreased by 57.7%, from 1,181 to 499 in FY 2012. Some of the decline can be attributed to a July 1, 2000, change in the minimum criteria for a juvenile to be committed to DJJ (from a felony or two Class 1 misdemeanor adjudications to a felony or four Class 1 misdemeanor adjudications). That policy change, however, cannot explain the persistent downward trend in commitments.

As mentioned in the previous section on the detention center population, the total number of juvenile intake

Both the JCC and detention center populations have been decreasing since FY 2003. Population forecasts to FY 2018 for both groups project that the decrease will continue.



Juvenile Intake Cases by Most Serious Offense, FY 2008-2012*

Most Serious Offense at Intake	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Felonies against person	3,556	3,237	2,776	2,524	2,332
Other felonies	7,588	7,293	5,925	5,267	5,342
Class 1 misdemeanors	26,881	27,193	24,464	23,174	21,643
Other (excluding status offenses)*	15,419	15,010	13,875	13,372	13,275

* Juveniles cannot be committed for status offenses.

cases has dropped for the past five years. In particular, felony intake cases decreased by 31.1% between FY 2008 and FY 2012.


In addition, recent DJJ policies may have affected intakes and admissions. DJJ has implemented policies that emphasize the use of validated, structured decision-making tools in various aspects of community and institutional operations. Decision points include the initial decision to detain, the assignment to various levels of community probation or parole supervision, and the classification of committed juveniles within the institutional setting. Tools include the DAI, YASI, and the JCC classification instrument. The DAI is designed to enhance consistency and equity in the detention decision and to ensure that only those juveniles who represent a serious threat to public safety or failure to appear in court are held in secure pre-trial detention. The YASI is an enhanced risk and needs assessment tool which will replace the previous risk assessment instrument. The JCC classification system is an objective classification system that enables

staff to assess a juvenile's appropriate security and custody level, determine the most appropriate services and programs, assign juveniles to appropriate housing within the facility, and assess juveniles for placement in the community. Finally, DJJ has implemented policies to address juvenile probation and parole violators. The goal is to enhance consistency and equity in the handling of violators and to ensure that only those juveniles who represent a serious threat to public safety are confined.


While admissions are a critical factor driving the JCC population, LOS in DJJ facilities also affects the size of the population. The change in commitment criteria in 2000 meant that juveniles with a limited misdemeanor record could no longer be committed to DJJ; those juveniles historically had the shortest LOSs with DJJ. By removing juveniles with the shortest LOSs the average LOS among the remaining juveniles is longer.

The composition of commitments to DJJ has continued to change as well, and juveniles with longer commitment terms now make up a larger proportion of those received by DJJ. There are three categories of juvenile commitments: indeterminate commitments, determinate commitments, and blended sentences. For a juvenile with an indeterminate commitment, DJJ determines how long the juvenile will remain in facility, up to a maximum of 36 months. These juveniles are assigned a LOS range based on guidelines that consider the juvenile's current offenses, prior offenses, and length of prior record. Failure to complete a mandatory treatment program such as substance abuse or sex offender treatment or the commission of institutional offenses could prolong the actual LOS beyond the assigned range. For a juvenile given a determinate commitment to DJJ, the judge sets the commitment period to be served (up to age 21); however, the juvenile can be released at the judge's discretion prior to serving the entire term. None-

JCC Admissions and June ADP, FY 2003-2012



JCC Admissions Forecast, FY 2003-2012



theless, determinately committed juveniles remain in DJJ facilities longer, on average, than juveniles with indeterminate commitments to DJJ. The average sentence for a juvenile given a determinate commitment in FY 2012 was approximately 36 months. Finally, a juvenile given a blended sentence can remain at a DJJ facility up to age 21 before being transferred to DOC to serve the remainder of his term in an adult facility. Juveniles with determinate commitments and those with blended sentences now make up a larger share of admissions to DJJ, increasing from 7.5% of all admissions in FY 2001 to nearly 19% of admissions in FY 2010. This percentage decreased slightly to 16% in FY 2012.

As the percentage of admissions with longer LOSs has increased, the composition of the state's JCCs has changed over time. Juveniles with longer LOSs (e.g., juveniles with an assigned LOS of 18 months or more on an indeterminate commitment, juveniles with a determinate commitment, and those with a DJJ/DOC blended


sentence) now make up a larger proportion of the JCC population compared to a decade ago.

JCC Forecast

Given the long-term downward trend in juvenile admissions, statistical models based on historical data are not useful tools in projecting future admissions. In four of the last seven years, the Policy Committee elected not to use the statistical forecast of juvenile admissions and instead set a level admissions forecast equal to the number of actual admissions during the most recent FY. In the other years, the Policy Committee utilized the statistical projection for the early years of the forecast horizon and then assumed a flat admissions forecast for the remaining years of the forecast period.

For this year's forecast, the Policy Committee approved the use of the DJJ admissions forecast for FY 2013, and a

JCC ADP Forecast, FY 2003-2012



flat admissions forecast from FY 2014 through FY 2018. Under this admissions forecast, it is assumed that admissions will continue to fall through FY 2013 and then level off for the remainder of the forecast horizon.

The approved forecast suggests that the ADP in JCCs will continue to decrease in the short term. The forecast projects a decline through FY 2015, when the population is expected to reach 580 juveniles. Beginning in FY 2016, however, the population of juveniles in JCCs is expected to grow again. This turnaround can be attributed to the longer LOSs, on average, for juveniles committed today compared to those committed just a few years ago. By the end of FY 2018, the forecast increases to 593 juveniles. Because admissions are a critical driver of the JCC population, the forecast committees will monitor admissions closely over the next FY.





4 Recidivism

Recidivism, or reoffending, is an important concept for juvenile and adult criminal justice systems because it provides a measure of outcome success. In terms of public awareness, this concept is usually the primary measure of interest when evaluating program effectiveness. Use of a standardized measure of recidivism allows evaluation across different types of programs. However, comparison of results is difficult because evaluation methodologies vary widely. Definitions of recidivism differ from study to study, and characteristics of the juveniles studied may not be adequately identified.

Within recidivism research there are three commonly accepted definitions used to measure reoffending:

- » *Rearrest* refers to a petitioned juvenile complaint for a new criminal offense made at intake or an adult arrest for a new criminal offense. Rearrest is an important measure of reoffending because it represents the initial official contact with the criminal justice system. Uses of rearrest rates are limited as a gauge of reoffending because rearrest measures police activity, and juveniles may be rearrested for offenses they did not actually commit.
- » *Reconviction* refers to a delinquent adjudication for a delinquent act or a guilty conviction of a criminal offense. This measure represents a more stringent way to measure reoffending. Because reconviction rates are based on the final disposition for an offense, only cases with a court finding of delinquency or guilt are counted.
- » *Reincarceration* refers to a return to incarceration subsequent to rearrest and reconviction on a new delinquent or criminal offense. This measure indicates that the new offense is serious enough to warrant a return to incarceration.

DJJ's Study of Juvenile Reoffending

Data on juvenile offenders in Virginia are contained in DJJ's electronic data management system. The system contains information on juvenile intakes, detainments, commitments to JCCs or other incarceration alternatives, and probation placements for all localities within Virginia. This information allows for the standardized

examination of juvenile reoffending patterns. DJJ also obtains statewide adult arrest and conviction information from VSP and VCSC. In addition, DJJ acquires information on subsequent incarcerations from DOC and the Virginia Compensation Board. Information from these sources enables the study of statewide juvenile reoffending patterns with long-term follow-up periods.

Juvenile reoffending patterns for FY 2007 through FY 2011 were examined for this report. Juvenile and adult arrest data on juveniles released from JCCs or placed on probation during these years were examined. The follow-up period ranged from three months to three years from the date the juvenile was released or placed. Demographic information for reoffenders was also included.

Although all three measures of reoffending were included in this report, it is important to note that the official DJJ recidivism definition is based on measures of reconviction. In February 2000, the Director of DJJ issued an administrative directive (07-710) that established an official definition for recidivism to be used by DJJ (this directive was updated in December 2004).

For the purposes of reporting recidivism rates of juveniles as required by § 2.2-222 of the *Code of Virginia*, DJJ uses the following definition:

A recidivist is a person who is found by a court to have committed, after being (a) placed on probation or (b) released from confinement, a delinquent or criminal act other than violation of probation or parole.

For the current recidivism definition, DJJ collects all instances of petitioned delinquent intakes and adult arrests for criminal activity for which a juvenile has been adjudicated guilty occurring after a juvenile is released from a JCC or is placed on probation. Technical violations are not included in this definition of reoffending. Tracking information for subsequent juvenile and adult offenses provides a better measure of reoffending than simply gathering information from the juvenile justice system alone.



Reoffense Rates for JCC Releases and Probation Placements

Reoffense data were examined for the following cohorts:

- » JCC Releases – all juveniles released from JCCs between FY 2007 and FY 2011
- » Probation Placements – all juveniles placed on probation between FY 2007 and FY 2011
- » Juveniles in DJJ Programs – all juveniles who were in various treatment programs (including juveniles served by VJCCCA) or incarceration alternatives (including post-D detention programs) between FY 2009 and FY 2011

Tables on the next pages include the following data:

- » Rearrest rates are presented for FY 2007 to FY 2011 for both JCC release and probation placement cohorts as well as FY 2009 to FY 2011 for VJCCCA Placements.
- » Reconviction rates are presented for FY 2007 to FY 2010 for both JCC release and probation placement cohorts.
- » Reincarceration rates are presented for FY 2007 to FY 2010 JCC releases. These rates represent recommitment back into a JCC, incarceration in a penitentiary (not including blended sentences), or a jail sentence imposed by a judge. Data on any commitment to a JCC or an adult incarceration are also included for the post-D detention program cohorts.

Only petitioned delinquent intakes were used for analysis. Reoffense data did not include the following offenses: violation of probation or parole, contempt of court, failure to appear (non-felony or misdemeanor), non-criminal DR/CW complaints, or non-criminal traffic violations.

When the length of time to rearrest or reconviction is reported, it indicates the time between the date the juvenile was released from a JCC or placed on probation and the date of a new arrest. For reincarceration length of time, the difference between the release date from a JCC and the reincarceration date was used.

There is a slight discrepancy between the total number of JCC releases/probation placements in the reoffense analysis when compared with the total number of juveniles released from the JCCs or placed on probation reported in other sections of this report. This slight discrepancy is due to the following methodological criteria used to establish the cohorts:

- » Probation placement cohorts did not include those few juveniles with missing date of birth data. This information is required to match cases in different state data systems (such as DJJ's electronic data management system and the VCIN used by the VSP).
- » Juveniles released from the JCCs under the following conditions were not included in the reoffense analysis: juveniles placed into RDC pre-dispositionally but not committed to the JCCs, juveniles sent directly to DOC upon release from the JCCs, or juveniles released from the JCCs on appeal (these juveniles were included in the analysis for any subsequent admissions and releases once the appeal process was completed and the juveniles were found guilty).

Data are not comparable to previous reports due to changes in methodology. All violations of probation, parole, and conditions of release (all VCCs with a CBC, CDI, SSV, PRB, PRP, PAR, CON, BND, and PRE) are excluded from this analysis.

12-Month Reoffense Rates for JCC Releases and Probation Placements in FY 2007-2011, Tracked Through FY 2012*

	JCC Releases					Probation Placements				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Rearrest	49.6%	46.6%	48.6%	44.9%	42.3%	34.4%	35.0%	35.3%	36.3%	34.4%
Reconviction	34.7%	36.4%	36.0%	35.5%	N/A	20.5%	21.9%	22.4%	24.2%	N/A
Reincarceration	17.7%	16.8%	16.9%	18.1%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

* Reincarceration rates for probation placements are not applicable because, by definition, a juvenile must be committed before being reincarcerated.

- » Rearrest rates of JCC releases are higher than those of probation placements.
- » The 12-month rearrest rate for JCC releases decreased 7.3% from FY 2007 to FY 2011.
- » The 12-month reconviction rate for JCC releases remained relatively stable from FY 2008 and FY 2010.
- » The 12-month reincarceration rate for JCC releases remained relatively stable from FY 2008 and FY 2010.
- » The 12-month rearrest rate for probation placements remained relatively stable from FY 2007 to FY 2011.
- » The 12-month reconviction rate for probation placements increased 3.7% from FY 2007 to FY 2010.

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. Any changes to data after the date of download are not reflected in this report.



Rearrest Rates for JCC Releases and Probation Placements in FY 2007-2011, Tracked Through FY 2012

Time to Reoffense	JCC Releases					Probation Placements				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
3 months	14.3%	12.0%	11.7%	13.5%	11.9%	13.7%	14.2%	15.0%	14.7%	13.5%
6 months	28.6%	25.8%	24.9%	27.2%	26.7%	22.8%	23.2%	24.2%	24.3%	22.4%
12 months	49.6%	46.6%	48.6%	44.9%	42.3%	34.4%	35.0%	35.3%	36.3%	34.4%
24 months	69.4%	64.6%	67.2%	65.8%	N/A	46.4%	46.8%	47.6%	51.0%	N/A
36 months	77.3%	74.2%	75.2%	N/A	N/A	52.4%	53.4%	55.3%	N/A	N/A

- » Rearrest rates for probation placements have been consistently lower than rearrest rates for JCC releases since FY 2007 (with the exception of the 3-month rates in FY 2008 through FY 2011).
- » 24-month rearrest rates for JCC releases decreased 3.6% from FY 2007 to FY 2010.
- » 36-month rearrest rates for JCC releases decreased 2.1% from FY 2007 to FY 2009.
- » 24-month rearrest rates for probation placements increased 4.6% from FY 2007 to FY 2010.
- » 36-month rearrest rates for probation placements increased 2.9% from FY 2007 to FY 2009.

Rearrest rates reflect the level of official contact juveniles have with the justice system after release or placement. Evaluation of rearrest rates provides a sense of the *maximum rate* of known reoffending.

12-Month Rearrest Rates by Demographics, FY 2011 JCC Releases and Probation Placements Tracked Through FY 2012*

Demographics	JCC Releases			Probation Placements		
	Total	Rearrests		Total	Rearrests	
Race						
Black	376	161	42.8%	2,422	938	38.7%
White	166	70	42.2%	2,819	872	30.9%
Asian	3	1	33.3%	63	20	31.7%
Other	27	10	37.0%	333	110	33.0%
Ethnicity - Hispanic	34	15	44.1%	565	190	33.6%
Sex						
Male	536	232	43.3%	4,150	1,548	37.3%
Female	36	10	27.8%	1,487	392	26.4%
Age						
Under 12	0	N/A	N/A	39	7	17.9%
12	1	0	0.0%	127	36	28.3%
13	2	1	50.0%	345	125	36.2%
14	5	3	60.0%	700	232	33.1%
15	17	10	58.8%	1,070	394	36.8%
16	53	31	58.5%	1,495	513	34.3%
17	165	70	42.4%	1,612	560	34.7%
18 or older	329	127	38.6%	249	73	29.3%
Total	572	242	42.3%	5,637	1,940	34.4%

- » Black juveniles had the highest rearrest rates of all races in the demographic analysis.
- » 44.1% of Hispanic JCC releases and 33.6% of Hispanic probation placements were rearrested.
- » Males had higher rearrest rates than females.
- » Caution should be used in making comparisons between age groups. Some age groups comprise a small number of juveniles. Therefore, the rearrest of only a few juveniles can strongly influence the rate. For example, there were only five juveniles in FY 2011 who were age 14 when they were released from a JCC.

* Total numbers of JCC releases and probation placements reported in this section differ from total numbers reported in other sections. See page 46 for an explanation of these slight variations.



Reconviction Rates for JCC Releases and Probation Placements in FY 2007-2010, Tracked Through FY 2012*

Time to Reoffense	JCC Releases				Probation Placements			
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2007	2008	2009	2010
3 months	7.9%	8.4%	8.2%	9.7%	7.3%	7.3%	7.7%	8.5%
6 months	17.4%	16.9%	17.5%	19.8%	12.5%	13.1%	13.9%	15.0%
12 months	34.7%	36.4%	36.0%	35.5%	20.5%	21.9%	22.4%	24.2%
24 months	58.1%	55.1%	55.6%	N/A	32.2%	33.5%	34.1%	N/A
36 months	67.7%	66.7%	N/A	N/A	39.7%	40.9%	N/A	N/A

* Because of cases still pending at the time of analysis, reconviction rates for FY 2011 JCC releases and probation placements are unavailable. Reconviction rates may increase slightly when reexamined next year because of updated final case dispositions.

- » Reconviction rates for probation placements have been consistently lower than rearrest rates for JCC releases since FY 2007.
- » 12-month reconviction rates for JCC remained relatively stable between FY 2007 and FY 2011.
- » The 24-month reconviction rate for JCC releases decreased 2.5% from FY 2007 to FY 2009.
- » The 36-month reincarceration rate for JCC releases remained relatively stable from FY 2007 to FY 2008.
- » Reconviction rates for probation placements increased at each measurement interval during the FYs examined, with the exception of the 3-month rate from FY 2007 to FY 2008.

DJJ's official definition of recidivism requires a new conviction. This rate is preferred because it considers the final adjudication of delinquency/guilt rather than the level of arrest activity.

12-Month Reconviction Rates by Demographics, FY 2010 JCC Releases and Probation Placements Tracked Through FY 2012*

Demographics	JCC Releases			Probation Placements		
	Total	Reconvictions		Total	Reconvictions	
Race						
Black	432	164	38.0%	2,474	717	29.0%
White	179	52	29.1%	2,666	542	20.3%
Asian	6	2	33.3%	71	10	14.1%
Other	40	15	37.5%	340	76	22.4%
Ethnicity - Hispanic	36	16	44.4%	521	129	24.8%
Sex						
Male	609	221	36.3%	4,165	1,117	26.8%
Female	48	12	25.0%	1,386	228	16.5%
Age						
Under 12	0	N/A	N/A	42	3	7.1%
12	0	N/A	N/A	104	18	17.3%
13	3	0	0.0%	309	74	23.9%
14	8	4	50.0%	675	177	26.2%
15	32	13	40.6%	1,119	264	23.6%
16	115	39	33.9%	1,476	367	24.9%
17	202	73	36.1%	1,602	386	24.1%
18 or older	297	104	35.0%	224	56	25.0%
Total	657	233	35.5%	5,551	1,345	24.2%

- » Black juveniles had the highest reconviction rates of all races in the demographic analysis.
- » 44.4% of Hispanic JCC releases and 24.8% of Hispanic probation placements were reconvicted.
- » Males had higher reconviction rates than females.
- » Caution should be used in making comparisons between age groups. Some age groups comprise a small number of juveniles. Therefore, the rearrest of only a few juveniles can strongly influence the rate. For example, there were only eight juveniles in FY 2010 who were age 14 when they were released from a JCC.

* Total numbers of JCC releases and probation placements reported in this section differ from total numbers reported in other sections. See page 46 for an explanation of these slight variations.

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. Any changes to data after the date of download are not reflected in this report.



Reincarceration rates are based on any new commitment to DJJ, incarceration with DOC, or a post-conviction sentence to a local jail. Only jail sentences imposed by a judge after a conviction were included in this analysis.

Reincarceration Rates for JCC Releases in FY 2007-2010, Tracked Through FY 2012*

Time to Reoffense	JCC Releases			
	2007	2008	2009	2010
3 months	2.4%	2.8%	1.1%	2.7%
6 months	6.8%	6.4%	6.3%	6.7%
12 months	17.7%	16.8%	16.9%	18.1%
24 months	35.9%	32.0%	35.3%	N/A
36 months	48.1%	44.7%	N/A	N/A

* Reincarceration rates presented in this report may differ from rates presented in previous years because of updated information obtained from DOC and from the Virginia Compensation Board (local jail sentence information) for FY 2006 through FY 2010 JCC Releases.

- » The 3-month reincarceration rate remained relatively stable from FY 2007 and FY 2010.
- » The 6-month reincarceration rate remained relatively stable from FY 2007 and FY 2010.
- » The 12-month reincarceration rate remained relatively stable from FY 2007 and FY 2010.
- » The 24-month reincarceration rate remained relatively stable from FY 2007 and FY 2009.
- » The 36-month reincarceration rate decreased from 48.1% to 44.7% between FY 2007 and FY 2008.
- » Of FY 2010 JCC releases reincarcerated for a new offense committed within 12 months of release, 11.7% were reincarcerated in a local jail, 5.2% in a JCC, and 1.2% in a DOC facility.

12-Month Reincarceration Rates by Demographics, FY 2010 JCC Releases Tracked Through FY 2012*

Demographics	JCC Releases		
	Total	Reincarcerations	
Race			
Black	432	86	19.9%
White	179	24	13.4%
Asian	6	1	16.7%
Other	40	8	20.0%
Ethnicity - Hispanic	36	7	19.4%
Sex			
Male	609	118	19.4%
Female	48	1	2.1%
Age			
Under 12	0	N/A	N/A
12	0	N/A	N/A
13	3	0	0.0%
14	8	2	25.0%
15	32	8	25.0%
16	115	20	17.4%
17	202	40	19.8%
18 or older	297	49	16.5%
Total	657	119	18.1%

* Total numbers of JCC releases and probation placements reported in this section differ from total numbers reported in other sections. See page 46 for an explanation of these slight variations.

- » Juveniles whose race was listed as "Other" had the highest reincarceration rates of all races in the demographic analysis.
- » 19.4% of Hispanic juveniles were reincarcerated.
- » Males had higher reincarceration rates than females.
- » Caution should be used in making comparisons between age groups. Some age groups comprise a small number of juveniles. Therefore, the rearrest of only a few juveniles can strongly influence the rate. For example, there were only eight juveniles in FY 2010 who were age 14 when they were released from a JCC.

Because of cases still pending at the time of analysis, reincarceration rates for FY 2011 JCC releases are unavailable.



12-Month Rearrest and Reconviction Rates by CSU, JCC Releases and Probation Placements Tracked Through FY 2012*

CSU	JCC Releases				Probation Placements			
	FY 2011		FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2010	
	Total	Rearrest	Total	Reconviction	Total	Rearrest	Total	Reconviction
1	7	14.3%	12	66.7%	224	30.4%	267	23.6%
2	32	46.9%	33	30.3%	180	47.2%	194	28.9%
2A	4	75.0%	10	40.0%	52	23.1%	47	17.0%
3	13	38.5%	18	50.0%	112	43.8%	78	32.1%
4	32	31.3%	53	30.2%	195	38.5%	212	30.2%
5	10	40.0%	18	38.9%	83	33.7%	72	23.6%
6	12	25.0%	17	11.8%	42	40.5%	59	52.5%
7	33	33.3%	41	39.0%	149	38.3%	218	33.0%
8	21	33.3%	23	13.0%	78	55.1%	73	34.2%
9	11	63.6%	11	36.4%	63	31.7%	62	33.9%
10	10	40.0%	11	54.5%	88	31.8%	112	19.6%
11	30	36.7%	34	23.5%	102	38.2%	70	32.9%
12	29	37.9%	26	42.3%	145	55.2%	156	36.5%
13	54	53.7%	57	52.6%	241	45.6%	168	44.0%
14	41	43.9%	44	45.5%	346	32.9%	366	20.8%
15	35	42.9%	41	31.7%	290	29.7%	266	24.1%
16	27	51.9%	18	33.3%	240	27.9%	257	23.3%
17A	11	27.3%	12	8.3%	189	22.2%	226	8.8%
17F	0	N/A	0	N/A	24	33.3%	6	33.3%
18	6	16.7%	8	25.0%	154	29.2%	142	25.4%
19	26	26.9%	32	28.1%	626	31.2%	578	22.0%
20L	6	66.7%	10	20.0%	170	37.6%	171	25.1%
20W	4	0.0%	4	50.0%	139	41.0%	103	19.4%
21	7	57.1%	8	37.5%	131	21.4%	127	24.4%
22	27	37.0%	10	20.0%	127	28.3%	154	26.6%
23	5	60.0%	2	50.0%	51	45.1%	18	38.9%
23A	13	69.2%	21	38.1%	66	47.0%	41	29.3%
24	16	56.3%	14	14.3%	222	38.7%	206	22.3%
25	4	25.0%	12	50.0%	72	33.3%	72	18.1%
26	16	43.8%	15	26.7%	127	39.4%	166	27.7%
27	5	40.0%	4	75.0%	148	27.7%	147	23.1%
28	3	0.0%	4	50.0%	116	28.4%	118	15.3%
29	1	0.0%	2	50.0%	128	20.3%	135	11.1%
30	2	50.0%	2	0.0%	139	28.1%	130	12.3%
31	19	68.4%	30	40.0%	378	35.4%	334	18.0%
<i>Total</i>	<i>572</i>	<i>42.3%</i>	<i>657</i>	<i>35.5%</i>	<i>5,637</i>	<i>34.4%</i>	<i>5,551</i>	<i>24.2%</i>

* Total numbers of JCC releases and probation placements reported in this section differ from total numbers reported in other sections. See page 46 for an explanation of these slight variations.

* Some CSUs had a small number of releases/placements. Therefore, the reoffense of only a few juveniles can strongly influence the rates. Caution should be used when looking at the percentages for each specific CSU and in making comparisons between CSUs.

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. Any changes to data after the date of download are not reflected in this report.



12-Month Rearrest and Reconviction Rates by Court District (previous page)

- » The CSU is identified by the J&DR district court that originally committed the juvenile to DJJ or placed the juvenile on probation.
- » Rearrest rates for JCC releases decreased in over half (55.9%) of the CSUs from FY 2010 to FY 2011. Reconviction rates for JCC releases decreased in over half (52.9%) of the CSUs from FY 2009 to FY 2010.
- » Rearrest rates for probation placements decreased in over half (62.9%) of the CSUs from FY 2010 to FY 2011. Reconviction rates increased in over half (51.4%) of the CSUs from FY 2009 to FY 2010.

Some CSUs had a small number of placements and releases. Therefore, the reoffense of only a few juveniles can strongly influence the rates. Caution should be used when looking at the percentages for each specific CSU and in making comparisons between CSUs.

12-Month Reoffense Rates by Risk Level, JCC Releases and Probation Placements Tracked Through FY 2012*

Risk Level	JCC Releases			Probation Placements	
	FY 2011 Rearrest	FY 2010		FY 2011 Rearrest	FY 2010 Reconviction
		Reconviction	Reincarceration		
Low	15.4%	4.0%	4.0%	19.3%	11.6%
Moderate	33.3%	31.0%	17.5%	35.0%	26.4%
High	50.9%	40.6%	19.6%	55.6%	44.5%

* There were a small number of JCC Releases with a low risk level.

The YASI is completed by CSU staff to determine a juvenile's relative risk of reoffending. (See Appendix C.) According to the risk assessment score, a juvenile's reoffense risk level is classified as low, moderate, or high. The risk assessment is completed as part of a social history report and is therefore not completed for all juveniles. A juvenile's risk assessment score is one factor examined when parole supervision level is established. Juveniles with high risk assessment scores typically receive more intensive parole services when first released from the JCCs.

- » For both JCC releases and probation placements, juveniles with low risk levels had the lowest reoffense rates, and juveniles with high risk levels had the highest reoffense rates.
- » Low-risk probation placements had higher rearrest rates in FY 2011 and higher reconviction rates in FY 2010 than low-risk JCC releases.
- » Moderate-risk probation placements had higher rearrest rates in FY 2011 and lower reconviction rates in FY 2010 than moderate-risk JCC releases.
- » High-risk probation placements had higher rearrest rates in FY 2011 and higher reconviction rates in FY 2010 than high-risk JCC releases.

Reoffense rates of juveniles by risk level are consistent with probable risk to reoffend according to risk score levels.



Rearrest Rate Comparison for Juveniles Placed in VJCCCA Programs in FY 2009-2011, Tracked Through FY 2012*

Time to Reoffense	Juveniles Placed in VJCCCA			Probation Placements			JCC Releases		
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011
3 months	15.3%	14.9%	15.5%	15.0%	14.7%	13.5%	11.7%	13.5%	11.9%
6 months	23.3%	23.2%	23.3%	24.2%	24.3%	22.4%	24.9%	27.2%	26.7%
12 months	34.1%	33.9%	34.0%	35.3%	36.3%	34.4%	48.6%	44.9%	42.3%
<i>Total Juveniles</i>	<i>12,672</i>	<i>11,314</i>	<i>10,917</i>	<i>6,445</i>	<i>5,551</i>	<i>5,637</i>	<i>795</i>	<i>657</i>	<i>572</i>

* Total numbers of JCC releases and probation placements reported in this section differ from total numbers reported in other sections. See page 46 for an explanation of these slight variations.

VJCCCA programs serve thousands of juveniles each year, with a variety of programs in each locality. Rearrest, defined as a new petitioned intake or adult arrest, is one of the outcome measures chosen for the evaluation of VJCCCA programs. The rearrest rates at 3-month, 6-month, and 12-month follow-up intervals for juveniles who were placed in VJCCCA programs are provided in the table above. For comparative purposes, the rearrest rates for probation placements and JCC releases for these years are also listed.

- » The 3-month, 6-month, and 12-month rearrest rates for juveniles placed in VJCCCA programs remained relatively stable.
- » Juveniles placed in VJCCCA programs had higher 3-month rearrest rates compared to probation placements and JCC releases.
- » 6-month and 12-month rearrest rates for juveniles placed in VJCCCA programs were lower than those for both probation placements and JCC releases, with the exception of the 6-month rate for juveniles placed in VJCCCA, which was higher than the rate for probation placements.

VJCCCA Success Rates by Service Category, FY 2008*

Service Category	Total Releases	Not Rearrested			Not Reconvicted		
		12 Months	24 Months	36 Months	12 Months	24 Months	36 Months
Accountability	4,122	74.8%	61.2%	53.9%	83.6%	72.8%	65.9%
Competency Development	3,932	68.9%	55.0%	46.5%	79.6%	67.6%	60.1%
Group Homes	241	63.5%	47.3%	38.2%	75.1%	58.1%	47.7%
Public Safety	1,659	61.4%	45.6%	37.9%	72.7%	58.3%	50.8%

* Success rates differ from recidivism rates reported elsewhere in this section; see below for an explanation.

- » The Accountability service category had the highest success rates for all measures included in this analysis. This service category includes community service and restorative justice programs.
- » The Public Safety service category had the lowest success rates 12 months after release. This service category includes outreach detention/electronic monitoring and surveillance/intensive supervision programs.
- » Group Homes had the lowest success rates when examining those not reconvicted within 24 and 36 months after release.
- » Competency Development includes the following services: life skills, mentoring, and parenting skills.

Recidivism rates represent the number of juveniles who reoffend while success rates represent the number of juveniles who did **NOT** reoffend. Therefore, a high success rate indicates that fewer program participants reoffended.

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. Any changes to data after the date of download are not reflected in this report.



12-Month Reoffense Rates for Agency Programs and Commitment Alternatives, FY 2009-2011 JCC and Post-D Detention Releases Tracked Through FY 2012

	Total Juveniles			Rearrest			Reconviction		Reincarceration	
	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2011	2009	2010	2009	2010
Halfway Houses	61	52	37	26.2%	44.2%	29.7%	18.0%	30.8%	4.9%	11.5%
Hanover JCC JROTC	98	30	92	53.1%	30.0%	46.7%	41.8%	26.7%	22.4%	23.3%
RSAT Program	37	12	24	29.7%	25.0%	20.8%	16.2%	8.3%	5.4%	0.0%
Sex Offender Treatment Need	90	72	71	24.4%	27.8%	21.1%	15.6%	19.4%	4.4%	9.7%
Substance Abuse Treatment Need	561	505	466	49.7%	46.3%	45.9%	36.0%	37.0%	18.0%	18.8%
Post-D Detention (with programs)	373	340	323	53.4%	45.9%	48.3%	40.5%	34.7%	20.1%	14.4%

Many juveniles committed to DJJ participate in programs designed to meet their treatment needs. There are also various program opportunities to assist in a successful return to the community. However, not all juveniles who are adjudicated delinquent are placed in a JCC. There are commitment alternatives available for placement of juveniles who may be better served in a non-JCC residential facility.

The analysis of reoffense rates for agency programs and commitment alternatives can not be used as a comparison among the programs – these programs often serve vastly different groups of juveniles with varying offense histories, treatment needs, and skills. Additionally, some programs serve a small number of juveniles each year; in such instances, the reoffenses of only a few juveniles may result in a seemingly high overall reoffense rate. All programs in the analysis *except post-D detention* are subsets of the overall JCC population. No comparisons are made between program reoffense rates and the overall JCC release rates for that reason.

- » **Halfway Houses** - Rearrest rates increased from FY 2009 to FY 2010 and decreased from FY 2010 to FY 2011. Between FY 2009 and FY 2010, both the 12-month reconviction and 12-month reincarceration rates increased.
- » **Hanover JCC JROTC** - Rearrest rates decreased from FY 2009 to FY 2010 and increased from FY 2010 to FY 2011. Between FY 2009 and FY 2010, the 12-month reconviction rate decreased and the 12-month reincarceration rate increased slightly.
- » **RSAT Program** - Rearrest rates decreased from FY 2009 to FY 2011. Between FY 2009 and FY 2010, both the 12-month reconviction and 12-month reincarceration rates decreased.
- » **Sex Offender Treatment Need** - Rearrest rates increased from FY 2009 to FY 2010 and decreased from FY 2010 to FY 2011. Between FY 2009 and FY 2010, both the 12-month reconviction and 12-month reincarceration rates increased.
- » **Substance Abuse Treatment Need** - Rearrest rates decreased from FY 2009 to FY 2011. Between FY 2009 and FY 2010, both the 12-month reconviction and 12-month reincarceration rates increased.
- » **Post-D Detention (with programs)** - Rearrest rates decreased from FY 2009 to FY 2010 and increased from FY 2010 to FY 2011. Between FY 2009 and FY 2010, both the 12-month reconviction and 12-month reincarceration rates decreased.
- » **Diverted Intakes** (not included in table above) - Of the 8,545 juveniles with a first-time diversion in FY 2011, 21.4% were rearrested within 12 months for a new offense.





5 Program Evaluations

DJJ operates many programs for juveniles residing in JCCs and under supervision in the community. In order to monitor these programs, DJJ conducts evaluations by collecting data on juveniles and analyzing recidivism rates and other behavioral indicators. Evaluations point out ways to improve programs to ultimately benefit the juveniles who participate.

DJJ Mentoring Initiative

DJJ received funds for a mentoring program through a Byrne Justice Assistance Sub-Grant through DCJS. The program matches 20 JCC residents who are being released to communities in the Richmond and surrounding areas with mentors who will begin meeting with residents 90 days prior to release and will continue to meet with them six to nine months after release. To evaluate the program, residents are pre-tested when they begin working with a mentor and post-tested afterward. The pre- and post-test forms are exactly the same and ask questions about attitude, school, and adult role models. Mentors also fill out pre- and post-test forms to evaluate the residents' attitudes before and after the program. Additionally, mentors fill out a log after each mentoring session and a monthly report at the end of each month, which will be analyzed qualitatively for program evaluation. For grant reporting purposes, the program also tracks the number of residents served, the number of participating mentors, and the number of mentor/mentee meetings held.

Re-Entry Services

Re-entry specialists provide orientation to residents upon arrival at the facilities and identify residents that are within 120 days of release to begin re-entry services which include employability skills, life skills, restorative justice, vocational and education planning, and career assessment. Re-entry specialists were transferred to DJJ from DCE on July 1, 2011, to continue to provide re-entry services to residents in the JCCs. DJJ began collecting data on residents receiving re-entry services in March 2012. Over the past couple of months staff were trained to input data. DJJ has been reviewing the initial data.

Recidivism analyses will be conducted once complete data are available.

Classification

Placements according to the revised classification system took place from April 2011 until August 2011. September 1, 2011, will be the beginning of the post-test period. Analysis could not be completed immediately due to the required follow-up period. The evaluation of the classification system has four goals: to determine if the revision in placement guidelines has improved overall institutional behavior, to determine if the revision to the initial classification scoring system better predicts institutional behavior once placements were completed, to determine if other variables collected at RDC are predictors of institutional behavior, and to determine whether committing offense severity, institutional behavior, or other factors are the best predictor of future institutional behavior. A variety of trend analyses and statistical analyses will be conducted to meet the four goals. The evaluation is expected to be completed by the end of FY 2013.

Program evaluations are useful in analyzing the effectiveness of programs and highlighting program areas that may need attention or modification.

Male WERP

WERP was moved to the RDC from Natural Bridge JCC in May of 2011. From the fourth quarter of FY 2011 to the fourth quarter of FY 2012, 35 residents have been released from WERP. Out of those 35 residents, 8 (22.9%) have been rearrested to date. This rate is not comparable to the overall JCC release rearrest rate because of the difference in follow-up period. DJJ will continue to monitor recidivism rates of residents who have participated in WERP. However, the number of residents participating is very small, which can skew rearrest rates.



REACH


REACH is DJJ's behavioral management program in the JCCs. Residents in the program are rewarded for good behavior by earning credits and being allowed to purchase reinforcers (e.g., snacks and activities). Residents can be promoted to higher levels of the program where they receive more rewards; levels from lowest to highest are as follows: bronze, silver, gold, platinum, and diamond.

DJJ generates monthly and quarterly reports on REACH activities and operations. The monthly reports include program activity information on credits earned by residents, the number of residents in each phase of the program, the number of promotions to higher phases, and the number of institutional offenses by residents in the program. Monthly reports also include program operation information on meetings held, staff present at meetings, and the amount of data missing from the previous month. The monthly reports are sent to the facilities with a summary of the month's activities and highlighted problem areas where the facility did not meet program goal targets. The quarterly reports present the monthly data aggregated by quarter and broken down by housing unit in each of the facilities. The quarterly report also includes a comparison of all of the facilities on the monthly reporting measures that points out which measures each facility needs to improve upon in the coming quarter.

DJJ began analyzing recidivism data on JCC releases by REACH phase in the spring of 2012. Only 2009 and 2010 releases are included in the analysis because REACH was implemented in 2008 and data was not complete until 2009.


The lowest level in the REACH program is Bronze, and the highest is Diamond. Residents are promoted to higher levels for good behavior in the JCCs. Juveniles released at higher levels of REACH had lower rearrest and reconviction rates than those at lower levels.

12-Month Rearrest and Reconviction Rates for FY 2009 JCC Releases by REACH Phase



- » The rearrest rate for residents who were released at the Diamond level (40.3%) was 12.7% lower than the rearrest rate of residents released at the Bronze level (53.0%).
- » The reconviction rate for residents who were released at the Diamond level (28.7%) was 14.9% lower than the reconviction rate of residents released at the Bronze level (43.6%).

12-Month Rearrest and Reconviction Rates for FY 2010 JCC Releases by REACH Phase



- » The rearrest rate for residents who were released at the Diamond level (33.3%) was 27.1% lower than the rearrest rate of residents released at the Bronze level (60.4%).
- » The reconviction rate for residents who were released at the Diamond level (26.9%) was 18.6% lower than the reconviction rate of residents released at the Bronze level (45.5%).

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. Any changes to data after the date of download are not reflected in this report.



VJCCCA

Programs funded by VJCCCA serve juveniles before intake, adjudicated delinquent, CHINS and CHINSup, focusing on three component areas: public safety, accountability, and competency development.

VJCCCA programs generally fall into three broad categories: public safety, accountability, and competency development. VJCCCA also funds group homes, which represent a separate category.

As discussed earlier in the Programs and Services section of this report, each locality in the state creates a VJCCCA plan outlining the programs, budgets, and program goals. Additionally, localities submit an annual program evaluation, which provides an update on all program goals to determine if programs are on track with the locality's plan. The evaluation includes the actual number of service units provided compared to the projected number to be provided as indicated in the plan. The actual cost of a service unit compared to the projected cost is also provided. A service unit is a measurable part of a program's activity; for instance, in a drug-screening program, a service unit would be one drug screen, and in a substance abuse treatment program, a service unit would be one counseling session. VJCCCA annual program evaluations also report on successful completion rates of program participants; each program is responsible for having at least 75% of participants complete the program successfully. For long-term programs, evaluations include recidivism outcomes, examining the percentage of participants rearrested for new criminal offenses within 12 months of their enrollment in the program. Evaluations also include locally defined outcome measures, these are measures determined by the program itself and may not be available to be analyzed quantitatively through DJJ's electronic data system.

If a program fails to meet any of the outcomes in the program evaluation, a corrective action plan is created to improve program operations. The corrective action plan indicates why the outcome was not met, the action that has been or will be taken to correct the identified issue, the action that will be taken to ensure that the issue does not recur/continue, completion data for the action taken

or to be taken, and the person responsible for ensuring that the corrective action will occur.

DJJ also monitors recidivism in all VJCCCA programs by service category and by locality. However, recidivism is presented as a success rate, representing the percentage of juveniles who were not rearrested or reconvicted after a successful release from a VJCCCA program. See the recidivism section for a full explanation of success rates and a breakdown of VJCCCA program success rates.

MHSTP

DJJ monitors the recidivism rates of residents with MHSTP alerts and compares them to the general population. Results from the most recent analysis are presented.


DJJ also monitors whether or not MHSTP facility and community meetings are held prior to each resident's release. In these meetings, facility staff meet with staff in the community and with parents/guardians of the residents to discuss the resident's mental health treatment that was administered in the facility and to create a plan to continue mental health services for the resident after he or she is released into the community. The large majority of residents released with a MHSTP alert have both meetings prior to release, but in some special circumstances, such as an earlier release date than anticipated, the meeting is not held. DJJ plans to compare recidivism rates of residents who had both meetings to residents who did not have both meetings to measure the impact of the meetings on releases in need of mental health programming.

If a juveniles show significant symptoms of a mental health disorder when admitted to RDC, they receive mental health treatment in the facility. A MHSTP is created for the juveniles with mental health disorders to ensure they continue to receive mental health services in the community after release from the JCC.



MHSTP, continued

12-Month Rearrest Rates for JCC Releases with an MHSTP Alert, FY 2010-2012*



* Total releases includes residents with an MHSTP alert and those without an MHSTP alert. This analysis is not comparable to the treatment need analyses that follow. The treatment need analyses compare juveniles with a need to juveniles without, while this analysis compares juveniles with an alert to total releases, which includes juveniles with an alert.

50% of all JCC releases from FY 2010-2012 had an MHSTP alert.

- » Residents with an MHSTP alert released in the first two quarters of FY 2010 and those released from the first quarter of FY 2011 to the present had higher rearrest rates than total releases.
- » Rearrest rates were highest for releases with a MHSTP alert during the second quarter of FY 2011. 56.3% were rearrested within 12 months.
- » Rearrest rates were lowest for releases with a MHSTP alert during the fourth quarter of FY 2011. 39.4% were rearrested within 12 months.
- » On average, 45.8% of releases with a MHSTP alert and 44.6% of all releases were rearrested within 12 months.

During an assessment at the RDC at the beginning of commitment, juveniles may be assigned a treatment need based on their social, psychological, and offense history. Juveniles can be assigned a treatment need in one of the three categories: aggression management, substance abuse, or sex offender treatment.

Treatment Needs

DJJ calculates quarterly rearrest rates for residents who had mandatory aggression management, substance abuse, and sex offender treatment needs. A mandatory treatment need indicates that the resident had to participate in the treatment and complete treatment before his or her release. Rearrest rates of residents with mandatory treatment needs are compared to the rearrest rates of those without mandatory treatment needs. DJJ also analyzes the rearrest rates of residents with an aggression management treatment need who are rearrested for an offense against persons, residents with a substance abuse treatment need who are rearrested for a substance related offense, and residents with a sex offender treatment need who are rearrested for a sex offense.


DJJ is currently in the process of reviewing treatment program completion data. Once this process is complete, available data from previous years will be collected, and staff will be trained to ensure current program completion information is up-to-date in the database. DJJ will then analyze institutional behavior before, during, and after the program as well as long term recidivism rates of program completers.

Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding. Any changes to data after the date of download are not reflected in this report.



Aggression Management Treatment Need


12-Month Rearrest Rates for JCC Releases with an Aggression Management Treatment Need, FY 2010-2012



- » Rearrest rates are similar between juveniles released with a mandatory treatment need and juveniles released without a mandatory treatment need, fluctuating between 35% and 55%.
- » Rearrest rates were highest for residents with a mandatory treatment need released during the fourth quarter of 2010. 54.8% were rearrested within 12 months.
- » Rearrest rates were lowest for residents with a mandatory treatment need during the fourth quarter of FY 2011. 34.4% were rearrested within 12 months.
- » On average, 42.6% of juveniles with a mandatory treatment need and 43.8% without were rearrested within 12 months of release.

63% of JCC Releases in FY 2010-2012 had an identified aggression management treatment need.

12-Month Rearrest Rates for Offenses Against Persons for JCC Releases with an Aggression Management Treatment Need, FY 2010-2012*




- » Juveniles released who had a mandatory aggression management treatment need reoffended with offenses against persons at a higher rate than those who did not have a mandatory aggression management treatment need.
- » Rearrest rates for offenses against persons were highest for juveniles released with a mandatory treatment need in the first quarter of 2012. 30.9% were rearrested within 12 months for an offense against persons.
- » Rearrest rates for offenses against persons were lowest for juveniles released with a mandatory treatment need in the fourth quarter of 2011. 17.8% were rearrested within 12 months for an offense against persons.
- » On average, 23.3% of juveniles with a mandatory treatment need and 17.4% of juveniles without were rearrested for an offenses against persons within 12 months of release.

* Against persons offenses include felonies and misdemeanors against persons as categorized by the VCSC.



Substance Abuse Treatment Need


12-Month Rearrest Rates for JCC Releases with a Substance Abuse Treatment Need, FY 2010-2012



- » Juveniles who had a mandatory treatment need had higher rearrest rate every quarter except for the third quarter of 2010.
- » Rearrest rates were highest for juveniles released with a mandatory treatment need in the fourth quarter of 2010. 55.4% were rearrested within 12 months.
- » Rearrest rates were lowest for juveniles released with a mandatory treatment need in the third quarter of FY 2010. 36.6% were rearrested within 12 months.
- » On average, 45.1% of juveniles with a mandatory treatment need and 43.5% of juveniles without were rearrested within 12 months of release.

36% of JCC Releases in FY 2010-2012 had an identified substance abuse treatment need.

12-Month Quarterly Rearrest Rates for Substance Offenses, Substance Abuse Treatment Need, FY 2010-2012*




- » There is no apparent trending for rearrest for substance offenses for either group.
- » Rearrest rates for substance offenses were highest for juveniles released with a mandatory treatment need in the first quarter of 2012. 14.7% were rearrested within 12 months.
- » Rearrest rates for substance offenses were lowest for juveniles released with a mandatory treatment need in the third quarter of FY 2011. 7.4% were rearrested within 12 months.
- » On average, 8.9% of juveniles without a mandatory treatment need and 10.4% of juveniles released with a mandatory treatment need were rearrested for a substance offense within 12 months of release.

* Substance abuse offenses in this analysis include the following VCCs: All NAR, TST, DWI, and ALC offenses, OBS-3712-M4, PRI-3889-MI, PRI-3890-M1, PRI-3261-F5, PRI-3260-F6, WPN-5303-F9, WPN-5302-F9, WPN-5278-F6, WPN-5257-F6, WPN-3159-F6, BOT-6267-M9, DNG-3270-M4, ORD-9966-S9, ORD-9965-S9, ORD-9964-S9, and ASP-4845-S9.



Sex Offender Treatment Need

12-Month Quarterly Rearrest Rate, Sex Offender Treatment Need, FY 2010-2012



No juveniles with a mandatory sex offender treatment need were rearrested for sex offenses.*

* Sex offenses in this analysis include all VCCs that are OBS, SEX, and RAP, excluding OBS-3712-M4 which is included as a substance offense.

- » 10% of JCC releases in FY 2010-2012 had an identified sex offender treatment need.
- » Juveniles with a mandatory treatment need were rearrested at significantly lower rates than those without a mandatory treatment need.
- » Rearrest rates were highest for juveniles with a mandatory treatment need released during the fourth quarter of FY 2010. 38.5% were rearrested within 12 months of release.
- » Rearrest rates were lowest for juveniles with a mandatory treatment need released during the third quarter of FY 2011. None were rearrested within 12 months.
- » On average, 47.3% of juveniles without a mandatory treatment need and 19.5% of juveniles with a mandatory treatment need were rearrested within 12 months of release.

Ongoing Program Evaluation Efforts

DJJ continues to seek out partnerships with outside organizations to complete high-quality program evaluations on many of the agency's programs in the JCCs and in the CSUs. For instance, the 2nd CSU and the 13th CSU have collaborated with the University of Cincinnati's Center for Criminal Justice Research to conduct in-depth evaluations on a variety of programs using both qualitative and quantitative research techniques.






6 Expenditures and Staffing

Expenditures

DJJ Operating Expenditures, FY 2012

During FY 2012, DJJ expended a total of \$ 190.3 million. Of that amount, 97.1% (\$184.7 million) was General Fund Expenditures and 2.9% (\$5.6 million) was Non-General Fund Expenditures. Transfer payments to localities for VJCCCA, detention, and locally-operated CSUs accounted for 23.6% of all expenditures.



JCC Expenditures and Per Bed Cost, FY 2012*

	Beaumont	Bon Air	Culpeper	Hanover	Oak Ridge	RDC	Total
Administration	\$2,416,028	\$1,369,729	\$1,278,974	\$1,395,968	\$1,231,335	\$960,665	\$8,652,699
Classification	\$187	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,005,094	\$1,005,281
Food Services	\$1,522,028	\$1,110,121	\$809,739	\$751,412	\$86,480	\$1,084,307	\$5,364,087
Juvenile Supervision	\$11,517,885	\$8,441,621	\$7,229,875	\$4,464,486	\$2,521,412	\$4,849,687	\$39,024,966
Maintenance	\$2,291,052	\$1,230,763	\$1,602,282	\$1,774,867	\$324,507	\$923,939	\$8,147,410
Medical Services	\$2,574,461	\$1,742,399	\$1,330,434	\$1,124,772	\$361,052	\$1,227,579	\$8,360,697
Treatment	\$2,549,520	\$1,729,634	\$1,337,738	\$1,154,343	\$414,261	\$707,759	\$7,893,255
Total	\$22,871,161	\$15,624,267	\$13,589,042	\$10,665,848	\$4,939,047	\$10,759,030	\$78,448,395

\$78,448,395 Total Expenditures (Excluding DCE Expenditures)

917 Capacity (Including RDC)

\$ 85,549 Per Bed Cost

* Data are not comparable to reports produced prior to FY 2011 due to changes in categories and methodology.



Staffing

CSU Staffing (Filled Positions) as of June 30, 2012*

CSU	Clerical/Admin. Support	Psychologist	Probation Officers	Probation Supv/Mgrs.	CSU Director	Total
1	5	0	18	4	1	28
2	7	0	20	4	1	32
2A	3	0	4	2	1	10
3	6	0	13	3	1	23
4	9	0	37	8	1	55
5	4	0	10	3	1	18
6	5	0	7	3	1	16
7	8	0	25	5	1	39
8	5	0	16	3	1	25
9	7	0	12	4	1	24
10	6	0	11	3	1	21
11	5	0	10	2	1	18
12	6	0	17	3	1	27
13	8	0	27	7	1	43
14	5	0	22	4	1	32
15	8	0	27	6	1	42
16	7	0	14	5	1	27
18	5	0	11	4	1	21
20L	2	0	7	3	1	13
20W	1	0	4	2	1	8
21	4	0	8	2	0	14
22	6	0	13	2	1	22
23	1	0	6	1	1	9
23A	4	0	11	2	1	18
24	5	0	16	3	1	25
25	6	0	11	2	1	20
26	4	0	11	2	1	18
27	5	0	13	2	1	21
28	4	0	7	2	1	14
29	7	1	12	2	1	23
30	4	0	9	2	1	16
31	6	1	25	6	1	39
<i>Total Filled Positions</i>	168	2	454	106	31	761

* Districts 17A, 17E, and 19 are not included because they are locally funded. Part-time employee positions are represented as one position.

» 59.7% of filled positions in the CSUs were probation officers (intake, probation, and parole).

» There were 66 vacant positions statewide in the CSUs; 66.7% of the vacancies were for probation officer positions.



JCC Staffing (Filled Positions) as of June 30, 2012*

Job Title	Beaumont	Bon Air	Culpeper	Hanover	Oak Ridge	RDC	Total
Superintendent	1	1	1	1	0	1	5
Assistant Superintendent	3	2	2	2	1	2	12
Major	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Captain	4	5	1	0	0	1	11
Lieutenant	4	4	5	5	4	4	26
Sergeant	13	11	14	12	4	9	63
JCO/JCO Senior	175	137	108	46	38	66	570
Treatment Staff	16	14	11	8	1	13	63
Medical Staff	9	13	3	4	0	0	29
Maintenance Staff	12	0	9	10	0	0	31
Food Service Staff	17	14	12	10	0	10	63
Clerical/Administrative Staff	12	17	11	9	4	12	65
BSU Staff	11	12	5	6	2	12	48
<i>Total Filled Positions</i>	<i>278</i>	<i>231</i>	<i>182</i>	<i>113</i>	<i>54</i>	<i>130</i>	<i>988</i>

* Bon Air, Oak Ridge, and RDC share staff at Central Infirmary (Filled: 7; Vacant: 1) and Central Maintenance (Filled: 15; Vacant: 1).

» 57.7% of filled positions in the JCCs were JCOs.

» There were 147 vacant positions in the JCCs: 21.8% at Beaumont JCC, 20.4% at Bon Air JCC, 19.0% at Culpeper JCC, 23.1% at Hanover JCC, 5.4% at Oak Ridge JCC, and 10.2% at RDC.





7 Appendices

Appendix A: Miscellaneous/Other Offenses

The following offense categories were grouped into the combined category of Miscellaneous/Other in the offense category distribution tables in this report. They were selected to be collapsed into this category due to their low incidence.

- » Abortion
- » Accomplice
- » Agriculture, Horticulture, & Food
- » Animals
- » Arrests (for use by Police & Magistrates)
- » Bail
- » Boating
- » Bribery
- » Computer Crime
- » Conservation
- » Conspiracy
- » Dangerous Conduct
- » Drugs/Cosmetics Misbranded
- » Emblems
- » Fare, Fail to Pay, etc.
- » Fire Protection/Safety
- » Gambling
- » Game, Fish, Wildlife
- » Interstate Compact
- » Judicial Reviews
- » J&DR District Court - Other
- » Lottery
- » Mental Health
- » Miscellaneous Crime
- » Money Laundering
- » Ordinance, City or County
- » Paraphernalia, Controlled
- » Peace, Conservator of the
- » Perjury
- » Pornography Registry, Child
- » Prisoners
- » Riot and Unlawful Assembly
- » School - Student's Behavior
- » School Attendance
- » Solicitation
- » Terrorism
- » Trade and Commerce
- » Treason
- » Venue
- » Violent Activities
- » Waters, Ports, & Harbors



Appendix B: DAI

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE JUSTICE
DETENTION ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

Juvenile Name: _____ DOB: ____/____/____ Juvenile #: _____ ICN# _____
 Intake Date: ____/____/____ Time: ____:____ AM PM Worker Name: _____ CSU #: _____
 Completed as Part of Detention Decision: Completed as Follow-Up (On-Call Intake):

	Score
1. Most Serious Alleged Offense (see reverse for examples of offenses in each category)	
Category A: Felonies against persons.....	15
Category B: Felony weapons or felony narcotics distribution.....	12
Category C: Other felonies.....	7
Category D: Class 1 misdemeanors against persons.....	5
Category E: Other Class 1 misdemeanors.....	3
Category F: Violations of probation/parole.....	2
2. Additional Charges in this Referral	
Two or more additional current felony offenses.....	3
One additional current felony offense.....	2
One or more additional misdemeanor OR violation of probation/parole offenses.....	1
One or more status offenses OR No additional current offenses.....	0
3. Prior Adjudications of Guilt (includes continued adjudications with "evidence sufficient to finding of guilt")	
Two or more prior adjudications of guilt for felony offenses.....	6
One prior adjudication of guilt for a felony offense.....	4
Two or more prior adjudications of guilt for misdemeanor offenses.....	3
Two or more prior adjudications of guilt for probation/parole violations.....	2
One prior adjudication of guilt for any misdemeanor or status offense.....	1
No prior adjudications of guilt.....	0
4. Petitions Pending Adjudication or Disposition (exclude deferred adjudications)	
One or more pending petitions/dispositions for a felony offense.....	8
Two or more pending petitions/dispositions for other offenses.....	5
One pending petition/disposition for an other offense.....	2
No pending petitions/dispositions.....	0
5. Supervision Status	
Parole.....	4
Probation based on a Felony or Class 1 misdemeanor.....	3
Probation based on other offenses OR CHINSup OR Deferred disposition with conditions.....	2
Informal Supervision OR Intake Diversion.....	1
None.....	0
6. History of Failure to Appear (within past 12 months)	
Two or more petitions/warrants/detention orders for FTA in past 12 months.....	3
One petition/warrant/detention order for FTA in past 12 months.....	1
No petition/warrant/detention order for FTA in past 12 months.....	0
7. History of Escape/ Runaways (within past 12 months)	
One or more escapes from secure confinement or custody.....	4
One or more instances of absconding from non-secure, court-ordered placements.....	3
One or more runaways from home.....	1
No escapes or runaways w/in past 12 months.....	0
8. TOTAL SCORE.....	_____

Indicated Decision: ____ 0 - 9 Release ____ 10 - 14 Detention Alternative ____ 15+ Secure Detention

Mandatory Overrides: 1. Use of firearm in current offense
 (must be detained) 2. Escapee/AWOL/Absconder per DJJ Procedure 9471
 3. Local court policy (indicate applicable policy) _____

Discretionary Override: 1. Aggravating factors (override to more restrictive placement than indicated by guidelines)
 2. Mitigating factors (override to less restrictive placement than indicated by guidelines)
 3. Approved local graduated sanction for probation/parole violation

Actual Decision / Recommendation: ____ Release ____ Alternative ____ Secure Detention



Appendix B, continued: DAI

Offense Categories and Included Offenses

Category A: Felonies Against Persons

Abduction
 Aggravated assault
 Aggravated sexual battery
 Arson of an occupied dwelling
 Assault, law enforcement officer
 Carjacking
 Escape from secure juvenile detention
 by force/violence
 Extortion
 Forcible sodomy
 Larceny > \$5 from a person
 Malicious wounding
 Murder
 Manslaughter
 Inanimate object sexual penetration
 Rape
 Reckless driving/disregard police with
 bodily injury
 Robbery

Category B: Felony Weapons & Felony Narcotics Distribution

Distribute Schedule I or II
 Distribute Schedule I, II, IV or
 marijuana on school property
 Possess Schedule I or II with intent to sell
 Sell Schedule I or II or > 1 oz. Marijuana
 to a minor 3 years junior
 Brandish/point a firearm on school property or
 within 1000 ft.
 Discharge firearm from motor vehicle
 Discharge firearm in/at an occupied building
 Possess a sawed-off shotgun

Category C: Other Felonies

Arson of an unoccupied dwelling
 Auto theft
 Burglary/Breaking and entering/
 Possess burglary tools
 Escape from a correctional facility
 (not detention)
 Failure to appear in court for a felony
 Fraud/bad checks/credit card > \$200
 Grand larceny/Larceny > \$200
 Larceny of a firearm /Receive a stolen firearm
 Possess Schedule I or II drugs
 Receive stolen goods > \$200
 Shoplift > \$200
 Unauthorized use of an automobile
 Vandalism > \$1000 damage

Category D: Misdemeanors Against Persons

Assault, simple
 Sexual battery

Category E: Other Misdemeanors

Brandish/point a firearm
 Carry concealed weapon
 Disorderly conduct
 Escape from secure juvenile detention
 without force/violence
 Fraud/bad checks/credit card < \$200
 Failure to appear for a misdemeanor
 Larceny < \$200
 Receive stolen goods < \$200

Common Aggravating / Mitigating Factors (Known at the time of Intake)

Aggravating


History of 2+ violent/assaultive offenses
 Parent unwilling to provide appropriate supervision
 Parent unable to provide appropriate supervision
 Juvenile has significant mental health problem/
 mental retardation
 Juvenile has significant substance abuse problem
 Juvenile does not regularly attend school/work
 Juvenile has violated conditions of a detention alternative
 Juvenile is charged with a new (detainable) offense
 while in a detention alternative
 Juvenile is an explicit threat to flee if released
 Juvenile is currently an absconder from a non-secure placement
 Other Aggravating factor
 Detention alternative not available

Mitigating

Juvenile marginally involved in the offense
 Parent able/willing to provide appropriate
 supervision
 Juvenile has significant mental health problem/
 mental retardation
 Juvenile has significant substance abuse problem
 Juvenile regularly attends school/work
 Offense less serious than indicated by charge
 Juvenile has no/minor prior record



Appendix C: YASI



Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument



1 Legal History

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Previous intake contacts for offenses | 8. Placements |
| 2. Age at first intake contact | 9. Juvenile detention |
| 3. Intake contacts for offenses | 10. DJJ Custody |
| 4. Felony-level offenses | 11. Escapes |
| 5. Weapon offenses | 12. Failure-to-appear in court |
| 6. Offenses against another person | 13. Violations of probation/parole/diversion |
| 7. Felony-level offenses against another person | |

2 Family

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Runaways/lock-outs | 11. Family support network |
| 2. History of child neglect | 12. Family member(s) the youth feels close to |
| 3. Compliance with parental rules | 13. Family provides opportunities for participation |
| 4. Circumstances of family members living at home | 14. Family provides opportunities for learning, success |
| 5. Historic problems of family members at home | 15. Parental love, caring and support |
| 6. Youth's current living arrangements | 16. Family conflict |
| 7. Parental supervision | |
| 8. Appropriate consequences | |
| 9. Appropriate rewards | |
| 10. Parental attitude | |

3 School

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Current enrollment status | 8. Youth believes in the value of education |
| 2. Attendance | 9. Encouraging school environment |
| 3. Conduct in past year | 10. Expulsions and suspensions |
| 4. Academic performance in past year | 11. Age at first expulsion |
| 5. Current conduct | 12. Involvement in school activities |
| 6. Current academic performance | 13. Teachers/staff/coaches youth likes |
| 7. Special education student | |

4 Community and Peers

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Associates the youth spends time with | 5. Free time spent with delinquent peers |
| 2. Attachment to positively influencing peer(s) | 6. Strength of delinquent peer influence |
| 3. Admiration/emulation of tougher delinquent peers | 7. Number of positive adult relationships in community |
| 4. Months associating with delinquent friends/gang | 8. Pro-social community ties |



Appendix C, continued: YASI

5 Alcohol and Drug

1. Alcohol and drug use
2. Receptive to substance use treatment
3. Previous substance use treatment

6 Mental Health

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mental health problems 2. Homicidal ideation 3. Suicidal ideation 4. Sexual aggression | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Physical/sexual abuse 6. Victimization |
|--|--|

7 Aggression

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Violence 2. Hostile interpretation - actions/intentions of others 3. Tolerance for frustration | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Belief in use of physical aggression to resolve a disagreement or conflict 5. Belief in use of verbal aggression to resolve a disagreement or conflict |
|---|--|

8 Attitudes

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Responsibility for delinquent/criminal behavior 2. Understanding impact of behavior on others 3. Willingness to make amends 4. Optimism | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Attitude during delinquent/criminal acts 6. Law-abiding attitudes 7. Respect for authority figures 8. Readiness to change |
|---|---|

9 Skills

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consequential thinking skills 2. Social perspective-taking skills 3. Problem-solving skills 4. Impulse-control skills to avoid getting in trouble | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Loss of control over delinquent/criminal behavior 6. Interpersonal skills 7. Goal-setting skills |
|---|---|

10 Employment and Free Time

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. History of employment 2. Number of times employed 3. Longest period of employment 4. Positive relationships with employers | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Structured recreational activities 6. Unstructured recreational activities 7. Challenging/exciting hobbies/activities 8. Decline in interest in positive leisure pursuits |
|--|---|



Appendix D: JCC Operating Capacities and Guidelines for Placements

JCC	Capacity	Classification Levels	Age Range
Beaumont	284 Males	III - High IV - Intensive	17-18.5
Bon Air	150 Males 43 Females	Males and Females: III - High IV - Intensive	Males: 11-17 Females 11-20
Culpeper	144 Males	III - High IV - Intensive	18.5-20
Hanover	120 Males	I - Low II - Medium	11-20
Oak Ridge	40 Males	I - Low II - Medium III - High IV - Intensive	11-20
RDC	116 Males 20 Females	Males and Females: I - Low II - Medium III - High IV - Intensive	Males and Females: 11-20



Appendix E: Initial Classification Custody Designation Form

INITIAL CUSTODY DESIGNATION FORM

SECTION A										DEMOGRAPHIC DATA																			
1. ASSESSMENT DATE: MM-DD-YYYY					2. COMMITMENT DATE: MM-DD-YYYY					3. LAST NAME					4. FIRST NAME					5. MIDDLE INITIAL					60 SUFFIX				
7. BIRTH DATE: MM-DD-YYYY										8. JUVENILE #																			
9. SEX: M=MALE F=FEMALE					10. COUNSELOR					11. COMMITTING COURT (FIPS)																			
SECTION B										CLASSIFICATION SCORING										Points									
1. SEVERITY OF CURRENT OFFENSE Most serious current offense (<i>according to the scale shown on the right, with "Person Felony" being the most serious</i>) for which the resident has been adjudicated guilty, including any detainers										500 = Person Felony or any Juvenile Sentenced with Active Adult Time 250 = Weapons Felony, or Circuit Court Commitment for Non-Person Felony 150 = Person Misdemeanor (with or without injury) 100 = Other Felony 50 = Non-Person Misdemeanor Offense 25 = Parole Violation																			
2. PRIOR OFFENSE HISTORY Most serious prior offense (<i>according to the scale shown on the right, with "Person Felony" being the most serious</i>) for which the resident has been adjudicated guilty										250 = Person Felony 150 = Weapons Felony, or Circuit Court Commitment for Non-Person Offense 100 = Person Misdemeanor (with or without injury) 75 = Other Felony 25 = Non-Person Misdemeanor Offense 0 = Traffic Offense, Status Offense, or None																			
3. PRIOR COMMITMENTS										25 = More than One Prior Commitment to DJJ 15 = One Prior Commitment to DJJ 0 = No Prior Commitments																			
4. ESCAPE OR RUNAWAY HISTORY										350 = Escape or Attempt to Escape, With Force Against a Person, from Any Facility or Police Custody 250 = More than One Escape or Attempt to Escape from a Secure Facility or Police Custody 175 = One Escape or Attempt to Escape from a Secure Facility or Police Custody 50 = One or More Escapes or Runaways from Non-secure Facility or Home 0 = None																			
5. ASSAULTIVE BEHAVIOR DURING PRIOR COMMITMENTS TO DJJ OR IN SECURE DETENTION Assaultive behavior refers to unprovoked assaults, not fights. Frequent fights may indicate a pattern of aggressive behavior. Does not include detention immediately preceding current commitment.										350 = More than One Instance of Assaultive Behavior with Injury 250 = One Instance of Assaultive Behavior with Injury 175 = More than One Instance of Assaultive Behavior without Injury 50 = One Instance of Assaultive Behavior without Injury, or a Pattern of Aggressive Behavior 0 = None or No Prior Commitments																			
6. INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT (RDC/DETENTION) RDC Staffing Team Assessment Includes time at RDC and time in detention immediately preceding current commitment										350 = Serious Threat to Institutional Security/Safety (pattern of predatory behavior; attempts to strong-arm/ harass/bully peers; assaultive with potential for injuries) 250 = Moderate Threat to Institutional Security/Safety (multiple fights or simple assaults without a clear pattern of predatory behavior; overly resistant to authority with a pattern of verbal abuse towards staff) 175 = Minor Threat to Institutional Security/Safety (pattern of oppositional/defiant behaviors but no pattern of predatory behavior; occasional mild reactive aggression whether verbal or physical) 50 = Frequent Compliance Problems, Not a Threat to Institutional Security/Safety 25 = Some Compliance Problems (slow to comply with authority) 0 = Good Adjustment																			
7. CUSTODY TOTAL										SUM OF ITEMS 1 thru 6																			
8. ASSIGNED CUSTODY LEVEL (Form-assigned)										I = Less than 150 Points II = 155-245 Points III = 250-495 Points IV = 500 or More Points																			
SECTION C										PLACEMENT CONSIDERATIONS																			
1. STATURE: <input type="checkbox"/> EXTRA SMALL <input type="checkbox"/> SMALL <input type="checkbox"/> MEDIUM <input type="checkbox"/> LARGE <input type="checkbox"/> EXTRA LARGE										3. RECOMMEND OVERRIDE OF FORM-ASSIGNED CUSTODY LEVEL <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES – CUSTODY LEVEL (AFTER OVERRIDE) _____ – REASON (REQUIRED) <input type="checkbox"/> Criminal Investigation Ongoing <input type="checkbox"/> Pending Court Charges <input type="checkbox"/> Active Gang Activities <input type="checkbox"/> Predatory/Manipulative Behavior Resulting in the Form of Mental or Physical Abuse of Others <input type="checkbox"/> Crime More Serious than Indicated by Charge <input type="checkbox"/> Crime Less Serious than Indicated by Charge <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ – COMMENT (REQUIRED) _____																			
2. SPECIAL MANAGEMENT CONCERNS – MARK "X" FOR ALL THAT APPLY: <input type="checkbox"/> NONE <input type="checkbox"/> PENDING CHARGES <input type="checkbox"/> INSTITUTIONAL PREDATORY OFFENSE <input type="checkbox"/> KNOWN MANAGEMENT PROBLEM <input type="checkbox"/> LOW FUNCTIONING <input type="checkbox"/> MENTAL HEALTH RISK/ DISABILITY <input type="checkbox"/> EDUCATION _____ <input type="checkbox"/> ESCAPE RISK _____ <input type="checkbox"/> SIB RISK _____ <input type="checkbox"/> GANG MEMBER _____ <input type="checkbox"/> PHYSICAL IMPAIRMENT _____ <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL MEDICAL NEEDS _____ <input type="checkbox"/> ENEMIES – INSTITUTION _____ <input type="checkbox"/> KNOWN ASSOCIATES – INSTITUTION _____ <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER _____										4. CLASSIFICATION INDICATED INSTITUTION: TREATMENT TEAM RECOMMENDED INSTITUTION: COMMENT IF DIFFERENT:																			
5. COUNSELOR SUPERVISOR _____										SIGNATURE _____																			

DIS-042: Revised March 30, 2011



Appendix F: Custody Reclassification Form

CUSTODY RECLASSIFICATION FORM – PAGE ONE of TWO

		SECTION A		DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION	
1. ASSESSMENT DATE: MM-DD-YYYY		-	-	2. INSTITUTION	
NAME: 3. LAST _____		4. FIRST _____		5. MIDDLE INIT. _____	6. SUFFIX _____
7. BIRTH DATE: MM-DD-YYYY		-	-	8. JUVENILE # _____	
9. SEX: M=MALE F=FEMALE _____		10. COUNSELOR			
11. PREVIOUS CUSTODY: _____ IV = MAXIMUM III = HIGH II = MEDIUM I = LOW		12. RECLASSIFICATION REASON: _____ 1 = QUARTERLY REVIEW 2 = INCIDENT 3 = INSTITUTIONAL TRANSFER 4 = REVISION/CORRECTION/OTHER			
		SECTION B		CUSTODY SCORING	
BEHAVIOR PRIOR TO CURRENT COMMITMENT				Points	
1. SEVERITY OF CURRENT OFFENSE Most serious current offense (<i>according to the scale shown on the right, with "Person Felony" being the most serious</i>) for which the resident has been adjudicated guilty, including any detainers	500 = Person Felony or any Juvenile Sentenced with Active Adult Time 250 = Weapons Felony, or Circuit Court Commitment for Non-Person Felony 150 = Person Misdemeanor (with or without injury) 100 = Other Felony 50 = Non-Person Misdemeanor Offense 25 = Parole Violation			_____	
2. PRIOR OFFENSE HISTORY Most serious prior offense (<i>according to the scale shown on the right, with "Person Felony" being the most serious</i>) for which the resident has been adjudicated guilty.	250 = Person Felony 150 = Weapons Felony, or Circuit Court Commitment for Non-Person Offense 100 = Person Misdemeanor (with or without injury) 75 = Other Felony 25 = Non-Person Misdemeanor Offense 0 = Traffic Offense, Status Offense, or None			_____	
3. PRIOR COMMITMENTS	25 = More than One Prior Commitment to DJJ 15 = One Prior Commitment to DJJ 0 = No Prior Commitments			_____	
4. ESCAPE OR RUNAWAY HISTORY PRIOR TO CURRENT COMMITMENT	350 = Escape or Attempt to Escape, With Force Against a Person, from Any Facility or Police Custody 250 = More than One Escapes or Attempts to Escape from a Secure Facility or Police Custody 175 = One Escape or Attempt to Escape from a Secure Facility or Police Custody 50 = One or More Escapes or Runaways from Non-secure Facility or Home 0 = None			_____	
INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT					
5. ASSAULTIVE/ESCAPE BEHAVIOR Only offenses for which the ward has been found guilty. Pattern of Aggressive Behavior - having at least four instances of the following over a six-month period: Fighting Simple Assault (Moderate Offense) Verbal Threats/Physical Gesturing Throwing Objects Abusive Language/Obscene Gesturing	400 = One or More Instances of Assault (Major Offense) with Injury, or Escapes/Attempts to Escape During Past 90 Days 300 = One or More Instances of Assault (Major Offense) with Injury During Past Year 200 = One or More Instances of Escapes/Attempts to Escape During Past Year 150 = One or More Instances of Assault (Major Offense) without Injury, During Past 90 Days 100 = One or More Instances of Assault (Major Offense) without Injury, During Past Year, OR Displayed a Pattern of Aggressive Behavior Over Past Six Months 0 = No Instances of Escape or Assault (Major Offense), or None Within the Past Year -50 = No Instances of Escape or Assault (Major Offense) During Past 18 Months (Not To Be Used Until Ward Has Remained With DJJ for at Least 18 Months)			_____	
6. FREQUENCY OF INSTITUTIONAL OFFENSES Only offenses for which the ward has been found guilty.	300 = More Than Two Majors, During Past 90 Days 150 = Two or Fewer Majors, During Past 90 Days 50 = More Than Ten Moderates, During Past 90 Days 0 = Ten or Fewer Moderates, During Past 90 Days -25 = No Offenses, During Past 90 Days -50 = No Institutional Offenses for Six Months or More			_____	
7. TREATMENT PROGRAM PARTICIPATION	200 = Expelled From Program for Disruptive Behavior, During Past 90 Days 100 = No Participation (Refuses to Participate, On Suspension), During Past 90 Days 0 = Awaiting Services, During Past 90 Days -25 = Fair Participation, During Past 90 Days -50 = Good Participation, During Past 90 Days -75 = Good Participation for Six Months or More -100 = Completed All Programs			_____	
8. EDUCATION/ WORK PROGRAM/ VOCATIONAL TRAINING PARTICIPATION	200 = Behavior is Consistently Seriously Disruptive, During Past 90 Days 100 = No Participation, During Past 90 Days 0 = Is Not In an Educational/Vocational Program -25 = Fair Participation, During Past 90 Days -50 = Good Participation, During Past 90 Days -75 = Good Participation for Six Months or More, or Successfully Completed Program			_____	
9. CUSTODY TOTAL		SUM OF ITEMS 1 thru 8			
10. FORM-RECOMMENDED RECLASSIFICATION		I = 150 or Fewer Points III = 250-495 Points		II = 155-245 Points IV = 500 or More Points	

DIS-043: Revised March 30, 2011





