

Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice

DATA RESOURCE GUIDE

FISCAL YEAR 2022



Data Resource Guide

Fiscal Year 2022

Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice
Amy Floriano, Director
December 2022



This guide fulfills the mandates set forth in §§ 2.2-222, 16.1-309.2 et seq., 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 Paragraph F of Item 426 of the 2022 Appropriation Act, Special Session I.



Table of Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | <i>Introduction and Overview</i> | 1 |
| | Agency Description | 1 |
| | Terminology | 2 |
| | Examples of Juvenile Dispositions | 8 |
| | Juveniles in Circuit Court | 9 |
| | DJJ Historical Timeline | 10 |
| | Regional Map | 11 |
| | Juvenile Justice System Process | 12 |
| | DJJ System Flow Chart | 13 |
| | Data in the DRG | 14 |
| 2 | <i>Programs and Services</i> | 15 |
| | Community Programs | 15 |
| | VJCCA | 32 |
| | JDCs | 35 |
| | Direct Care | 41 |
| 3 | <i>Special Topics</i> | 57 |
| | Youth Violence and Weapon Trends | 57 |
| | Initiative-Specific Performance Measures | 59 |
| | Types of Reoffenses | 60 |
| 4 | <i>Trends and Forecast</i> | 63 |
| | 10-Year Trends. | 63 |
| | Forecast | 68 |
| 5 | <i>Recidivism</i> | 71 |
| | Methodology | 71 |
| | 12-Month Recidivism Rate Overview. | 72 |
| | Diversion Plans | 74 |
| | Probation | 74 |
| | Direct Care | 76 |
| | Parole | 77 |
| | Risk Levels | 81 |
| | VJCCA | 83 |
| | Post-D Detention with Programs | 83 |
| 6 | <i>Expenditures and Staffing</i> | 85 |
| | Expenditures | 85 |
| | Staffing. | 87 |
| 7 | <i>Appendices</i> | 89 |
| | Appendix A: CSUs and FIPS | 90 |
| | Appendix B: YASI. | 92 |
| | Appendix C: DAI | 94 |
| | Appendix D: LOS Guidelines for Indeterminately Committed Juveniles. | 95 |
| | Appendix E: “Other” Categories | 96 |
| | Appendix F: Probation and Parole Statuses | 97 |





1 Introduction and Overview

The Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) provides services to youth and families. In FY 2022, DJJ operated 30 court services units (CSUs) (see Appendix A) and Bon Air Juvenile Correctional Center (JCC). As of June 30, 2022, DJJ audits and certifies 32 CSUs, including two locally operated units; 24 juvenile detention centers (JDCs); the JCC; eight community placement programs (CPPs); nine detention reentry programs; and 14 group homes, shelter care facilities, and independent living programs. The Board of Juvenile Justice regulates and monitors policies and activities for the programs and facilities for which DJJ is responsible. Additionally, DJJ contracts with providers for a variety of services.

Agency Description

DJJ's mission is to protect the public by preparing court-involved youth to be successful citizens. To accomplish this mission, DJJ uses an integrated approach to juvenile justice, bringing together current research and best practices to target delinquent behavior; meet the needs of court-involved youth, victims, and communities; and manage activities and resources in a responsible and proactive manner. DJJ's primary responsibilities are to hold youth accountable for wrongdoing, prevent further offending, and treat all youth fairly and equitably.

DJJ strives to balance the safety of the community with the needs of youth. When appropriate, youth may be diverted from the court system as a means to best address minor infractions and low-risk behaviors. For matters that require court involvement, DJJ uses a balanced approach that provides (i) protection of public safety by control of youth's liberties through community supervision or secure confinement, (ii) a structured system of incentives and graduated sanctions in both community and direct care settings to ensure accountability for youth's actions, and (iii) a variety of services and programs that build skills and competencies (e.g., substance abuse and aggression management treatment, academic and career readiness education). These strategies enable youth to become law-abiding members of the community during and upon release from DJJ's supervision.

DJJ is committed to using the Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR) principles by (i) focusing resources on youth with the highest risk of reoffending and (ii) addressing the individual risk factors that contribute to the initiation and continuation of delinquent behavior to create the greatest impact on offending. DJJ recognizes that successful outcomes require services that are individualized to the strengths and needs of youth, families, and communities. Individual risk factors are identified and addressed to increase the likelihood of successful outcomes. Likewise, appropriate public safety strategies such as electronic monitoring, drug screening, and various levels of supervision are matched to youth's individualized circumstances. DJJ also uses a set of research- and consensus-based instruments to guide decisions at different points within the juvenile justice system, including the initial decision to detain and the assignment to various levels of community probation or parole supervision.

DJJ continues to expand its continuum of services and alternative placements that offer programs and treatments to divert youth from further involvement with DJJ and provide appropriate dispositional options for youth under supervision that enable committed youth to return successfully to the community. DJJ contracts with two regional service coordinators (RSCs) to assist in assessing existing programming, developing new service capacity, and selecting and subcontracting with direct service providers (DSPs). Additionally, the CPPs and detention reentry programs in several JDCs provide alternatives to JCC placement for youth in direct care. These programs allow committed youth to be placed in smaller settings intended to keep them closer to family, provide individualized services to address criminogenic needs, and enhance reentry planning and services.

Although DJJ bears the primary responsibility for many aspects of Virginia's juvenile justice system, collaborative partnerships with both the public and private sectors and families are key to its work. For example, local governments and multi-jurisdictional commissions operate secure JDCs and provide an array of services to youth and families. Within each community, DJJ works with law enforcement, behavioral and mental health providers, schools, social services, and other bodies. DJJ also secures services from private providers to assist in



treating youth and connecting them to their communities. These partnerships enable DJJ to intervene effectively and efficiently in addressing the needs of youth, their families, and communities.

Agency Transformation

Nearly eight years ago, DJJ initiated a significant transformation plan. With the input of many stakeholders, DJJ undertook a rigorous self-analysis to ensure positive outcomes for the youth, families, and communities while using taxpayer resources effectively.

DJJ now has several years of reporting and reflection on the outcomes of this transformation plan. Under new leadership, DJJ will build upon the strength and successes it has achieved while developing new initiatives to address where DJJ has fallen short of its goals. As DJJ begins a new chapter, it reaffirms its commitment to the community through these strategic goals:

- » Expanding reentry services to include vocational, workforce development, and mentoring programs to provide resources that encourage a positive path for youth returning to the community;
- » Supporting successful community programs and creating new initiatives that will address the current concerns throughout the Commonwealth;
- » Building trust with law enforcement and judicial partners to ensure youth are placed in the best possible and most effective programs;
- » Addressing the concerns highlighted in the 2021 Joint Legislative Audit & Review Commission (JLARC) report, which focused on recidivism for the most serious offenders; and
- » Creating new resources to support victims and families, including those with limited English proficiency or disabilities, who have been impacted by violent crime.

As DJJ moves forward to face new challenges, it will work to accomplish these goals by maintaining the highest standards of accountability and ensuring it has the trust of the communities it serves.

DJJ will balance community safety with the rehabilitative needs of youth. Virginia's juvenile justice system must have the trust of all stakeholders, including elected leaders, judges, law enforcement, families, victims, and the broader communities.

DJJ must hold youth accountable for their actions while ensuring they receive the services they need, at the dosage they need, in order to create the greatest likelihood of success when they are no longer in DJJ's care. Addressing and preventing youth violent crime, especially

gun-related crime, must be a focus of DJJ and all community stakeholders.

DJJ will be transparent. DJJ must have an objective, critical analysis of its successes and failures. This commitment is vital to the community, the families, and the youth we serve.

Terminology

Acronyms, abbreviations, and terms commonly used by DJJ are defined below. Terms are referred to by their acronyms or abbreviations throughout the report. (In addition, see Appendix E for a listing of "Other" categories.)

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACA: American Correctional Association

ADHD: Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder

ADP: Average Daily Population

AMI: AMIkids

ART®: Aggression Replacement Training

AWOL: Absent Without Leave

BADGE: Balanced Approach Data Gathering Environment

BSU: Behavioral Services Unit

CANS: Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths

CAP: Central Admission and Placement

CCRC: Central Classification and Review Committee

CD: Conduct Disorder

CEST: Classification and Evaluation Staffing Team

CHINS: Child in Need of Services

CHINSup: Child in Need of Supervision

COVID-19: Coronavirus Disease 2019

CPMT: Community Policy and Management Team

CPP: Community Placement Program

CQI: Continuous Quality Improvement

CRCP: Comprehensive Reentry Case Plan

CSA: Children's Services Act

CSU: Court Service Unit



| | |
|---|---|
| CTE: Career and Technical Education | HFW: High Fidelity Wraparound |
| CTM: Community Treatment Model | ICJ: Interstate Compact for Juveniles |
| CTST: Classification and Treatment Services Team | ICN: Intake Case Number |
| CVIU: Cover Virginia Incarcerated Unit | ICRC: Institutional Classification and Review Committee |
| CY: Calendar Year | IEP: Individualized Education Program |
| CYT: Cannabis Youth Treatment | J&DR: Juvenile and Domestic Relations |
| DAI: Detention Assessment Instrument | JCC: Juvenile Correctional Center |
| DARS: Virginia Department of Aging and Rehabilitative Services | JDAI: Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative |
| DBHDS: Virginia Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services | JDC: Juvenile Detention Center |
| DBT: Dialectical Behavior Therapy | JP: Juvenile Profile |
| DCJS: Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services | LEA: Local Education Agency |
| DGS: Virginia Department of General Services | LOS: Length of Stay (used for probation, detention, direct care, and parole) |
| DJJ: Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice | LOS Guidelines: LOS Guidelines for Indeterminately Committed Juveniles |
| DMAS: Virginia Department of Medical Assistance Services | LRD: Late Release Date |
| DMV: Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles | MHSTP: Mental Health Services Transition Plan |
| DPB: Virginia Department of Planning and Budget | MOA: Memorandum of Agreement |
| DR/CW: Domestic Relations and Child Welfare | MOE: Maintenance of Effort |
| DRG: Data Resource Guide | MSO: Most Serious Offense |
| DSM: Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders | MST: Multi-Systemic Therapy |
| DSP: Direct Service Provider | OCS: Virginia Office of Children's Services |
| DSS: Virginia Department of Social Services | ODD: Oppositional Defiant Disorder |
| EBA: Evidence-Based Associates | OJJDP: United States Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention |
| ECO: Emergency Custody Order | PBIS: Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports |
| EOC: End of Course | PREA: Prison Rape Elimination Act |
| EPICS: Effective Practices in Community Supervision | PO: Probation/Parole Officer |
| ERD: Early Release Date | Post-D: Post-Dispositional |
| FAPT: Family Assessment and Planning Team | Pre-D: Pre-Dispositional |
| FFT: Functional Family Therapy | PYD: Positive Youth Development |
| FIPS: Federal Information Processing Standards | QA: Quality Assurance |
| FY: Fiscal Year | RDC: Reception and Diagnostic Center |
| GED®: General Educational Development | RED: Racial and Ethnic Disparities |



RNR: Risk-Needs-Responsivity

RPIC: Residential Practice Improvement Coach

RS: Resident Specialist

RSC: Regional Service Coordinator

RTI: Response to Intervention

RTC: Residential Treatment Center

SEAS: Screening for Experiences and Strengths

SGA: Student Government Association

SOL: Standards of Learning

SOP: Standard Operating Procedure

SPEP™: Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol

SPSHS: Secretary of Public Safety and Homeland Security

SY: School Year

TF-CBT: Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy

TDO: Temporary Detention Order

VADOC: Virginia Department of Corrections

VCC: Virginia Crime Code

VCIN: Virginia Criminal Information Network

VCSC: Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission

VDOE: Virginia Department of Education

VJCCCA: Virginia Juvenile Community Crime Control Act

VLDS: Virginia Longitudinal Data System

VPSTC: Virginia Public Safety Training Center

VSCC: Virginia State Crime Commission

VSP: Virginia Department of State Police

VTSS: Virginia Tiered Systems of Supports

WRS: Workplace Readiness Skills

W!SE: Working in Support of Education

YASI: Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument

Definitions

Admission: when a youth officially enters the direct care population.

Adjudication: the findings of a court on the merits of a petition (e.g., delinquency, CHINS, CHINSup, or status offense) based on evidence presented at the adjudicatory hearing.

Adjudicatory Hearing: a court hearing on the merits of a petition filed alleging a delinquent act, CHINS, CHINSup, or status offense.

Blended Sentence: a sentencing option for a youth convicted in circuit court, which combines a juvenile disposition with an adult sentence. For example, the circuit court may impose an adult sentence with a portion of that sentence to be served in the custody of DJJ; the judge may suspend the adult sentence pending successful completion of the juvenile disposition. See § 16.1-272 of the *Code of Virginia*. The exact use of this term can vary; in this report, blended sentence data reflect youth with an active VADOC sentence at the time of commitment to DJJ.

Certification: when a judge determines after a preliminary hearing that there is probable cause in the case of a youth 16 years of age or older charged with a violent juvenile felony, jurisdiction for the case is transferred to circuit court for trial as an adult. If the pending charges are for aggravated murder, first- or second-degree murder, lynching, or aggravated malicious wounding, the case is automatically certified to circuit court for trial. If the pending charges are for any other violent juvenile felony, the case may be certified to circuit court based on the discretion of the attorney for the Commonwealth if certain statutory requirements are met. Any youth convicted in circuit court after certification will be treated as an adult in any subsequent offense. Prior to FY 2021, the minimum age for certification to circuit court was 14 years of age. See page 9 and §§ 16.1-269.1 and 16.1-271 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 effort to maintain school attendance, (ii) runs away from 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: the court-ordered disposition placing a youth in the custody of DJJ for a determinate or indeterminate period of time. To be eligible for commitment, a youth must be 14 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 a common act, transaction, or scheme; or be 11 years of age or older and adjudicated delinquent of a violent juvenile felony. See § 16.1-278.8 of the *Code of Virginia*. A commitment to DJJ differs from an admission. An admission may occur days or weeks after the youth is committed to DJJ (during which time the youth is held in a JDC). A single admission could be the result of multiple commitments to DJJ (for example, a youth 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.

CPP: a direct care residential program in a JDC. The goal of CPPs is to place youth closer to their home community. CPPs focus on addressing PYD and increasing competency in the areas of education, vocational preparation, life and social skills, thinking skills, employability skills, and anger management.

CSU: a locally or state-operated entity that provides services to the J&DR district court, including intake, investigations and reports, probation, parole, case management, and other related services in the community. See Appendix A.

DAI: a detention screening tool used during CSU intake to guide detention decisions using objective criteria. See Appendix C.

Delinquent Offense: an act committed by a youth that would be a felony or misdemeanor offense if committed by an adult as designated under state law, local ordinance, or federal law. Delinquent offenses do not include status offenses. See § 16.1-228 of the *Code of Virginia*.

Detainment: the first admission of a continuous detention stay. A new detainment is not counted if a youth is transferred to another JDC or has a change

in dispositional status before being released or returns to a JDC as part of a disposition of weekend detention.

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

Detention Reentry: a direct care residential program in a JDC. The goal of detention reentry is to allow youth in direct care to begin transitioning back to their community 30 to 120 days before their scheduled release date.

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

Direct Care: the time during which a youth who is committed to DJJ pursuant to §§ 16.1-272, 16.1-278.8(A)(14), 16.1-278.8(A)(17), or 16.1-285.1 of the *Code of Virginia* is under the supervision of staff in a juvenile residential facility operated by DJJ or an alternative placement.

Disposition: the treatment, conditions, services, and sanctions ordered by the court for a youth adjudicated delinquent, found to be a status offender, or found to be in need of services.

Dispositional Hearing: a hearing in the J&DR district court which occurs after an adjudication. During this hearing, the court may impose treatment, conditions, services, and sanctions. See §§ 16.1-278.4, 16.1-278.5, 16.1-278.6, and 16.1-278.8 of the *Code of Virginia*.

Diversion: the handling of a juvenile intake complaint in an informal manner as an alternative to the official court process. The intake officer must develop a plan for the youth that may include counseling, informal supervision, restitution, community service, or other programs. The youth and parents must agree to the diversion plan. An alleged violent juvenile felony and a complaint after a prior diversion or adjudication on a felony offense cannot be diverted. Truancy complaints may be diverted unless



there has been a prior truancy diversion or truancy adjudication within the preceding three years or a total of three prior truancy diversions or truancy adjudications. Through FY 2020, such supervision was limited to 90 days for truancy and 120 days for all other offenses. Beginning in FY 2021, supervision for truancy is limited to 120 days. See §§ 16.1-227 and 16.1-260 of the *Code of Virginia*.

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

FY: the time period measured from July 1 of one year to June 30 of the following year. For example, FY 2022 began July 1, 2021, and ended June 30, 2022.

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.

Indeterminate Commitment: the commitment of a youth to DJJ in which the youth's LOS range (ERD to LRD) 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 youth's 21st birthday. See §§ 16.1-285 and 16.1-278.8(A)(14) of the *Code of Virginia*.

Intake Case: a youth with one or more intake complaints involving an alleged delinquent act, a CHINS, a CHINSup, or a status offense.

Intake Complaint: a request for the processing of a petition to initiate a matter that is alleged to fall within the jurisdiction and venue of a particular J&DR district court. An intake officer at the CSU decides whether the complaint will result in no action, diversion, or the filing of a petition initiating formal court action.

JCC: a DJJ secure residential facility with construction fixtures designed to prevent escape and to restrict the movement and activities of youth held in lawful custody. JCCs house youth who have been committed to DJJ. See §§ 16.1-278.8, 16.1-285, and 16.1-285.1 of the *Code of Virginia*.

JDC: a local or regional secure residential facility with construction fixtures designed to prevent escape and to restrict the movement and activities of youth held in lawful custody. JDCs may house pre-D and

post-D youth. See §§ 16.1-248.1, 16.1-278.8, and 16.1-284.1 of the *Code of Virginia*.

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 youth indeterminately committed to DJJ will remain in direct care. Factors that affect a youth's LOS include the seriousness of the committing offense(s) and YASI risk level. Treatment needs may also affect a youth's LOS. See Appendix D.

Parole: a period of supervision and monitoring of a youth in the community following release from commitment if ordered by the court or administratively determined by DJJ.

Petition: a document filed with the J&DR district court by the intake officer initiating formal court action. Petitions may allege that a youth is delinquent, a CHINS, a CHINSup, an abused or neglected child, or a status offender; may be for domestic relations purposes; or may be for other actions over which the J&DR district 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 youth by a judge to a JDC for up to six months (or 12 months for felony or Class 1 misdemeanor offenses resulting in death) with structured programs of treatment and services intended to build and maintain community ties. To be eligible for post-D detention, a youth 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 of the *Code of Virginia*.

Post-D Detention without Programs: the ordering of a youth by a judge to a JDC for up to 30 days without special programs provided. To be eligible for post-D detention, a youth 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 §§ 16.1-284.1, 16.1-291, and 16.1-292 of the *Code of Virginia*.

Pre-D Detention: the confinement of a youth in a JDC while awaiting a dispositional or adjudicatory hearing. Generally, to be eligible for pre-D detention, there must be probable cause establishing that the youth committed an offense that would be a felony or Class 1 misdemeanor offense if committed by an adult, violated the terms of probation or parole



for such an offense, or knowingly and intentionally possessed or transported a firearm. In addition, the youth must be a clear and substantial threat to another person, the property of others, or to self; have threatened to abscond from the court's jurisdiction; or have willfully failed to appear at a court hearing within the last year. A youth may be placed in pre-D detention for other statutorily prescribed circumstances, such as when the youth is a fugitive from another state or failed to comply with conditions of release for what would be a felony or Class 1 misdemeanor charge if committed by an adult. See §§ 16.1-248.1 and 16.1-249 of the *Code of Virginia*.

Pre-D and Post-D Reports: documents prepared (i) within the timelines established by approved procedures when ordered by the court, (ii) for each youth placed on probation supervision, (iii) for each youth 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, also known as the social history report, must include identifying and demographic information for the youth, including current offense and prior court involvement; social, medical, psychological, and educational information about the youth; information about the youth's family; and dispositional and treatment recommendations if permitted by the court.

Probable Cause: there are reasonable grounds to believe that an offense has been committed, and the accused is the person who committed it.

Probation: the court-ordered disposition placing a youth under the supervision of a CSU in the community, requiring compliance with specified rules and conditions.

Psychotropic Medication: prescribed drugs that affect the mind, perception, behavior, or mood. Common types include antidepressants, anxiolytics or anti-anxiety agents, antipsychotics, and mood stabilizers.

Quarter: a three-month time period of a FY or CY. For example, the first quarter of FY 2022 began July 1, 2021, and ended September 30, 2021.

Recidivism Rate: the percentage of individuals who commit a subsequent offense, measured in this report by rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration. See page 71.

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

See map on page 11 for an overview of DJJ's regions.

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

Shelter Care: a non-secure facility or emergency shelter specifically approved to provide a range of as-needed services on an individual basis. 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. See § 16.1-228 of the *Code of Virginia*.

Subsequent Commitment: commitments to DJJ received after the youth was admitted to direct care that require a recalculation of the original LOS. These commitments may be associated with an offense that occurred prior to admission but was not processed by the court until after admission or with an offense that occurred after admission while in direct care. An offense that occurred while in direct care also may result in an adult jail or prison sentence rather than a subsequent commitment to DJJ.

TDO: an order issued by a judge, magistrate, or special justice for the involuntary inpatient mental health treatment of a youth, 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 self or others to the extent that a severe or irreversible injury is likely to result, or (b) is experiencing a serious deterioration of the ability to care for oneself in a developmentally age-appropriate manner; 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 the J&DR district court, after consideration of specific statutory factors, determines the J&DR district court is not the proper court for the proceedings involving a youth 14 years of age or older at the time of the offense who is accused of a felony and transfers jurisdiction to the circuit court. See page 9.

Transfer Hearing: a hearing in the J&DR district court wherein the judge determines whether the J&DR



district 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 J&DR district 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 youth's history, and specific statutory factors. Any youth 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 youth 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, carjacking, rape, forcible sodomy, and object sexual penetration. See § 16.1-228 of the *Code of Virginia*.

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

Examples of Juvenile Dispositions

Juvenile dispositions may include the following:

- » Defer disposition for a specified period of time, with or without probation supervision, to consider dismissing the case if the youth exhibits good behavior during the deferral period
- » Impose a fine and/or order restitution
- » Order the youth to complete a public service project
- » Suspend the youth's driver's license
- » Impose a curfew on the youth
- » Order the youth 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 youth on probation with specified conditions and limitations that may include required participation in programs or services
- » Place the youth in a JDC for 30 days or less
- » Place the youth in a post-D program in a JDC generally for a period not to exceed six months
- » Commit the youth to DJJ for an indeterminate or determinate period of time



Juveniles in Circuit Court

Consideration for Trial in Circuit Court

Pursuant to § 16.1-269.1 et seq. of the *Code of Virginia*, cases involving juveniles that meet certain age and offense criteria may be certified or transferred to circuit court, where the juvenile will be tried as an adult under one of the following circumstances:

Mandatory Certification: If a juvenile 16 years of age or older is charged with aggravated murder, first- or second-degree murder, murder by lynching, or aggravated malicious wounding, the juvenile receives a preliminary hearing in J&DR district court. If probable cause is found, the court certifies the charges, the case is sent to circuit court, and the juvenile is tried as an adult. The certification may not be appealed. Prior to FY 2021, mandatory certification applied to juveniles 14 years of age or older.

Prosecutorial Discretionary Certification: When a juvenile 16 years of age or older is charged with a violent juvenile felony as defined in § 16.1-228 of the *Code of Virginia*, which does not require mandatory certification, the prosecution may elect to certify if certain statutory requirements in § 16.1-269.1(C) are met. The juvenile receives a preliminary hearing in J&DR district court. If probable cause is found, the court certifies the charges, the case is sent to circuit court, and the juvenile is tried as an adult. The certification may not be appealed. Prior to FY 2021, prosecutorial discretionary certification applied to juveniles 14 years of age or older.

Transfer: When a juvenile 14 years of age or older is charged with a felony offense, the prosecutor may ask a J&DR district court judge to transfer the case to circuit court for trial as an adult. The 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). The judge decides whether the juvenile is a proper person to remain in the jurisdiction of the J&DR district court. If not, the case goes to the circuit court. The decision may be appealed by either party.

Direct Indictment: In cases proceeding under mandatory or prosecutorial discretionary certification, if the J&DR district court does not find probable cause, the attorney for the Commonwealth may seek a di-

rect indictment in the circuit court on the offense and all ancillary charges. The direct indictment may not be appealed.

Waiver: A juvenile 14 years of age or older charged with an offense that would be a felony if committed by an adult may waive the jurisdiction of the J&DR district court with the written consent of counsel and have the case heard in the circuit court.

Trial of Juveniles in Circuit Court

Juvenile cases transferred to circuit court are tried in the same manner as adults except youth are not sentenced by a jury. A conviction of a youth as an adult precludes the J&DR district court from taking jurisdiction of such youth for any subsequent offenses allegedly committed by that youth and any pending allegations of delinquency that had not been disposed of by the J&DR district court at the time of the criminal conviction. If a youth is not convicted in circuit court, jurisdiction over that youth for any future alleged delinquent behavior is initiated in the J&DR district court.

Sentencing of Juveniles in Circuit Court

Circuit court judges may sentence youth transferred or certified to their courts to juvenile dispositions, adult sentences, or both. For example, when a youth receives a blended sentence, the court orders the youth to serve the beginning of their sentence with DJJ and a later portion in an adult correctional facility.

According to a VCSC study, one-third of youth convicted of felonies in circuit court in FY 2017 were given a disposition involving DJJ. The other two-thirds of youth were sentenced to prison, jail, or adult probation.



DJJ Historical Timeline

DJJ, formerly named the Department of Youth and Family Services, began operations as a separate agency from VADOC in 1990. The information below presents a history by CY of the agency since 2000. (See DJJ's website for a complete historical timeline of the juvenile justice system in Virginia.)

2000: The criteria for indeterminate commitments were amended from being adjudicated delinquent for two Class 1 misdemeanors to four Class 1 misdemeanors that were not part of a common act, transaction, or scheme.

2003: DJJ implemented the After-Hours Video Intake Program.

2005: Barrett JCC was closed and mothballed.

2010: Natural Bridge JCC was closed and mothballed.

2012: A portion of the former Department of Correctional Education merged with DJJ and became DJJ's Division of Education.

2013: Hanover JCC was closed and repurposed as the VPSTC.

The program serving youth with mental disabilities, developmental delays, and emotional disturbances at Oak Ridge JCC was relocated to an autonomous section of Beaumont JCC, RDC was moved to the former Oak Ridge JCC building, and the former RDC building was repurposed as an administrative building.

2014: Hampton Place and Abraxas House, DJJ's two halfway houses, were closed. (The facilities were closed to youth in December 2013.)

Culpeper JCC was closed and transferred to VADOC.

DJJ partnered with Blue Ridge, Chesapeake, Rappahannock, and Virginia Beach JDCs to establish CPPs as alternative placements for youth in direct care.

2015: RDC was closed and mothballed.

Youth in the Oak Ridge Program were gradually integrated with the general population at Beaumont JCC for educational services and other programming while retaining specialized housing.

The Board of Juvenile Justice revised the LOS Guidelines.

CTM was piloted.

DJJ partnered with Merrimac and Shenandoah Valley JDCs to establish CPPs.

2016: DJJ partnered with Chesterfield and Lynchburg JDCs to establish CPPs.

DJJ contracted with two experienced service coordination agencies, AMI and EBA, to develop a statewide continuum of evidence-based services and additional alternatives to placement in secure facilities.

2017: Beaumont JCC was closed and mothballed.

DJJ partnered with Prince William JDC to establish a CPP.

CTM was fully implemented at Bon Air JCC.

RSCs implemented systems for managing centralized referrals, service coordination, billing, and reporting.

2019: DJJ partnered with Northern Virginia JDC to establish a CPP for females.

2020: Governor Northam declared a state of emergency due to the COVID-19 pandemic on March 12.

2021: Chesapeake CPP closed.


2022: Lynchburg and Northern Virginia CPPs closed.

DJJ began creating and implementing pre-court services.



Regional Map


DJJ's Division of Community Programs is organized into five regions, each overseen by a regional program manager who reports to the Deputy Director of Community Programs. The regions are geographically divided into Central, Eastern, Northern, Southern, and Western. CSUs 17 and 19 are locally operated. Effective in FY 2022, CSUs 23 and 23A are combined (CSU 23), and CSUs 20L and 20W are combined (CSU 20).



| Central | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| CSUs: 9, 15, 16, 24, 25 | CSUs: 1, 2, 2A, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 | CSUs: 17, 18, 19, 20, 26, 31 | CSUs: 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 | CSUs: 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29, 30 |



Juvenile Justice System Process



Steps in the Juvenile Justice System

Intake

- » When an offense is alleged against a youth, an individual (e.g., parents, agency representatives, law enforcement personnel) may file a complaint with an intake officer.
- » When the youth has contact with law enforcement, the youth may be taken into custody, summonsed and released until a hearing on the matter, diverted, or counseled and released with no further action.
- » The intake officer reviews the circumstances of the complaint to determine whether probable cause exists.
- » If the intake officer finds that no probable cause exists, the complaint is unfounded, and no further action is taken. The complaining party may appeal this decision to the magistrate if the offense is a felony or Class 1 misdemeanor.
- » If probable cause exists, in most cases 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 youth in a JDC.

Petition and Detention


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

Adjudication or Trial

- » A youth who is adjudicated in J&DR district court does not have the right to a jury trial but has all the other constitutional protections afforded in criminal court, such as the right to an attorney, the right to call and cross-examine witnesses, and the right to refrain from self-incrimination. All delinquency charges must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt.
- » If the judge finds the youth delinquent, the case is usually continued to another day for the judge to make a dispositional decision. The judge's adjudication and dispositional decisions may be appealed by either party to the circuit court for a *de novo* review (as if the first adjudication never occurred).
- » When a youth is tried in circuit court as an adult, the trial is handled in the same manner as a trial of an adult. In the case of a jury trial, the court determines the sentence. The conviction and sentencing in circuit court may be appealed by either party to the Court of Appeals.



DJJ System Flow Chart, FY 2022*



* Not all CSUs receive and enter all court summons paperwork.

* The original intake decision is counted. Unsuccessful diversions with a petition filed are included in "Diversion Plan" because diversion is the original decision.

* In the chart above, "Other" includes the following intake decisions: adult criminal, accepted by ICJ, consent agreement signed, detention order only, pending, returned to out-of-state, shelter care only, and unfounded.

* Disposition categories (i.e., probation, post-D detention with or without programs, direct care) are not inclusive of all possible options.

* Probation, post-D detention, and direct care dispositions are counted based on placement, status, and admission start dates in FY 2022; they do not necessarily connect to the intakes or intake decisions above.

Intakes

- » There were 23,562 juvenile intake cases and 32,803 juvenile intake complaints. Juvenile intake cases may be comprised of one or more intake complaints. In FY 2022, juvenile intake cases had an average of 1.4 complaints.

Intake Decisions

- » A petition was filed for 61.7% of the juvenile intake complaints.
- » 7.3% of juvenile intake complaints were court summonses. A court summons is issued by a law enforcement officer and filed directly with the court rather than pursuing a petition through the CSU. A court summons may be issued to youth only for certain offenses, such as traffic offenses, low-level alcohol offenses, and select violations of local ordinances.
- » Of the remaining juvenile intake complaints, 59.0% had a diversion plan, and 30.3% were resolved.

Dispositions

- » Of probation, post-D detention, and direct care dispositions, probation was the most common.
- » There were 1,543 probation placements, 533 statuses for post-D detention without programs, 134 statuses for post-D detention with programs, and 147 direct care admissions.



Data in the DRG

Since 2001, DJJ has published the DRG annually to fulfill General Assembly reporting mandates. While there are many similarities between the current DRG and previous editions, changes have been implemented to report the data more accurately and to align with DJJ's changing operational and data needs. Some revisions and data clarifications are described below:

- » Any changes to the data after the download date are not reflected in this report. Data from previous reports may differ slightly.
- » Counts, percentages, and ADPs may not add to totals or 100% due to rounding. Decimal values are used in percentage calculations. Non-zero values may display as zero due to rounding.
- » Expunged cases are included unless otherwise specified.
- » Adult intake, probation, and parole cases are excluded from all data.
- » Not applicable or not available (N/A) is used in tables throughout this report to indicate instances where data cannot be calculated (e.g., groups of zero, offense definitions and classifications, absence of post-D detention with programs, and pending cases in the recidivism analysis).
- » Ethnicity is reported as "Hispanic," "Non-Hispanic," or "Unknown/Missing." Effective FY 2020, ethnicity is a required data entry field but may still be recorded as unknown.
- » Reported ages were expanded in FY 2021 to include youth over 20 and under 21. Prior to FY 2021, these youth were included in the "Missing" age category; therefore, age data are not comparable to reports prior to FY 2021.
- » Unless otherwise specified, the MSO is determined by a ranking assigned to each type of complaint. Periodically, DJJ uses VCC information published by VCSC to develop the rankings. Felonies are given the highest ranks, ordered first by their statutory maximum penalty and then their highest primary offense score on VCSC's guidelines. Next, misdemeanors are ranked by their statutory maximum penalty. Finally, the remaining complaints are ranked in the following order from most to least severe: technical violations, other offenses, non-delinquent traffic offenses, status offenses, and DR/CW complaints.
- » The DAI ranking of MSOs used by DJJ is checked periodically against the VCSC designation and the *Code of Virginia* to ensure consistency and is updated accordingly.
- » Offense categories on pages 21, 38, 49, and 54 are based on the VCC prefix, with the exception of technical and status offenses, which are categorized by the specific VCC. Offense categorizations are checked periodically and updated accordingly.
- » ADPs for probation and parole are calculated using only primary statuses; LOSs are calculated using the entire continuous placement. (See Appendix F for an explanation of continuous probation and parole statuses.)
- » With the exception of initial YASIs, when risk is reported, the closest risk assessment completed within 180 days before or after the measurement date (e.g., probation start date) is used unless otherwise specified.
- » Intake cases with successful diversions have at least one complaint with a successful diversion plan and no complaints with a petition.
- » Locality-specific CSU data are presented in summary form. More detailed locality-specific CSU data are available on DJJ's website.
- » Some localities utilize multiple JDCs. In the map on page 35, the localities served are determined by the highest number of detainments in FY 2022.
- » Direct care ADP is downloaded directly from DJJ's electronic data management system. In prior reports, this information came from daily population reports.
- » Subsequent commitments are excluded unless otherwise specified. An offense that occurred while in direct care also may result in an adult jail or prison sentence rather than a subsequent commitment to DJJ; these sentences are not included.
- » Blended sentences from circuit court are included as a commitment type. Data on blended sentences represent commitments with an active adult sentence at the time of commitment.
- » The categorization of commitment types (i.e., blended, determinate, indeterminate) and assigned LOSs are based on the initial commitment(s) and not subsequent commitment(s) unless otherwise specified.
- » The Division of Education SY starts in August and ends in June of the following year. Credits and credentials earned in the summer are counted toward the previous SY.
- » Canceled, rescinded, and successfully appealed commitments are not included except in the direct care ADP and Division of Education data.
- » Youth in non-JCC placements are not included in the Division of Education data.



2 Programs and Services

Community Programs

The Division of Community Programs is responsible for CSUs and community-based services for individuals who come in contact with the juvenile justice system. The Division provides a continuum of community-based interventions to youth and families through partnerships with localities, non-profits, and contracted providers. The Division includes CSUs, the Diversion Unit, the Practice Improvement and Services Unit, and the Reentry Unit.

Juvenile Intake

Intake services are available 24 hours a day across the Commonwealth. 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, the intake officer determines whether a petition should be filed to initiate proceedings in the J&DR district court. When appropriate, the intake officer develops a diversion plan, which may include informal counseling or monitoring, skills coaching delivered by CSU staff, and/or referrals to community resources or services. (See page 5 for diversion eligibility criteria.)

DJJ has a Video Intake Unit to provide secure, remote intake coverage during non-business hours. It is utilized by the vast majority of localities. (CSUs that do not utilize the Video Intake Unit conduct after-hours intakes locally.)

In FY 2021, DJJ established the Diversion Unit to expand the focus on prevention and diversion programming, increase opportunities for alternatives to official court processing of complaints, and coordinate and support front-end reforms and system improvement. The unit oversees the implementation of JDAI and VJCCCA. (See page 32 for VJCCCA information.)

If a petition is filed, the intake officer must decide whether the youth should be released to a parent/guardian or another responsible adult, placed in a detention alternative, or detained pending a court hearing. An intake case is considered detention-eligible prior to disposition if at least one of the associated intake complaints

is detention-eligible. (See page 6 for pre-D detention eligibility criteria.) Decisions by intake officers concerning whether detention-eligible cases are appropriate for detention are guided by the completion of the DAI. The DAI assesses the youth and provides guidance in detention decisions using standardized, objective criteria. (See Appendix C.)

Investigations and Reports

Pre-D and post-D reports, also known as social history reports, constitute the majority of the reports completed by CSU personnel. These reports describe the behavior, needs, strengths, resilience, and social circumstances of youth and their families. Some reports are court-ordered and completed prior to disposition while others are completed following placement on probation or commitment to DJJ as required by Board of Juvenile Justice regulations and DJJ procedures. A YASI is completed as part of the social history report, classifying the youth according to their relative risk of reoffending and determining strengths and areas of need. (See Appendix B.) The information in the social history report and YASI provide the basis for CSU personnel to develop assessment-driven case plans for youth, determine the level of supervision needed based on risk, and recommend the most appropriate disposition to the court.

Other instruments and reports completed by CSU personnel may include substance abuse screenings, trauma screenings, CANS assessments and case summaries for the FAPT reviews under the CSA, commitment documentation, ICJ reports, MHSTPs, transfer reports when youth are being considered for trial in adult court, and ongoing case documentation.

DR/CW

In addition to handling complaints for delinquency, CHINS, CHINSup, and status offenses, CSUs provide intake services for DR/CW complaints. These complaints include paternity, determination of temporary or permanent custody, visitation rights, support, abuse and neglect, family abuse, termination of parental rights, and emancipation. In some CSUs, services such as treat-



ment 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 on criteria defined in the *Code of Virginia*.

Probation

DJJ strives to achieve a balanced and evidence-based approach in its probation practices, focusing on public safety, accountability, and competency development. DJJ uses a risk-based system of probation, with youth classified as the highest risk to reoffend receiving the most intensive supervision and intervention. (See Appendix F for an overview of probation statuses.)

Probation officers serve as the primary interventionists and provide skills coaching using cognitive-behavioral strategies to teach new skills and new ways of thinking. They also coordinate services, including individual and family counseling, life skills coaching, career readiness education, substance abuse treatment, and other community-based services. These programs and services are funded through CSA, Medicaid, VJCCCA, or DJJ. CSUs purchase services from a statewide network of approved public and private DSPs, primarily through DJJ's RSC Service Delivery Model.

Parole

Reentry planning is initiated when a youth is committed to DJJ, and most youth are placed on parole supervision upon release from direct care. Parole supervision is designed to assist in the successful transition back to the community, building on the programs and services the youth received while in direct care. As with probation, parole supervision is structured on the balanced approach of public safety, accountability, and competency development. Parole officers serve as the primary interventionists and provide skills coaching using cognitive-behavioral strategies to teach new skills and new ways of thinking. Public safety is emphasized through a level system of supervision based on the youth's assessed risk of reoffending and adjustment to rules and expectations. The length of parole supervision varies according to the youth's needs, risk level, offense history, and adjustment. Supervision may last until the youth's 21st birthday. (See Appendix F for an overview of parole statuses.)

Parole officers provide intervention and case management, facilitate appropriate transitional services, and

monitor adjustment in the community. Youth may receive individual and family counseling, life skills coaching, career readiness education, substance abuse treatment, or other community-based services. A statewide network of approved public and private DSPs deliver these services, which the CSUs purchase for youth and their families primarily through DJJ's RSC Service Delivery Model.

Practice Improvement

DJJ focuses on providing the appropriate interventions to youth to match their identified needs. With implementation support, coaching, and technical assistance from DJJ's Practice Improvement and Services Unit, CSUs actively implement evidence-based principles, with emphasis on the RNR model, YASI, and EPICS.

Staff at all state-operated CSUs are trained in EPICS, a model developed by the University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute. The initial training and ongoing coaching help POs become more effective in their roles by providing a model, structure, and techniques for deliberately incorporating cognitive-behavioral and other evidence-based practices into their daily interactions. Staff learn to focus on addressing risk factors that contribute to the initiation and continuation of delinquent behavior. Interventions, including behavior chain diagrams, are used to teach youth the thought-behavior linkage and strategies to restructure decision-making. EPICS emphasizes skills coaching where the PO serves as a prosocial model, demonstrating skills and providing youth with practice opportunities.

Reentry

Reentry coordination provides treatment planning for youth in preparation for their release from direct care. Planning for reentry begins at commitment through collaboration with staff at the direct care placement, POs, reentry advocates, and youth and their families in order to create a seamless transition and improve outcomes. Reentry advocates are assigned regionally to connect youth and families with benefits, employment services, and other resources. (See pages 41-45 for more information on services for youth in direct care.)

RSC Service Delivery Model

DJJ utilizes and continues to expand a continuum of services and alternative placements that offer programs and treatments needed to divert youth from further involvement with DJJ, provide appropriate dispositional options for youth under supervision, and enable successful reentry upon committed youth's return to the



community. DJJ contracts with two service coordination agencies, AMI and EBA, to serve as RSCs and assist DJJ with building this continuum of services for youth and families.

The work of the RSCs is divided using DJJ's five administrative regions. The RSCs support DJJ's continuum of services by managing centralized referrals, service coordination, quality assurance, billing, and reporting. They are responsible for assessing existing programming, developing new service capacity, and selecting and subcontracting with DSPs. They also are responsible for monitoring the quality of the DSPs and fidelity to evidence-based practices and programs, completing ongoing service gap analyses, and filling those service gaps. The Practice Improvement and Services Unit manages the RSC Service Delivery Model while also focusing on CSU practice fidelity and providing implementation and operational support. The QA Unit partners with the RSCs to facilitate quality improvement initiatives and technical assistance.

The RSC Service Delivery Model has increased DJJ's access to evidence-based models. For example, FFT and MST, two evidence-based family interventions designed to prevent out-of-home placements, are now available in 97% of cities and counties in Virginia. In addition, the availability of TF-CBT and HFW continue to expand. During FY 2022, the RSCs contracted with more than 140 distinct DSPs; a total of 1,250 youth were referred to the RSCs, and 2,740 assessments and services were approved and authorized. (See page 45 for more information about the continuum of services related to direct care.)

ICJ

ICJ provides for the cooperative supervision of youth on probation and parole when moving from state to state. It also serves youth with delinquent and status offenses 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 youth. It provides the procedures for (i) supervising youth in states other than where they were adjudicated delinquent or found guilty and placed on probation or parole supervision and (ii) returning youth who have escaped, absconded, or run away from their home state. All 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands are current members. Additional information on ICJ, including ICJ history, forms, and manuals can be found at www.juvenilecompact.org.



Intake Complaints, FY 2020-2022*

| DR/CW Complaints | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Custody | 49,945 | 51,449 | 51,905 |
| Support/Desertion | 13,307 | 11,970 | 12,324 |
| Protective Order/ECO | 16,631 | 16,567 | 18,334 |
| Visitation | 31,370 | 33,623 | 33,429 |
| Total DR/CW Complaints | 111,253 | 113,609 | 115,992 |
| Juvenile Complaints | | | |
| Felony | 8,466 | 5,555 | 6,184 |
| Class 1 Misdemeanor | 16,596 | 9,196 | 12,906 |
| Class 2-4 Misdemeanor | 3,535 | 1,716 | 1,627 |
| CHINS/CHINSup/Status | 6,045 | 4,696 | 6,676 |
| Other | | | |
| TDO | 919 | 752 | 737 |
| Technical Violation | 4,068 | 2,851 | 3,242 |
| Traffic | 1,352 | 1,114 | 983 |
| Other | 766 | 463 | 448 |
| Total Juvenile Complaints | 41,747 | 26,343 | 32,803 |
| Total Complaints | 153,000 | 139,952 | 148,795 |

* The "CHINS/CHINSup/Status" juvenile complaint category was previously listed as "CHINS/CHINSup" and is comparable to previous reports.

- » 78.0% of total intake complaints were DR/CW complaints in FY 2022.
- » DR/CW complaints increased from 113,609 in FY 2021 to 115,992 in FY 2022, an increase of 2.1%.
- » Juvenile complaints increased from 26,343 in FY 2021 to 32,803 in FY 2022, an increase of 24.5%.
- » 18.9% of juvenile complaints in FY 2022 were felony complaints.


Juvenile Intake Complaint Initial Decisions, FY 2022*

| Intake Decision | 2022 |
|---|---------------|
| Court Summons | 7.3% |
| Detention Order Only | 1.2% |
| Diversion Plan | 18.3% |
| Open Diversion | 0.6% |
| Successful Diversion | 14.4% |
| Unsuccessful Diversion with Petition | 1.8% |
| Unsuccessful Diversion with No Petition | 1.6% |
| Petition | 61.7% |
| Petition Filed | 39.6% |
| Detention Order with Petition | 22.0% |
| Resolved | 9.4% |
| Referred to Another Agency | 2.0% |
| Resolved | 7.3% |
| Returned to Probation Supervision | 0.1% |
| Unfounded | 1.0% |
| Other | 1.1% |
| Total Juvenile Complaints | 32,803 |

* Not all CSUs receive and enter all court summons paperwork.

- » A petition was initially filed for 61.7% of juvenile complaints.
- » 74.3% of juvenile complaints were diversion-eligible.
- » 27.7% of juvenile complaints were initially resolved or diverted.
- » Of the 6,003 juvenile complaints with a diversion plan, 78.5% had successful outcomes.

Initial YASIs, FY 2018-2022*



- » Initial YASIs may be completed at different points of contact and are not connected to individual intake cases.
- » 2,910 initial YASIs were completed in FY 2022.
- » The percentage of initial YASIs that were low risk decreased from 49.9% in FY 2018 to 40.4% in FY 2022.
- » Over half (59.6%) of initial YASIs were moderate or high risk in FY 2022.

* Only YASIs entered as "Initial Assessment" are included.

* Data may include multiple initial YASIs for a youth if completed on different days.



Juvenile Intake Case Demographics, FY 2020-2022

| Demographics | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Race | | | |
| Asian | 1.3% | 0.9% | 1.1% |
| Black | 41.1% | 40.7% | 41.1% |
| White | 48.6% | 49.3% | 49.0% |
| Other/Unknown | 9.0% | 9.1% | 8.8% |
| Ethnicity | | | |
| Hispanic | 12.7% | 11.0% | 11.0% |
| Non-Hispanic | 63.4% | 65.2% | 64.6% |
| Unknown/Missing | 23.9% | 23.8% | 24.4% |
| Sex | | | |
| Female | 32.3% | 32.9% | 35.4% |
| Male | 67.7% | 67.1% | 64.6% |
| Age | | | |
| 8-12 | 7.3% | 7.7% | 9.0% |
| 13 | 7.7% | 7.2% | 9.5% |
| 14 | 12.7% | 12.0% | 14.7% |
| 15 | 18.3% | 17.0% | 18.4% |
| 16 | 23.3% | 23.5% | 21.2% |
| 17 | 26.3% | 27.2% | 23.0% |
| 18-20 | 3.4% | 4.0% | 3.0% |
| Missing | 1.0% | 1.3% | 1.2% |
| <i>Total Juvenile Intake Cases</i> | 29,234 | 17,892 | 23,562 |

- » Juvenile intake cases may be comprised of one or more intake complaints. In FY 2022, juvenile intake cases had an average of 1.4 complaints.
- » 49.0% of juvenile intake cases in FY 2022 were White, and 41.1% were Black.
- » 64.6% of juvenile intake cases in FY 2022 were non-Hispanic, and 11.0% were Hispanic. 24.4% had unknown ethnicity information.
- » 64.6% of juvenile intake cases in FY 2022 were male, and 35.4% were female.
- » Approximately half (44.1%-50.7%) of juvenile intake cases since FY 2020 were 16 or 17 years of age.
- » The average age of juvenile intake cases in FY 2022 was 15.6 years.

Workload Information, FY 2022*

| Completed Reports | Count | Status | ADP |
|-------------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| Pre-D Reports | 1,369 | Probation | 1,368 |
| Post-D Reports | 590 | Parole | 161 |
| Transfer Reports | 161 | Commitments | 208 |

* Transfer reports indicate the number of cases considered for trial in circuit court with a report from the CSU. Transfer reports do not indicate the actual number of juveniles tried in circuit court.

* Commitments workload ADP is not equal to the direct care ADP reported in other sections due to different data sources.

- » Probation had the highest ADP (1,368).
- » The majority (92.4%) of completed reports were pre-D or post-D social history reports.


Probation Placement Demographics, FY 2020-2022

| Demographics | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Race | | | |
| Asian | 1.1% | 1.2% | 0.5% |
| Black | 46.5% | 45.6% | 45.1% |
| White | 45.0% | 46.0% | 46.5% |
| Other/Unknown | 7.4% | 7.2% | 7.9% |
| Ethnicity | | | |
| Hispanic | 15.2% | 12.7% | 15.2% |
| Non-Hispanic | 70.7% | 74.5% | 71.6% |
| Unknown/Missing | 14.1% | 12.8% | 13.2% |
| Sex | | | |
| Female | 22.1% | 20.5% | 21.6% |
| Male | 77.9% | 79.5% | 78.4% |
| Age | | | |
| 8-12 | 3.2% | 2.1% | 3.1% |
| 13 | 6.8% | 6.0% | 7.6% |
| 14 | 14.3% | 11.6% | 13.3% |
| 15 | 20.6% | 18.9% | 19.3% |
| 16 | 26.5% | 26.5% | 24.0% |
| 17 | 24.7% | 27.7% | 26.5% |
| 18-20 | 3.8% | 7.1% | 6.2% |
| <i>Total Probation Placements</i> | 1,899 | 1,511 | 1,543 |

- » 46.5% of probation placements in FY 2022 were White, and 45.1% were Black.
- » 71.6% of probation placements in FY 2022 were non-Hispanic, and 15.2% were Hispanic. 13.2% had unknown ethnicity information.
- » 78.4% of probation placements in FY 2022 were male, and 21.6% were female.
- » Approximately half (50.5-54.2%) of probation placements since FY 2020 were 16 or 17 years of age.
- » The average age of probation placements in FY 2022 was 16.1 years.



Probation Placements by Risk Levels, FY 2018-2022*




* Percentages may not add to 100% due to missing YASIs. For example, in FY 2022, 17 probation placements were missing YASIs.

- » 1,526 probation placements had a YASI completed in FY 2022.
- » Approximately half (49.8%-52.8%) of probation placements were moderate risk between FY 2018 and FY 2022.

The YASI is a validated tool that assesses risk, needs, and protective factors to help develop case plans for youth. In addition to the initial assessment, the YASI is used to reassess youth at regular intervals.

Parole Placements by Risk Levels, FY 2018-2022*



* Percentages may not add to 100% due to missing YASIs. For example, in FY 2022, two parole placements were missing YASIs.

- » 129 parole placements had a YASI completed in FY 2022.
- » Between FY 2018 and FY 2022, the proportion of parole placements that were high risk increased from 74.2% to 85.5%.



Juvenile Complaints and Offenses, FY 2022*

| Offense Category | Felony Juvenile Intake Complaints | Misdemeanor Juvenile Intake Complaints | Total Juvenile Intake Complaints | Probation Placement Offenses | Commitment Offenses |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| Delinquent | | | | | |
| Abusive Language | N/A | 0.2% | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Alcohol | N/A | 3.1% | 1.4% | 0.9% | 0.2% |
| Arson | 1.8% | 0.7% | 0.6% | 0.8% | 0.2% |
| Assault | 18.9% | 36.6% | 19.8% | 20.2% | 18.3% |
| Burglary | 7.1% | N/A | 1.3% | 2.7% | 3.7% |
| Computer | 0.0% | 0.5% | 0.2% | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Disorderly Conduct | N/A | 1.0% | 0.5% | 1.1% | 0.2% |
| Escape | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Extortion | 4.3% | 0.7% | 1.1% | 1.2% | 0.3% |
| Fraud | 4.1% | 1.7% | 1.5% | 0.8% | 3.5% |
| Gangs | 0.4% | 0.0% | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.0% |
| Kidnapping | 1.2% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.4% | 0.5% |
| Larceny | 21.2% | 8.4% | 7.7% | 15.6% | 15.9% |
| Marijuana | 0.0% | 2.6% | 1.2% | 0.2% | 0.0% |
| Murder | 1.6% | N/A | 0.3% | 0.1% | 2.4% |
| Narcotics | 3.7% | 0.6% | 1.0% | 1.8% | 1.9% |
| Obscenity | 3.4% | 1.3% | 1.2% | 1.5% | 0.2% |
| Obstruction of Justice | 0.7% | 3.4% | 1.6% | 2.6% | 1.3% |
| Paraphernalia | N/A | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Robbery | 7.1% | N/A | 1.3% | 1.7% | 8.6% |
| Sexual Abuse | 7.2% | 0.8% | 1.7% | 5.3% | 7.6% |
| Sexual Offense | 0.2% | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.4% | 0.6% |
| Telephone | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.3% |
| Trespassing | 0.0% | 3.7% | 1.6% | 2.7% | 0.8% |
| Vandalism | 6.5% | 8.8% | 5.1% | 7.6% | 6.0% |
| Weapons | 5.3% | 10.4% | 5.6% | 10.3% | 13.8% |
| Other | 0.7% | 1.6% | 2.0% | 2.5% | 1.0% |
| Technical | | | | | |
| Contempt of Court | 0.1% | 0.1% | 6.7% | 4.3% | 1.1% |
| Failure to Appear | 0.8% | 1.1% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Parole Violation | N/A | N/A | 0.3% | 0.0% | 1.4% |
| Probation Violation | 0.1% | 0.0% | 2.9% | 0.5% | 6.7% |
| Traffic | | | | | |
| Traffic | 3.4% | 11.9% | 9.0% | 6.5% | 3.3% |
| Status/Other | | | | | |
| Civil Commitment | N/A | N/A | 2.2% | 0.0% | N/A |
| CHINS | N/A | N/A | 4.8% | 0.9% | N/A |
| CHINSup | N/A | N/A | 9.7% | 5.6% | N/A |
| Marijuana | N/A | N/A | 2.1% | 0.3% | 0.2% |
| Other | N/A | N/A | 3.7% | 1.0% | N/A |
| Total Complaints | 6,195 | 14,545 | 32,803 | 3,223 | 630 |

- » 57.8% of juvenile intake complaints were for delinquent offenses, 10.5% were for technical offenses, 9.0% were for traffic offenses, and 22.6% were for status or other offenses.
- » 81.0% of offenses that resulted in a probation placement were for delinquent offenses, 4.8% were for technical offenses, 6.5% were for traffic offenses, and 7.7% were for status or other offenses.
- » 87.3% of offenses that resulted in commitment were for delinquent offenses, 9.2% were for technical offenses, 3.3% were for traffic offenses, and 0.2% were for status or other offenses.
- » See page 38 for detaining MSO data for pre-D detention.
- » See pages 49-50 for MSO data for direct care admissions.

* N/A for intake complaints indicates an offense severity (e.g., felony, misdemeanor) that does not exist for that offense category. N/A for commitments indicates an offense severity that is not commitment-eligible.

* Felony and misdemeanor technical violations generally do not apply to youth; however, some youth have been charged under the criminal procedure that applies to adults. Therefore, these complaints appear as felonies or misdemeanors.

* "Larceny" may include fraud offenses that were charged as a larceny in accordance with the *Code of Virginia*.

* "Narcotics" no longer includes marijuana possession offenses that are captured under the new VCC prefix, MRJ. Beginning in FY 2022, there are two "Marijuana" categories: delinquent marijuana offenses and status marijuana offenses.

* Traffic offenses may be delinquent (if felonies or misdemeanors) or non-delinquent, but all are captured under "Traffic."

* Total includes felonies, misdemeanors, other, and missing offenses; therefore, the sum of felonies and misdemeanors may not equal the total, and total percentages may not add to 100%.



Juvenile Cases by MSO, FY 2022*

| MSO Severity | Juvenile Intake Cases | Probation Cases | Commitments |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| DAI Ranking | | | |
| Felony | | | |
| Against Persons | 8.6% | 26.4% | 68.4% |
| Weapons/Narcotics Dist. | 0.9% | 2.5% | 7.6% |
| Other | 6.3% | 14.6% | 17.7% |
| Class 1 Misdemeanor | | | |
| Against Persons | 21.7% | 22.1% | 3.8% |
| Other | 14.6% | 16.6% | 1.3% |
| Prob./Parole Violation | 4.5% | 0.0% | 1.3% |
| Court Order Violation | 7.8% | 2.1% | N/A |
| Status Offense | 25.3% | 10.8% | N/A |
| Other | 10.3% | 4.9% | N/A |
| VCSC Ranking | | | |
| Person | 32.4% | 45.6% | 60.1% |
| Property | 13.6% | 24.8% | 28.5% |
| Narcotics | 1.0% | 2.0% | 3.2% |
| Other | 52.9% | 27.6% | 8.2% |
| Missing | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| <i>Total Juvenile Cases</i> | <i>23,562</i> | <i>1,543</i> | <i>158</i> |

* N/A indicates an offense severity that is not commitment-eligible.

- » MSO by DAI ranking:
 - › Status offenses (25.3%) were the highest percentage of juvenile intake cases.
 - › Felonies against persons (26.4%) were the highest percentage of probation placements.
 - › Felonies against persons were the highest percentage (68.4%) of commitments.
- » MSO by VCSC ranking:
 - › Other offenses were the highest percentage (52.9%) of juvenile intake cases.
 - › Person offenses were the highest percentage (45.6%) of probation placements.
 - › Person offenses were the highest percentage (60.1%) of commitments.

Timeframes

- » The average time from intake to adjudication in FY 2021 was 142 days. FY 2022 data are not available due to pending adjudications.
- » The average time from DJJ's receipt of commitment papers to direct care admission in FY 2022 was 14 days (excluding subsequent commitments).

62.7% (14,779) of juvenile intake cases were detention-eligible. There were 3,735 pre-D detention statuses for a rate of 4.0 detention-eligible intakes per pre-D detention status.

Placements, Releases, and Average LOS, FY 2022

| | Probation | Parole |
|--------------------|-----------|--------|
| Placements | 1,543 | 131 |
| Releases | 1,547 | 194 |
| Average LOS (Days) | 377 | 408 |

- » The average age for probation placements was 16.1 years.
- » The average age for parole placements was 18.3 years.
- » The average LOS on probation was 12.4 months, and the average LOS on parole was 13.4 months.



Summary by CSU

Intake Complaints, FY 2022*

| CSU | Complaints | | Juvenile Complaints | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|
| | DR/CW | Juvenile | Felony | Class 1 Misdemeanor | Class 2-4 Misdemeanor | CHINS/ CHINSup/ Status | Other |
| 1 | 5,901 | 712 | 24.6% | 44.5% | 3.2% | 22.3% | 5.3% |
| 2 | 6,367 | 1,389 | 21.2% | 47.1% | 5.2% | 9.4% | 17.1% |
| 2A | 944 | 283 | 21.9% | 35.3% | 11.3% | 11.0% | 20.5% |
| 3 | 2,933 | 474 | 23.4% | 37.1% | 5.5% | 16.2% | 17.7% |
| 4 | 5,641 | 1,075 | 27.0% | 36.6% | 7.2% | 4.9% | 24.4% |
| 5 | 1,838 | 956 | 17.6% | 52.5% | 5.6% | 10.0% | 14.2% |
| 6 | 1,929 | 583 | 23.2% | 47.5% | 4.3% | 16.6% | 8.4% |
| 7 | 3,415 | 1,282 | 17.2% | 30.4% | 4.4% | 20.5% | 27.5% |
| 8 | 2,962 | 912 | 11.2% | 43.0% | 4.1% | 27.3% | 14.5% |
| 9 | 2,667 | 1,068 | 20.2% | 48.7% | 5.7% | 19.8% | 5.6% |
| 10 | 2,427 | 635 | 19.7% | 35.3% | 5.8% | 22.2% | 17.0% |
| 11 | 2,011 | 677 | 16.8% | 17.1% | 3.7% | 20.1% | 42.2% |
| 12 | 5,800 | 2,148 | 20.1% | 55.7% | 4.8% | 13.1% | 6.2% |
| 13 | 3,019 | 864 | 35.8% | 32.2% | 3.0% | 10.2% | 18.9% |
| 14 | 4,200 | 1,619 | 19.1% | 46.5% | 6.8% | 9.9% | 17.6% |
| 15 | 8,325 | 1,966 | 16.6% | 45.5% | 3.6% | 19.9% | 14.4% |
| 16 | 4,629 | 1,205 | 20.0% | 33.4% | 6.1% | 28.7% | 11.8% |
| 17 | 846 | 391 | 18.4% | 28.4% | 5.6% | 23.3% | 24.3% |
| 18 | 1,038 | 395 | 18.5% | 44.6% | 9.1% | 18.0% | 9.9% |
| 19 | 5,370 | 1,482 | 32.5% | 36.8% | 4.6% | 11.5% | 14.6% |
| 20 | 2,935 | 1,084 | 14.7% | 55.0% | 6.5% | 16.4% | 7.5% |
| 21 | 3,568 | 538 | 23.0% | 25.8% | 6.3% | 37.7% | 7.1% |
| 22 | 3,056 | 1,263 | 8.6% | 23.6% | 4.8% | 21.5% | 41.6% |
| 23 | 4,683 | 1,164 | 13.0% | 35.1% | 5.8% | 26.5% | 19.6% |
| 24 | 4,694 | 1,374 | 18.2% | 35.0% | 3.1% | 23.7% | 19.9% |
| 25 | 2,882 | 1,133 | 19.1% | 27.1% | 4.5% | 35.5% | 13.9% |
| 26 | 5,211 | 1,676 | 10.5% | 37.9% | 5.4% | 23.0% | 23.2% |
| 27 | 4,699 | 1,325 | 16.5% | 40.7% | 6.3% | 25.1% | 11.4% |
| 28 | 2,503 | 259 | 13.1% | 30.5% | 4.2% | 34.4% | 17.8% |
| 29 | 2,835 | 697 | 4.6% | 25.8% | 5.0% | 50.5% | 14.1% |
| 30 | 2,731 | 671 | 5.5% | 25.9% | 2.8% | 56.8% | 8.9% |
| 31 | 3,933 | 1,503 | 27.9% | 43.4% | 1.8% | 13.4% | 13.5% |
| Total | 115,992 | 32,803 | 18.9% | 39.3% | 5.0% | 20.4% | 16.5% |

* "Other" includes juvenile intake complaints for TDOs, technical violations, traffic offenses, and other offenses.



YASI Overall Risk Levels, FY 2022

| CSU | Initial YASIs | | | | Probation Placement YASIs | | | | | Parole Placement YASIs | | | | |
|-------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|---------------------------|-------|-------|---------|-------|------------------------|--------|-------|---------|-------|
| | High | Mod. | Low | Total | High | Mod. | Low | Missing | Total | High | Mod. | Low | Missing | Total |
| 1 | 10.9% | 52.7% | 36.4% | 55 | 16.7% | 50.0% | 33.3% | 0.0% | 48 | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2 |
| 2 | 13.9% | 51.0% | 35.1% | 202 | 36.8% | 54.4% | 8.8% | 0.0% | 68 | 87.5% | 12.5% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 8 |
| 2A | 4.3% | 65.2% | 30.4% | 23 | 0.0% | 54.5% | 45.5% | 0.0% | 11 | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1 |
| 3 | 27.6% | 65.5% | 6.9% | 29 | 35.7% | 64.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 14 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 5 |
| 4 | 26.8% | 58.8% | 14.4% | 97 | 38.5% | 46.2% | 15.4% | 0.0% | 65 | 91.7% | 8.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 12 |
| 5 | 15.1% | 52.8% | 32.1% | 53 | 22.0% | 61.0% | 14.6% | 2.4% | 41 | 87.5% | 0.0% | 12.5% | 0.0% | 8 |
| 6 | 31.6% | 60.5% | 7.9% | 38 | 44.8% | 51.7% | 0.0% | 3.4% | 29 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3 |
| 7 | 17.0% | 67.9% | 15.1% | 53 | 21.6% | 68.6% | 7.8% | 2.0% | 51 | 84.6% | 15.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 13 |
| 8 | 27.1% | 49.2% | 23.7% | 59 | 65.0% | 30.0% | 5.0% | 0.0% | 20 | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2 |
| 9 | 25.9% | 48.1% | 25.9% | 27 | 33.3% | 44.4% | 22.2% | 0.0% | 18 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3 |
| 10 | 28.2% | 46.2% | 25.6% | 39 | 18.4% | 63.2% | 18.4% | 0.0% | 38 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 |
| 11 | 9.8% | 34.8% | 55.4% | 92 | 40.0% | 53.3% | 6.7% | 0.0% | 15 | 83.3% | 16.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6 |
| 12 | 7.3% | 28.0% | 64.7% | 286 | 49.1% | 37.7% | 13.2% | 0.0% | 53 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 9 |
| 13 | 23.7% | 47.4% | 28.9% | 114 | 31.0% | 55.2% | 13.8% | 0.0% | 58 | 91.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 8.3% | 12 |
| 14 | 12.2% | 30.1% | 57.7% | 156 | 34.6% | 57.7% | 5.1% | 2.6% | 78 | 83.3% | 16.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6 |
| 15 | 20.9% | 52.2% | 26.9% | 67 | 24.1% | 58.6% | 17.2% | 0.0% | 29 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4 |
| 16 | 7.6% | 28.5% | 63.9% | 158 | 30.2% | 46.0% | 22.2% | 1.6% | 63 | 60.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% | 5 |
| 17 | 14.3% | 54.3% | 31.4% | 35 | 21.6% | 59.5% | 16.2% | 2.7% | 37 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 |
| 18 | 16.7% | 33.3% | 50.0% | 48 | 14.0% | 46.5% | 39.5% | 0.0% | 43 | 66.7% | 33.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3 |
| 19 | 19.2% | 39.2% | 41.5% | 260 | 55.7% | 29.5% | 13.1% | 1.6% | 122 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3 |
| 20 | 36.7% | 40.8% | 22.4% | 49 | 40.6% | 46.9% | 12.5% | 0.0% | 32 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1 |
| 21 | 6.5% | 41.0% | 52.5% | 139 | 19.2% | 59.6% | 21.2% | 0.0% | 52 | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2 |
| 22 | 19.5% | 46.8% | 33.8% | 77 | 25.9% | 55.6% | 18.5% | 0.0% | 54 | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4 |
| 23 | 14.4% | 34.5% | 51.1% | 139 | 44.8% | 44.8% | 10.3% | 0.0% | 29 | 80.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 5 |
| 24 | 16.0% | 48.9% | 35.1% | 94 | 17.0% | 48.0% | 33.0% | 2.0% | 100 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3 |
| 25 | 21.7% | 60.9% | 17.4% | 69 | 16.4% | 70.1% | 11.9% | 1.5% | 67 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 3 |
| 26 | 41.1% | 44.6% | 14.3% | 56 | 46.4% | 37.5% | 12.5% | 3.6% | 56 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2 |
| 27 | 25.2% | 57.9% | 16.8% | 107 | 40.0% | 51.7% | 8.3% | 0.0% | 60 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 |
| 28 | 31.0% | 34.5% | 34.5% | 29 | 30.0% | 35.0% | 35.0% | 0.0% | 20 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 |
| 29 | 21.9% | 50.0% | 28.1% | 32 | 28.6% | 42.9% | 21.4% | 7.1% | 14 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 |
| 30 | 7.5% | 30.2% | 62.3% | 159 | 11.4% | 51.9% | 35.4% | 1.3% | 79 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 |
| 31 | 36.2% | 47.8% | 15.9% | 69 | 45.6% | 39.2% | 13.9% | 1.3% | 79 | 66.7% | 33.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6 |
| Total | 16.9% | 42.7% | 40.4% | 2,910 | 31.8% | 49.8% | 17.3% | 1.1% | 1,543 | 85.5% | 12.2% | 0.8% | 1.5% | 131 |



Juvenile Intake Cases, Probation Placements, Detainments, and Commitments, FY 2020-2022*

| CSU | Juvenile Intake Cases | | | Probation Placements | | | Detainments | | | Commitments | | |
|--------------|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| 1 | 637 | 412 | 477 | 64 | 56 | 48 | 115 | 99 | 93 | 10 | 8 | 7 |
| 2 | 1,159 | 710 | 859 | 90 | 94 | 68 | 290 | 210 | 288 | 3 | 11 | 6 |
| 2A | 197 | 144 | 197 | 14 | 8 | 11 | 13 | 7 | 27 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 541 | 309 | 304 | 36 | 25 | 14 | 141 | 76 | 62 | 4 | 4 | 7 |
| 4 | 1,145 | 640 | 683 | 71 | 57 | 65 | 343 | 175 | 205 | 21 | 27 | 14 |
| 5 | 483 | 299 | 564 | 29 | 39 | 41 | 121 | 74 | 115 | 11 | 7 | 12 |
| 6 | 391 | 209 | 378 | 17 | 14 | 29 | 80 | 54 | 90 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| 7 | 1,233 | 812 | 908 | 86 | 60 | 51 | 209 | 173 | 149 | 14 | 8 | 12 |
| 8 | 628 | 691 | 682 | 38 | 36 | 20 | 167 | 116 | 117 | 18 | 4 | 4 |
| 9 | 771 | 462 | 733 | 33 | 22 | 18 | 114 | 120 | 98 | 4 | 4 | 6 |
| 10 | 515 | 251 | 485 | 35 | 26 | 38 | 97 | 57 | 79 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 11 | 513 | 429 | 541 | 20 | 13 | 15 | 83 | 48 | 71 | 8 | 7 | 5 |
| 12 | 1,631 | 949 | 1,409 | 45 | 48 | 53 | 209 | 156 | 196 | 13 | 7 | 10 |
| 13 | 795 | 407 | 511 | 96 | 67 | 58 | 272 | 214 | 234 | 19 | 20 | 13 |
| 14 | 1,236 | 848 | 1,020 | 88 | 85 | 78 | 357 | 231 | 292 | 9 | 7 | 5 |
| 15 | 1,694 | 1,076 | 1,502 | 55 | 52 | 29 | 289 | 227 | 243 | 12 | 5 | 8 |
| 16 | 962 | 604 | 885 | 84 | 61 | 63 | 123 | 113 | 126 | 9 | 7 | 7 |
| 17 | 489 | 187 | 275 | 53 | 26 | 37 | 110 | 49 | 52 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 18 | 413 | 208 | 278 | 36 | 24 | 43 | 63 | 39 | 72 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 19 | 2,248 | 917 | 1,022 | 154 | 69 | 122 | 458 | 268 | 274 | 9 | 3 | 7 |
| 20 | 1,087 | 588 | 792 | 72 | 39 | 32 | 82 | 62 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 21 | 265 | 144 | 408 | 47 | 35 | 52 | 55 | 21 | 33 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 22 | 985 | 823 | 1,042 | 61 | 69 | 54 | 143 | 117 | 133 | 13 | 4 | 5 |
| 23 | 1,538 | 921 | 953 | 26 | 36 | 29 | 245 | 115 | 142 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| 24 | 1,229 | 738 | 985 | 80 | 71 | 100 | 229 | 133 | 195 | 7 | 5 | 8 |
| 25 | 798 | 712 | 915 | 51 | 50 | 67 | 138 | 127 | 172 | 9 | 4 | 8 |
| 26 | 1,369 | 923 | 1,339 | 83 | 67 | 56 | 289 | 243 | 208 | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| 27 | 793 | 708 | 964 | 61 | 72 | 60 | 93 | 83 | 117 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 28 | 336 | 172 | 212 | 47 | 18 | 20 | 30 | 19 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 29 | 488 | 310 | 596 | 26 | 20 | 14 | 37 | 29 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 30 | 454 | 422 | 585 | 47 | 54 | 79 | 53 | 46 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 31 | 2,211 | 867 | 1,058 | 154 | 98 | 79 | 233 | 128 | 172 | 9 | 1 | 3 |
| <i>Total</i> | <i>29,234</i> | <i>17,892</i> | <i>23,562</i> | <i>1,899</i> | <i>1,511</i> | <i>1,543</i> | <i>5,281</i> | <i>3,629</i> | <i>4,226</i> | <i>229</i> | <i>166</i> | <i>158</i> |

* Individual CSU probation placements may not add to the total because some cases were open in multiple CSUs but are only counted once in the statewide total. The totals displayed above represent the statewide totals.

* Individual CSU detainment data are identified by the CSU that made the decision to detain the youth (not the JDC location). Reports prior to FY 2021 identified the CSU by the associated ICN, but the data above identify the CSU by the detaining FIPS; therefore, detainment data by CSU are not comparable to reports prior to FY 2021.

* Individual CSU detainments may not add to the total because some detainments were not assigned a detaining FIPS but are counted in the statewide total.

* CSU 12 had four subsequent commitments in FY 2022; these commitments are excluded in the table.



Juvenile Intake Complaint Initial Decisions, FY 2022*

| CSU | Court Summons | Det. Order Only | Diversion Plan | | | | Petition | | Resolved | Unfounded | Total |
|--------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| | | | Open | Success. | Unsuccess. w/ Petition | Unsuccess. w/o Petition | Filed | Det. Order | | | |
| 1 | 2.1% | 0.4% | 0.7% | 11.8% | 1.4% | 0.8% | 36.2% | 24.4% | 20.5% | 1.1% | 712 |
| 2 | 4.5% | 6.0% | 0.0% | 10.2% | 0.7% | 1.4% | 32.8% | 32.5% | 11.3% | 0.0% | 1,389 |
| 2A | 27.9% | 0.0% | 0.4% | 7.4% | 1.1% | 0.0% | 35.3% | 21.9% | 3.2% | 0.4% | 283 |
| 3 | 15.4% | 0.8% | 0.0% | 11.4% | 1.3% | 2.1% | 14.6% | 36.5% | 16.2% | 1.3% | 474 |
| 4 | 9.8% | 2.7% | 0.0% | 2.5% | 0.0% | 1.5% | 31.3% | 37.3% | 10.4% | 2.6% | 1,075 |
| 5 | 3.6% | 0.2% | 0.1% | 12.4% | 1.0% | 2.0% | 51.8% | 22.9% | 5.3% | 0.4% | 956 |
| 6 | 8.2% | 0.2% | 1.0% | 11.3% | 0.7% | 2.2% | 37.6% | 30.4% | 5.0% | 1.9% | 583 |
| 7 | 15.9% | 1.4% | 0.0% | 2.1% | 0.0% | 0.5% | 42.2% | 28.9% | 7.3% | 0.7% | 1,282 |
| 8 | 5.2% | 8.4% | 0.0% | 9.3% | 0.4% | 4.8% | 43.0% | 15.1% | 10.5% | 3.2% | 912 |
| 9 | 0.3% | 0.7% | 0.3% | 20.6% | 2.0% | 1.5% | 50.6% | 16.2% | 6.9% | 0.5% | 1,068 |
| 10 | 6.3% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 18.4% | 0.5% | 1.6% | 50.1% | 20.0% | 2.8% | 0.0% | 635 |
| 11 | 8.9% | 0.1% | 0.1% | 7.2% | 1.5% | 1.9% | 52.9% | 17.0% | 9.6% | 0.4% | 677 |
| 12 | 0.3% | 0.1% | 1.1% | 29.7% | 2.4% | 2.7% | 39.5% | 13.9% | 8.6% | 1.1% | 2,148 |
| 13 | 0.6% | 3.0% | 0.0% | 7.9% | 0.7% | 2.0% | 32.4% | 51.0% | 2.4% | 0.0% | 864 |
| 14 | 22.4% | 2.2% | 0.7% | 6.4% | 1.6% | 0.8% | 32.6% | 17.0% | 12.4% | 3.2% | 1,619 |
| 15 | 3.7% | 0.3% | 0.7% | 15.7% | 0.7% | 0.9% | 49.0% | 13.3% | 13.4% | 0.8% | 1,966 |
| 16 | 2.2% | 0.1% | 0.7% | 22.3% | 3.3% | 1.8% | 37.6% | 19.6% | 10.6% | 0.9% | 1,205 |
| 17 | 19.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6.9% | 2.8% | 1.3% | 40.2% | 26.1% | 2.8% | 0.3% | 391 |
| 18 | 12.9% | 2.8% | 0.8% | 11.1% | 4.3% | 0.8% | 51.4% | 3.0% | 8.4% | 3.3% | 395 |
| 19 | 0.5% | 4.5% | 1.8% | 8.2% | 0.5% | 0.6% | 30.8% | 42.2% | 7.1% | 1.1% | 1,482 |
| 20 | 3.1% | 0.0% | 1.2% | 30.0% | 1.9% | 3.5% | 18.6% | 10.5% | 28.0% | 2.1% | 1,084 |
| 21 | 11.7% | 0.6% | 0.6% | 17.8% | 5.2% | 0.6% | 14.5% | 20.6% | 27.3% | 0.2% | 538 |
| 22 | 17.8% | 0.0% | 0.4% | 6.7% | 1.0% | 2.0% | 51.6% | 16.9% | 2.5% | 0.6% | 1,263 |
| 23 | 21.0% | 0.0% | 0.8% | 9.5% | 2.8% | 1.8% | 36.1% | 17.2% | 5.6% | 0.8% | 1,164 |
| 24 | 2.1% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 6.0% | 0.6% | 0.6% | 52.3% | 35.4% | 2.1% | 0.1% | 1,374 |
| 25 | 8.3% | 0.5% | 0.9% | 12.4% | 2.5% | 2.1% | 36.3% | 22.2% | 12.9% | 0.8% | 1,133 |
| 26 | 11.6% | 0.2% | 0.8% | 16.4% | 5.3% | 0.4% | 47.9% | 12.5% | 2.4% | 1.1% | 1,676 |
| 27 | 3.1% | 0.1% | 0.5% | 26.7% | 2.4% | 0.8% | 40.3% | 18.6% | 5.7% | 0.8% | 1,325 |
| 28 | 13.9% | 0.0% | 0.4% | 32.0% | 1.9% | 0.4% | 27.4% | 12.7% | 7.3% | 1.2% | 259 |
| 29 | 3.6% | 0.0% | 1.0% | 35.0% | 4.3% | 4.3% | 36.0% | 7.3% | 7.2% | 0.3% | 697 |
| 30 | 3.7% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 12.8% | 1.5% | 1.8% | 52.6% | 6.7% | 17.7% | 0.0% | 671 |
| 31 | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.5% | 16.0% | 1.9% | 2.1% | 35.5% | 29.1% | 12.4% | 0.9% | 1,503 |
| Total | 7.3% | 1.2% | 0.6% | 14.4% | 1.8% | 1.6% | 39.6% | 22.0% | 9.4% | 1.0% | 32,803 |

* Not all CSUs receive and enter all court summons paperwork.

* Percentages may not add to 100% because "Other" intake decisions are not displayed. Five percent or less of intake decisions were "Other" for each CSU.



Diversion-Eligible Juvenile Intake Complaints, FY 2022*

| CSU | Diversion-Eligible Complaints | | | Diversion Plan | Resolved | Diversion Plan or Resolved | Successful Diversions |
|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|---|
| | Count of Complaints | % of Total Complaints | Count of Diversion Plans | % of Diversion-Eligible Complaints | | | % of Diversion-Eligible Diversion Plans |
| 1 | 633 | 88.9% | 105 | 16.6% | 22.1% | 38.7% | 80.0% |
| 2 | 1,078 | 77.6% | 170 | 15.8% | 14.5% | 30.2% | 82.9% |
| 2A | 151 | 53.4% | 25 | 16.6% | 6.0% | 22.5% | 84.0% |
| 3 | 324 | 68.4% | 70 | 21.6% | 23.5% | 45.1% | 77.1% |
| 4 | 681 | 63.3% | 42 | 6.2% | 15.7% | 21.9% | 64.3% |
| 5 | 762 | 79.7% | 147 | 19.3% | 6.2% | 25.5% | 79.6% |
| 6 | 458 | 78.6% | 87 | 19.0% | 6.3% | 25.3% | 74.7% |
| 7 | 735 | 57.3% | 33 | 4.5% | 12.4% | 16.9% | 81.8% |
| 8 | 684 | 75.0% | 133 | 19.4% | 13.9% | 33.3% | 63.9% |
| 9 | 977 | 91.5% | 259 | 26.5% | 7.6% | 34.1% | 84.6% |
| 10 | 465 | 73.2% | 131 | 28.2% | 3.9% | 32.0% | 88.5% |
| 11 | 326 | 48.2% | 72 | 22.1% | 19.9% | 42.0% | 68.1% |
| 12 | 1,908 | 88.8% | 768 | 40.3% | 9.5% | 49.8% | 82.7% |
| 13 | 587 | 67.9% | 87 | 14.8% | 3.6% | 18.4% | 73.6% |
| 14 | 1,011 | 62.4% | 153 | 15.1% | 19.6% | 34.7% | 66.7% |
| 15 | 1,594 | 81.1% | 349 | 21.9% | 16.2% | 38.1% | 87.4% |
| 16 | 979 | 81.2% | 337 | 34.4% | 12.9% | 47.3% | 79.5% |
| 17 | 238 | 60.9% | 43 | 18.1% | 3.8% | 21.8% | 62.8% |
| 18 | 293 | 74.2% | 67 | 22.9% | 10.6% | 33.4% | 65.7% |
| 19 | 1,170 | 78.9% | 164 | 14.0% | 8.7% | 22.7% | 74.4% |
| 20 | 903 | 83.3% | 391 | 43.3% | 31.3% | 74.6% | 82.1% |
| 21 | 409 | 76.0% | 129 | 31.5% | 33.7% | 65.3% | 73.6% |
| 22 | 649 | 51.4% | 127 | 19.6% | 4.0% | 23.6% | 66.9% |
| 23 | 758 | 65.1% | 172 | 22.7% | 7.9% | 30.6% | 63.4% |
| 24 | 1,037 | 75.5% | 95 | 9.2% | 2.6% | 11.8% | 80.0% |
| 25 | 839 | 74.1% | 192 | 22.9% | 16.7% | 39.6% | 70.3% |
| 26 | 1,103 | 65.8% | 383 | 34.7% | 3.4% | 38.1% | 71.8% |
| 27 | 1,090 | 82.3% | 402 | 36.9% | 6.9% | 43.8% | 87.8% |
| 28 | 176 | 68.0% | 90 | 51.1% | 10.8% | 61.9% | 92.2% |
| 29 | 586 | 84.1% | 309 | 52.7% | 8.5% | 61.3% | 78.6% |
| 30 | 557 | 83.0% | 110 | 19.7% | 21.2% | 40.9% | 78.2% |
| 31 | 1,207 | 80.3% | 298 | 24.7% | 15.2% | 39.9% | 78.5% |
| Total | 24,368 | 74.3% | 5,940 | 24.4% | 12.3% | 36.6% | 78.6% |

* Counts are not comparable to data elsewhere in this report because only diversion-eligible complaints are included. Statewide, 63 complaints that were not eligible for diversion resulted in a diversion plan and are not included above.

* Only diversion-eligible complaints, based on the *Code of Virginia*, are included.



Diversion-Eligible Juvenile Intake Cases, FY 2022*

| CSU | Diversion-Eligible Cases | | Diversion Plan | Resolved | Diversion Plan or Resolved | Successful Divisions |
|--------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| | Count of Cases | % of Total Cases | % of Diversion-Eligible Cases | | | % of Diversion Plans |
| 1 | 420 | 88.1% | 22.6% | 27.4% | 50.0% | 81.1% |
| 2 | 653 | 76.0% | 22.1% | 19.0% | 41.0% | 81.9% |
| 2A | 161 | 81.7% | 13.7% | 5.0% | 18.6% | 81.8% |
| 3 | 238 | 78.3% | 23.9% | 27.7% | 51.7% | 73.7% |
| 4 | 447 | 65.4% | 8.3% | 17.4% | 25.7% | 70.3% |
| 5 | 418 | 74.1% | 29.9% | 8.9% | 38.8% | 78.4% |
| 6 | 322 | 85.2% | 24.2% | 7.8% | 32.0% | 74.4% |
| 7 | 615 | 67.7% | 4.6% | 14.1% | 18.7% | 82.1% |
| 8 | 554 | 81.2% | 21.5% | 16.4% | 37.9% | 63.9% |
| 9 | 663 | 90.5% | 34.4% | 9.7% | 44.0% | 85.1% |
| 10 | 371 | 76.5% | 32.9% | 4.9% | 37.7% | 88.5% |
| 11 | 252 | 46.6% | 26.6% | 23.8% | 50.4% | 67.2% |
| 12 | 1,232 | 87.4% | 47.9% | 12.0% | 59.9% | 83.7% |
| 13 | 312 | 61.1% | 25.6% | 5.8% | 31.4% | 70.0% |
| 14 | 853 | 83.6% | 14.7% | 21.1% | 35.8% | 64.8% |
| 15 | 1,204 | 80.2% | 25.5% | 20.4% | 45.9% | 87.3% |
| 16 | 724 | 81.8% | 39.4% | 13.0% | 52.3% | 78.6% |
| 17 | 208 | 75.6% | 18.8% | 2.9% | 21.6% | 61.5% |
| 18 | 245 | 88.1% | 24.5% | 12.2% | 36.7% | 63.3% |
| 19 | 767 | 75.0% | 18.5% | 12.6% | 31.2% | 73.9% |
| 20 | 696 | 87.9% | 43.7% | 35.2% | 78.9% | 80.6% |
| 21 | 360 | 88.2% | 32.5% | 38.6% | 71.1% | 70.9% |
| 22 | 661 | 63.4% | 18.2% | 4.1% | 22.2% | 67.5% |
| 23 | 809 | 84.9% | 19.4% | 7.7% | 27.1% | 63.1% |
| 24 | 705 | 71.6% | 13.8% | 4.0% | 17.7% | 76.3% |
| 25 | 743 | 81.2% | 26.5% | 19.7% | 46.2% | 66.5% |
| 26 | 995 | 74.3% | 33.5% | 3.8% | 37.3% | 72.7% |
| 27 | 787 | 81.6% | 45.6% | 8.4% | 54.0% | 87.5% |
| 28 | 171 | 80.7% | 49.7% | 11.1% | 60.8% | 91.8% |
| 29 | 512 | 85.9% | 54.1% | 9.0% | 63.1% | 80.9% |
| 30 | 498 | 85.1% | 20.1% | 22.9% | 43.0% | 79.0% |
| 31 | 825 | 78.0% | 32.5% | 20.5% | 53.0% | 77.2% |
| Total | 18,421 | 78.2% | 28.0% | 14.6% | 42.6% | 78.0% |

* In order to be categorized as a diversion-eligible case, all offenses associated with the case must be diversion-eligible based on the *Code of Virginia*.

* In order to be categorized as a case with a diversion plan, at least one complaint associated with the case must have a diversion plan, and no complaints can be petitioned. These may include cases that are not diversion-eligible.

* In order to be categorized as a resolved case, all complaints associated with the case must be resolved. These may include cases that are not diversion-eligible.

* In order to be categorized as a case with a successful diversion, the case must be diversion-eligible, at least one complaint associated with the case must have a successful diversion plan, and no complaints can have a petition.



Workload Information, FY 2022*

| CSU | Completed Reports | | | Probation | ADP | |
|--------------|-------------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|-------------|
| | Pre-D | Post-D | Transfer | | Parole | Commitments |
| 1 | 36 | 26 | 7 | 44 | 4 | 10 |
| 2 | 76 | 14 | 26 | 84 | 12 | 10 |
| 2A | 17 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 35 | 8 | 4 | 23 | 4 | 7 |
| 4 | 102 | 6 | 10 | 53 | 17 | 26 |
| 5 | 71 | 7 | 4 | 41 | 11 | 12 |
| 6 | 34 | 4 | 2 | 18 | 4 | 6 |
| 7 | 57 | 34 | 23 | 49 | 15 | 14 |
| 8 | 47 | 0 | 4 | 32 | 9 | 7 |
| 9 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 24 | 2 | 5 |
| 10 | 15 | 18 | 1 | 21 | 1 | 0 |
| 11 | 18 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 6 | 5 |
| 12 | 55 | 6 | 3 | 37 | 7 | 11 |
| 13 | 28 | 55 | 13 | 59 | 16 | 22 |
| 14 | 64 | 29 | 2 | 65 | 7 | 5 |
| 15 | 22 | 10 | 10 | 45 | 3 | 8 |
| 16 | 40 | 18 | 4 | 63 | 11 | 6 |
| 17 | 8 | 19 | 0 | 29 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | 34 | 6 | 1 | 27 | 3 | 2 |
| 19 | 129 | 18 | 1 | 85 | 7 | 4 |
| 20 | 38 | 5 | 1 | 31 | 1 | 0 |
| 21 | 45 | 4 | 7 | 35 | 1 | 3 |
| 22 | 63 | 27 | 5 | 56 | 2 | 9 |
| 23 | 46 | 8 | 4 | 23 | 2 | 4 |
| 24 | 44 | 55 | 9 | 63 | 2 | 6 |
| 25 | 38 | 39 | 7 | 56 | 2 | 10 |
| 26 | 5 | 30 | 1 | 75 | 7 | 5 |
| 27 | 66 | 37 | 2 | 61 | 0 | 3 |
| 28 | 18 | 7 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 0 |
| 29 | 33 | 2 | 0 | 18 | 1 | 0 |
| 30 | 52 | 40 | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 |
| 31 | 16 | 48 | 3 | 73 | 3 | 4 |
| <i>Total</i> | <i>1,369</i> | <i>590</i> | <i>161</i> | <i>1,368</i> | <i>161</i> | <i>208</i> |

* Transfer reports indicate the number of cases considered for trial in circuit court with a report from the CSU. Transfer reports do not indicate the actual number of juveniles tried in circuit court.

* Commitments workload ADP is not equal to the direct care ADP reported in other sections of this report due to different data sources.



Summary by Region

Intake Complaints, FY 2022*

| Complaints | Central | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |
|----------------------------------|---------|---------|----------|----------|---------|
| DR/CW Complaints | 23,197 | 30,001 | 19,333 | 19,386 | 24,075 |
| Juvenile Complaints | 6,746 | 7,083 | 6,531 | 6,526 | 5,917 |
| Juvenile Complaints | | | | | |
| Felony | 1,249 | 1,422 | 1,382 | 1,425 | 706 |
| Class 1 Misdemeanor | 2,605 | 2,924 | 2,715 | 2,844 | 1,818 |
| Class 2-4 Misdemeanor | 299 | 377 | 314 | 327 | 310 |
| CHINS/CHINSup/Status | 1,677 | 1,059 | 1,098 | 905 | 1,937 |
| Other | 916 | 1,301 | 1,022 | 1,025 | 1,146 |
| Juvenile Intake Decisions | | | | | |
| Court Summons | 3.4% | 8.7% | 5.6% | 8.0% | 11.2% |
| Detention Order Only | 0.3% | 3.1% | 1.3% | 1.0% | 0.1% |
| Diversion Plan | 18.6% | 10.3% | 20.9% | 20.1% | 22.7% |
| Petition | 66.6% | 65.4% | 59.0% | 61.1% | 55.1% |
| Resolved | 9.5% | 10.5% | 10.4% | 7.9% | 8.6% |
| Unfounded | 0.6% | 1.2% | 1.3% | 1.3% | 0.5% |
| Other | 0.9% | 0.8% | 1.5% | 0.6% | 1.9% |

* Not all CSUs receive and enter all court summons paperwork.

Workload Information, FY 2022*

| Completed Reports | Central | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |
|-------------------|---------|---------|----------|----------|---------|
| Pre-D Reports | 161 | 441 | 230 | 214 | 323 |
| Post-D Reports | 126 | 98 | 126 | 115 | 125 |
| Transfer Reports | 30 | 81 | 7 | 25 | 18 |
| ADP | | | | | |
| Probation | 252 | 331 | 320 | 214 | 252 |
| Parole | 21 | 73 | 21 | 40 | 7 |
| Commitments | 35 | 88 | 15 | 50 | 20 |

* Transfer reports indicate the number of cases considered for trial in circuit court with a report from the region. Transfer reports do not indicate the actual number of juveniles tried in circuit court.

* Commitments workload ADP is not equal to the direct care ADP reported in other sections of this report due to different data sources.

Initial YASIs, FY 2022*

| | Central | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |
|---------------------|---------|---------|----------|----------|---------|
| Low | 41.2% | 26.8% | 33.5% | 51.3% | 44.9% |
| Moderate | 43.6% | 55.3% | 41.6% | 35.0% | 40.6% |
| High | 15.2% | 17.9% | 25.0% | 13.7% | 14.5% |
| Total Initial YASIs | 415 | 571 | 517 | 725 | 682 |

* Data may include multiple initial YASIs for a youth if completed on different days.

Juvenile Cases, FY 2022*

| | Central | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |
|-----------------------|---------|---------|----------|----------|---------|
| Juvenile Intake Cases | 5,020 | 4,674 | 4,764 | 4,344 | 4,760 |
| Probation Placements | 277 | 318 | 369 | 271 | 308 |
| Detainments | 831 | 1,045 | 834 | 966 | 540 |
| Commitments | 37 | 62 | 15 | 34 | 10 |
| Parole Placements | 18 | 51 | 15 | 36 | 11 |

* Regional probation placements may not add to the statewide total because some cases were open in multiple CSUs.

* CSU 12 had four subsequent commitments in FY 2022; these commitments are excluded in the table.



Juvenile Intake Cases by MSO, FY 2022

| MSO Severity | Central | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| DAI Ranking | | | | | |
| Felony | | | | | |
| Against Persons | 9.1% | 8.8% | 10.1% | 10.1% | 4.9% |
| Weapons/Narcotics Distribution | 0.8% | 0.9% | 1.2% | 1.4% | 0.4% |
| Other | 5.9% | 7.8% | 7.2% | 7.4% | 3.7% |
| Class 1 Misdemeanor | | | | | |
| Against Persons | 21.2% | 24.5% | 23.3% | 23.4% | 16.3% |
| Other | 12.6% | 13.8% | 16.4% | 19.2% | 11.7% |
| Probation/Parole Violation | 3.0% | 5.7% | 6.7% | 3.4% | 3.4% |
| Court Order Violation | 8.7% | 5.3% | 7.6% | 6.2% | 10.8% |
| Status Offense | 31.2% | 18.8% | 19.6% | 17.1% | 38.9% |
| Other | 7.6% | 14.5% | 8.0% | 11.9% | 10.0% |
| VCSC Ranking | | | | | |
| Person | 32.3% | 33.4% | 34.8% | 33.2% | 28.4% |
| Property | 12.4% | 14.0% | 14.5% | 18.9% | 8.8% |
| Narcotics | 1.1% | 0.5% | 2.2% | 0.9% | 0.6% |
| Other | 54.3% | 52.1% | 48.5% | 47.0% | 62.2% |
| <i>Total Juvenile Intake Cases</i> | <i>5,020</i> | <i>4,674</i> | <i>4,764</i> | <i>4,344</i> | <i>4,760</i> |

Probation Placements by MSO, FY 2022*

| MSO Severity | Central | Eastern | Northern | Southern | Western |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| DAI Ranking | | | | | |
| Felony | | | | | |
| Against Persons | 34.7% | 33.6% | 16.3% | 29.9% | 20.5% |
| Weapons/Narcotics Distribution | 2.9% | 2.8% | 1.1% | 4.1% | 1.9% |
| Other | 15.2% | 23.3% | 8.9% | 17.3% | 9.7% |
| Class 1 Misdemeanor | | | | | |
| Against Persons | 19.1% | 18.2% | 30.6% | 18.8% | 21.4% |
| Other | 14.4% | 14.8% | 18.2% | 22.5% | 13.3% |
| Probation/Parole Violation | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Court Order Violation | 4.0% | 0.3% | 1.6% | 1.1% | 3.9% |
| Status Offense | 7.2% | 0.0% | 19.0% | 1.5% | 23.4% |
| Other | 2.5% | 6.9% | 4.3% | 4.8% | 5.8% |
| VCSC Ranking | | | | | |
| Person | 49.8% | 47.8% | 44.4% | 45.0% | 41.6% |
| Property | 26.4% | 31.1% | 20.6% | 29.9% | 17.2% |
| Narcotics | 1.4% | 1.6% | 2.2% | 2.6% | 2.3% |
| Other | 22.4% | 19.5% | 32.8% | 22.5% | 39.0% |
| <i>Total Probation Placements</i> | <i>277</i> | <i>318</i> | <i>369</i> | <i>271</i> | <i>308</i> |

* Regional probation placements may not add to the statewide total because some cases were open in multiple CSUs.



VJCCCA

In 1995, the General Assembly enacted VJCCCA “to establish a community-based system of progressive intensive sanctions and services that correspond to the severity of offense and treatment needs.” The purpose was “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” (§ 16.1-309.2 of the *Code of Virginia*).

Under the legislation, state and local dollars are combined to fund community-based juvenile justice programs. All 133 localities in Virginia voluntarily participate. Since January 1996, state funding has been allocated to localities through a formula based on factors such as the number and types of arrests and average daily cost of serving a youth. The MOE originally required that a locality must expend the same amount that it did in FY 1995 in order to receive state funding, but as of July 1, 2011, a locality can reduce its MOE to an amount equal to the state funds allocated by VJCCCA.

Effective in FY 2020, VJCCCA’s purpose in § 16.1-309.2 of the *Code of Virginia* was amended to “deter crime by providing community diversion or community-based services to juveniles who are in need of such services and by providing an immediate, effective punishment that emphasizes accountability of the juvenile offender for his actions as well as reduces the pattern of repeat offending.” Localities are not required but may elect to include the category of prevention services. Prior to FY 2020, all VJCCCA funding was to be used to serve youth “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*). VJCCCA data in this report do not include prevention services.

Plan Development and Evaluation

Participation requires that localities develop a biennial plan for utilizing the funding. While plans must be approved by DJJ and the Board of Juvenile Justice, communities have autonomy and flexibility in addressing their juvenile offense patterns. Plan development requires consultation with judges, CSU directors, and CSA CPMTs (interagency bodies that manage the expenditures of CSA state funding to serve children and families). The local governing body designates an entity responsible for managing the plan. Some localities have combined their plans with one or more other localities. In FY 2022, there were a total of 76 VJCCCA plans throughout Virginia.

Localities may provide services directly or purchase services from other public or private agencies. Specific programs or services are not required, though a list of allowable programs and services is included on DJJ’s website. The intent is to use evidence-based programs and services to fit the needs of each locality and their youth.

DJJ’s Diversion Unit oversees the management of VJCCCA. Each locality or group of localities must submit an annual evaluation for each of their programs to inform changes to the plan. The evaluations contain the utilization, cost-effectiveness, and success rate of each program or service in the plan as well as trend data and locality-specific needs to address juvenile offending.

Programs and Services

Programs and services are categorized under five headings: “Accountability,” “Competency Development,” “Group Homes,” “Public Safety,” and “Specialized Program Services.” The “Accountability” category includes programs such as community service and restorative justice. “Competency Development” encompasses the largest array of services, including skill development programs, substance abuse education, and other clinical services. The “Group Homes” category includes locally and privately operated community group homes which serve court-involved youth. In the category of “Public Safety,” typical programs include alternatives to detention such as outreach detention and electronic monitoring. Finally, the “Specialized Program Services” category represents additional service types.

In FY 2022, the average cost for a VJCCCA residential placement was \$10,552, and the average cost for a VJCCCA non-residential placement was \$1,817. Non-residential placements encompass a variety of programming from electronic monitoring to treatment services. Average costs were calculated based on the number of placements and not the number of youth receiving services. Youth may have multiple placements during the FY.

In FY 2022, Hampton did not complete the required financial closeout certification; therefore, the locality is excluded from all data presented.

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



Youth Served, FY 2022

| | 2022 |
|------------------------------|-------|
| Youth Placed | 4,401 |
| Total Program Placements | 6,662 |
| Average Placements per Youth | 1.5 |
| Youth Eligible for Detention | 79.3% |

- » 4,401 youth were placed in VJCCCA programs for a total of 6,662 placements.
- » On average, there were 1.5 placements per youth.
- » 79.3% of youth placed in VJCCCA programs were eligible for detention.

Placement Status, FY 2022

| Dispositional Status | Residential | Non-Residential |
|----------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Pre-D | 484 (7.3%) | 4,526 (67.9%) |
| Post-D | 35 (0.5%) | 1,617 (24.3%) |

- » The majority of placements were pre-D and non-residential (67.9%).
- » The second-highest percentage of placements were post-D and non-residential (24.3%).
- » Of the 7.8% of placements that were residential, 93.3% were pre-D, and 6.7% were post-D.


Placements by Service Category and Type, FY 2020-2022

| Service Category and Type | 2020 | | 2021 | | 2022 | |
|--|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Total | % | Total | % | Total | % |
| Accountability | 1,715 | 19.7% | 967 | 17.3% | 1,197 | 18.0% |
| Community Service | 1,648 | 19.0% | 894 | 16.0% | 1,163 | 17.5% |
| Restitution/Restorative Justice | 67 | 0.8% | 73 | 1.3% | 34 | 0.5% |
| Competency Development | 2,197 | 25.3% | 1,268 | 22.7% | 1,610 | 24.2% |
| After-School/Extended Day | 85 | 1.0% | 34 | 0.6% | 42 | 0.6% |
| Anger Management Programs | 636 | 7.3% | 331 | 5.9% | 531 | 8.0% |
| Case Management | 456 | 5.2% | 160 | 2.9% | 182 | 2.7% |
| Employment/Vocational | 27 | 0.3% | 10 | 0.2% | 8 | 0.1% |
| Home-Based/Family Preservation | 68 | 0.8% | 44 | 0.8% | 44 | 0.7% |
| Individual, Group, Family Counseling | 107 | 1.2% | 26 | 0.5% | 24 | 0.4% |
| Law-Related Education | 240 | 2.8% | 178 | 3.2% | 310 | 4.7% |
| Life Skills | 55 | 0.6% | 80 | 1.4% | 101 | 1.5% |
| Parenting Skills | 32 | 0.4% | 62 | 1.1% | 55 | 0.8% |
| Sex Offender Education/Treatment | 2 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.0% |
| Shoplifting Programs | 183 | 2.1% | 85 | 1.5% | 87 | 1.3% |
| Substance Abuse Assessment | 79 | 0.9% | 61 | 1.1% | 45 | 0.7% |
| Substance Abuse Education/Treatment | 227 | 2.6% | 195 | 3.5% | 180 | 2.7% |
| Group Homes | 185 | 2.1% | 117 | 2.1% | 97 | 1.5% |
| Public Safety | 4,248 | 48.9% | 2,986 | 53.5% | 3,326 | 49.9% |
| Crisis Intervention/Shelter Care | 593 | 6.8% | 346 | 6.2% | 422 | 6.3% |
| Intensive Supervision/Surveillance | 516 | 5.9% | 249 | 4.5% | 187 | 2.8% |
| Outreach Detention/Electronic Monitoring | 3,139 | 36.1% | 2,391 | 42.8% | 2,717 | 40.8% |
| Specialized Program Services | 347 | 4.0% | 231 | 4.1% | 388 | 5.8% |
| Missing | 3 | 0.0% | 16 | 0.3% | 44 | 0.7% |
| <i>Total Placements</i> | <i>8,695</i> | <i>100.0%</i> | <i>5,585</i> | <i>100.0%</i> | <i>6,662</i> | <i>100.0%</i> |

- » There were 6,662 total placements in VJCCCA programs during FY 2022, a decrease of 23.4% from FY 2020.
- » The “Public Safety” service category had the highest percentage (48.9-53.5%) of placements, and the “Competency Development” service category had the second-highest percentage (22.7-25.3%) of placements out of all service categories from FY 2020 to FY 2022.
- » “Outreach Detention and Electronic Monitoring,” a service type in the “Public Safety” service category, had the highest percentage (36.1-42.8%) of placements, and “Community Service,” a service type in the “Accountability” service category, had the second-highest percentage (16.0-19.0%) of placements out of all service types from FY 2020 to FY 2022.




Expenditures, FY 2022



- » Localities paid 56.1% of the total expenditures for VJCCCA programs. Of the total local expenditures, 59.4% were MOE, and 40.6% were additional funds.
- » VJCCCA funded the equivalent of 296.5 staff positions in FY 2022.

Completion by Status, FY 2022*



* Percentages may not add to 100% because missing completion statuses are not displayed.

- » 7,165 services were closed.
- » 76.8% completed the services satisfactorily.

Youth Demographics, FY 2020-2022

| Demographics | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Race | | | |
| Asian | 0.8% | 0.7% | 0.8% |
| Black | 45.0% | 45.8% | 42.5% |
| White | 45.7% | 46.3% | 48.6% |
| Other/Unknown | 8.5% | 7.2% | 8.1% |
| Ethnicity | | | |
| Hispanic | 9.5% | 9.6% | 10.4% |
| Non-Hispanic | 62.4% | 66.3% | 63.7% |
| Unknown/Missing | 28.1% | 24.0% | 25.9% |
| Sex | | | |
| Female | 29.4% | 28.3% | 31.0% |
| Male | 70.6% | 71.7% | 69.0% |
| Age | | | |
| 8-12 | 4.5% | 3.5% | 6.0% |
| 13 | 7.5% | 6.0% | 8.6% |
| 14 | 13.3% | 11.1% | 15.2% |
| 15 | 19.3% | 19.4% | 19.8% |
| 16 | 24.3% | 25.1% | 22.6% |
| 17 | 26.7% | 29.2% | 23.9% |
| 18-20 | 4.1% | 5.6% | 3.7% |
| Missing | 0.3% | 0.2% | 0.1% |
| Total Youth | 5,538 | 3,472 | 4,401 |

- » 42.5% of youth placed in VJCCCA programs in FY 2022 were Black, and 48.6% were White.
- » 63.7% of youth placed in VJCCCA programs in FY 2022 were non-Hispanic, and 10.4% were Hispanic. 25.9% had unknown ethnicity information.
- » 69.0% of youth placed in VJCCCA programs in FY 2022 were male, and 31.0% were female.
- » Approximately half (46.5-54.3%) of youth placed in VJCCCA programs since FY 2020 were 16 or 17 years of age.
- » The average age of youth placed in VJCCCA programs in FY 2022 was 15.8 years.

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



JDCs


DJJ provides partial funding and serves as the certifying agency for 24 JDCs, operated by local governments or multi-jurisdictional commissions. JDCs provide temporary care for youth under secure custody pending a court appearance (pre-D) and those held after disposition (post-D). Educational instruction, including remedial services, is required within 24 hours of detainment (or the next school day) and is provided by the locality in which the JDC is located through a cooperative agreement facilitated and funded by VDOE's Division of State-Operated Programs. Youth participate in a highly structured program of care, which includes medical and mental health screenings and services, recreational and religious activities, and parent/guardian visitation. The map below shows the area served by each JDC.

Each JDC provides pre-D detention, which can be ordered by a judge, intake officer, or magistrate. (See page 6 for pre-D detention eligibility criteria.) Detention decisions by intake officers are guided by the DAI. (See Appendix C.) All JDCs also provide post-D detention without programs for up to 30 days while some provide post-D detention with programs for up to 180 days for most offenses pursuant to § 16.1-284.1 of the *Code of Virginia*. Treatment services in post-D detention with programs are coordinated by the JDC, CSU, local mental health and social services agencies, and the youth's family. Individualized services such as anger management, substance abuse treatment, life skills, career readiness education, and victim empathy are provided to meet youth's needs. Out of 1,445 certified JDC beds on the last day of FY 2022, 227 beds were certified to facilitate post-D detention with programs.

JDCs by Area Served*

* Some localities utilize multiple JDCs. (See page 14 for details.)

* Culpeper County is served by Blue Ridge JDC.



Several JDCs also partner with DJJ to facilitate admission and evaluation services such as medical, psychological, behavioral, educational, career readiness, and sociological evaluations for youth in direct care. Additionally, as of June 30, 2022, eight JDCs operate CPPs, highly structured residential programs for youth in direct care. Nine JDCs operate detention reentry programs, which allow youth in direct care to transition to the community 30 to 120 days before release. Youth in direct care admission and evaluation, CPPs, detention reentry, or individually contracted JDC beds are counted in the direct care population despite being housed in JDCs. In FY 2022, the direct care ADP in JDC facilities was 87 youth.

JDC Data

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

Detention dispositional statuses are categorized as pre-D, post-D without programs, post-D with programs, or other. (See Appendix E.) Statuses 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.

Beginning in FY 2019, individual offenses are associated with a detainment. Any changes to these offenses after intake (e.g., nolle prosequi, amended) may not be reflected in the data, resulting in possible inaccuracies in the offense data for post-D detention. (See page 38 for detaining MSO data for pre-D detention.)



Detention Offerings, FY 2022*


| JDC | Post-D with Programs | Direct Care | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------------|
| | | Admission and Evaluation | CPP | Detention Reentry |
| Blue Ridge | X | X | X | X |
| Chesapeake | X | | | |
| Chesterfield | X | X | X | |
| Crater | | X | | X |
| Fairfax | X | X | | |
| Henrico | | | | |
| Highlands | X | | | |
| James River | X | X | | X |
| Loudoun | X | X | | |
| Lynchburg | X | X | | |
| Merrimac | X | X | X | X |
| New River Valley | X | | | |
| Newport News | X | X | | |
| Norfolk | X | X | | X |
| Northern Virginia | X | X | X | |
| Northwestern | X | X | | |
| Piedmont | | X | | |
| Prince William | | X | X | |
| Rappahannock | X | X | X | X |
| Richmond | X | X | | X |
| Roanoke Valley | X | X | | |
| Shenandoah Valley | | X | X | X |
| Virginia Beach | X | X | X | X |
| W. W. Moore, Jr. | X | X | | |
| Total | 19 | 20 | 8 | 9 |

* All JDCs offer pre-D detention, post-D detention without programs, and other routine detention services.

* Offerings are determined on the last day of the FY.

* Lynchburg CPP was closed to youth on June 30, 2022.

Detainments, FY 2020-2022



» Detainments decreased 31.3% from FY 2020 to FY 2021 and then increased 16.5% in FY 2022.

» In FY 2022, there were 15 weekend detainments, which may include multiple weekend stays as part of a single detainment.

Detention Demographics, FY 2022*


| Demographics | Pre-D | Post-D (No Programs) | Post-D (Programs) | Total Detainments |
|------------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Race | | | | |
| Asian | 0.7% | 0.2% | 0.0% | 0.6% |
| Black | 57.5% | 36.0% | 56.0% | 55.2% |
| White | 34.7% | 55.5% | 35.8% | 37.0% |
| Other/Unknown | 7.1% | 8.3% | 8.2% | 7.2% |
| Ethnicity | | | | |
| Hispanic | 12.5% | 11.4% | 11.9% | 12.5% |
| Non-Hispanic | 75.5% | 67.7% | 79.9% | 74.4% |
| Unknown/Missing | 12.0% | 20.8% | 8.2% | 13.1% |
| Sex | | | | |
| Female | 22.4% | 31.9% | 9.0% | 23.2% |
| Male | 77.6% | 68.1% | 91.0% | 76.8% |
| Age | | | | |
| 8-12 | 2.7% | 1.5% | 0.0% | 2.6% |
| 13 | 7.0% | 2.6% | 1.5% | 6.4% |
| 14 | 13.6% | 11.8% | 9.0% | 13.3% |
| 15 | 20.8% | 17.4% | 25.4% | 20.3% |
| 16 | 26.3% | 27.6% | 32.8% | 26.3% |
| 17 | 29.3% | 38.6% | 31.3% | 30.6% |
| 18 | 0.2% | 0.4% | 0.0% | 0.5% |
| Missing | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Total | 3,735 | 533 | 134 | 4,226 |

* One detainment may include multiple dispositional statuses, including "other" statuses; therefore, the sum of the statuses may not equal the total detainments.

- » Black youth represented 57.5% of youth with pre-D statuses, 36.0% of youth with statuses for post-D without programs, and 56.0% of youth with statuses for post-D with programs.
- » White youth represented 34.7% of youth with pre-D statuses, 55.5% of youth with statuses for post-D without programs, and 35.8% of youth with statuses for post-D with programs.
- » The average age at detainment was 16.1 years.
- » The average ages by detention status were as follows:
 - › Pre-D detention – 16.0 years
 - › Post-D detention without programs – 16.4 years
 - › Post-D detention with programs – 16.5 years



Capacity and ADP, FY 2020-2022*



* Capacities are determined on the last day of the FY and represent the number of certified beds; they may not represent the number of "operational" or "staffed" beds, which may be substantially lower.

» JDCs consistently operate below certified capacity.

DAI Scores at Detainment, FY 2020-2022*


| DAI Scores | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| 0-9 (Release) | 17.4% | 17.3% | 22.3% |
| 10-14 (Detention Alternative) | 19.1% | 20.9% | 17.0% |
| 15+ (Secure Detention) | 59.5% | 57.7% | 55.4% |
| Missing | 4.0% | 4.1% | 5.4% |
| Total Detainments | 3,622 | 2,617 | 3,115 |

* Data include only pre-D detainments recorded as non-judge-ordered.

» Of the youth who were detained in non-judge-ordered pre-D detention in FY 2022, 55.4% had a DAI score indicating secure detention.

» In FY 2022, of the youth who were detained in non-judge-ordered pre-D detention and received a DAI score of less than 15, 47.2% had mandatory overrides. (See Appendix C.)


Detention Dispositional Statuses, FY 2022*



* Youth with dispositional status changes during their detainment are counted in each dispositional status.


- » 80.4% of dispositional statuses were pre-D detention.
- » 11.5% of dispositional statuses were post-D detention without programs, and 2.9% were post-D detention with programs.
- » 5.2% of dispositional statuses were other statuses. (See Appendix E.)

ADP by Dispositional Status, FY 2022



- » Pre-D detention had the highest ADP (246).
- » Post-D detention without programs had the lowest ADP (16).

Average LOS (Days) by Dispositional Status, FY 2022 Releases*



* A release is counted when a dispositional status is closed even if a new status is opened and the youth remains in a JDC.

- » Post-D detention with programs had the longest average LOS (148.1 days) and the fewest releases (129).
- » Pre-D detention had an average LOS of 25.3 days and the most releases (3,694).
- » Post-D detention without programs had the shortest average LOS (11.5 days).
- » See page 38 for more details on pre-D detention LOSs.



Pre-D Statuses by MSO Category, FY 2022*


| MSO Category | Felony | Misdemeanor | Total |
|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| Delinquent | | | |
| Alcohol | N/A | 1.0% | 0.2% |
| Arson | 2.7% | 0.9% | 1.5% |
| Assault | 20.2% | 33.7% | 16.5% |
| Burglary | 5.0% | N/A | 2.5% |
| Disorderly Conduct | N/A | 0.6% | 0.1% |
| Escapes | 0.1% | 1.0% | 0.2% |
| Extortion | 4.8% | 1.0% | 2.6% |
| Fraud | 1.7% | 0.3% | 0.9% |
| Gangs | 0.4% | 0.0% | 0.2% |
| Kidnapping | 2.0% | 0.0% | 1.0% |
| Larceny | 20.1% | 5.3% | 11.1% |
| Murder | 3.1% | N/A | 1.6% |
| Narcotics | 3.8% | 0.3% | 2.0% |
| Obscenity | 1.3% | 0.0% | 0.6% |
| Obstruction of Justice | 1.0% | 4.8% | 1.4% |
| Robbery | 12.3% | N/A | 6.2% |
| Sexual Abuse | 7.8% | 0.4% | 4.0% |
| Sexual Offense | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Telephone | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.2% |
| Trespass | 0.1% | 1.0% | 0.2% |
| Vandalism | 2.8% | 5.1% | 2.4% |
| Weapons | 6.2% | 35.7% | 9.8% |
| Other | 0.5% | 0.9% | 2.0% |
| Technical | | | |
| Contempt of Court | 0.1% | N/A | 12.8% |
| Failure to Appear | 0.4% | 5.3% | 1.2% |
| Parole Violation | N/A | N/A | 0.8% |
| Probation Violation | 0.1% | 0.4% | 11.0% |
| Traffic | | | |
| Traffic | 3.8% | 1.6% | 2.2% |
| Status/Other | | | |
| CHINS | N/A | N/A | 0.5% |
| CHINSup | N/A | N/A | 1.3% |
| Marijuana | N/A | N/A | 0.0% |
| Other | N/A | N/A | 0.1% |
| Total Pre-D Statuses | 1,883 | 704 | 3,735 |

* See the caveats on page 21 (bottom right) for explanations of offense category data.

- » 67.3% of pre-D statuses were for delinquent offenses, 25.8% were for technical offenses, 2.2% were for traffic offenses, and 1.9% were for status or other offenses. 2.8% of pre-D statuses were missing offense information.
- » Assault (16.5%) and contempt of court (12.8%) were the most common offenses among pre-D statuses.
 - › Assault (20.2%) and larceny (20.1%) were the most common offenses among felony pre-D statuses.
 - › Weapons (35.7%) and assault (33.7%) were the most common offenses among misdemeanor pre-D statuses.

Pre-D detention constituted the majority of both ADP (70.4%) and detention statuses (80.4%).

Pre-D Detention LOS Distribution (Days), FY 2022 Releases*



* A release is counted when a dispositional status is closed even if a new status is opened and the youth remains in a JDC.

* Data are not comparable to reports prior to FY 2021. In reports prior to FY 2021, cases with missing ICNs were excluded; these cases are now included.

- » There were 3,694 pre-D releases.
- » The most common LOS in pre-D detention was between four and 21 days.
- » 32.0% of youth in pre-D detention had an LOS of three days or less.



Summary by JDC

Detainments and DAI Scores at Detainment, FY 2022

| JDC | Detainments | DAI Scores at Detainment (Pre-D Non-Judge-Ordered Only) | | | | Total |
|--------------------------|--------------|---|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------|
| | | 0-9 (Release) | 10-14 (Det. Alt.) | 15+ (Secure) | Missing | |
| Blue Ridge | 94 | 23.9% | 17.0% | 51.1% | 8.0% | 88 |
| Chesapeake | 267 | 20.2% | 15.3% | 61.2% | 3.3% | 183 |
| Chesterfield | 199 | 16.9% | 16.9% | 66.1% | 0.0% | 118 |
| Crater | 111 | 29.9% | 18.4% | 47.1% | 4.6% | 87 |
| Fairfax | 273 | 12.5% | 16.8% | 67.6% | 3.1% | 256 |
| Henrico | 289 | 27.2% | 15.9% | 47.8% | 9.1% | 232 |
| Highlands | 131 | 14.3% | 6.3% | 68.3% | 11.1% | 63 |
| James River | 23 | 50.0% | 25.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 12 |
| Loudoun | 59 | 29.8% | 12.3% | 56.1% | 1.8% | 57 |
| Lynchburg | 212 | 21.3% | 21.3% | 55.3% | 2.0% | 150 |
| Merrimac | 179 | 19.5% | 14.2% | 55.8% | 10.6% | 113 |
| New River Valley | 94 | 19.7% | 18.2% | 59.1% | 3.0% | 66 |
| Newport News | 267 | 23.2% | 19.9% | 51.4% | 5.5% | 181 |
| Norfolk | 232 | 26.0% | 15.5% | 56.4% | 2.2% | 181 |
| Northern Virginia | 125 | 29.8% | 11.6% | 48.8% | 9.9% | 121 |
| Northwestern | 166 | 25.6% | 21.4% | 51.3% | 1.7% | 117 |
| Piedmont | 68 | 17.9% | 16.1% | 62.5% | 3.6% | 56 |
| Prince William | 173 | 21.0% | 15.9% | 58.6% | 4.5% | 157 |
| Rappahannock | 191 | 22.6% | 16.4% | 47.3% | 13.7% | 146 |
| Richmond | 232 | 29.7% | 16.8% | 53.0% | 0.5% | 185 |
| Roanoke Valley | 228 | 18.4% | 15.6% | 53.9% | 12.1% | 141 |
| Shenandoah Valley | 187 | 21.8% | 13.6% | 55.5% | 9.1% | 110 |
| Virginia Beach | 285 | 23.3% | 24.8% | 51.4% | 0.5% | 210 |
| W. W. Moore, Jr. | 141 | 12.9% | 16.5% | 58.8% | 11.8% | 85 |
| <i>Total Detainments</i> | <i>4,226</i> | <i>22.3%</i> | <i>17.0%</i> | <i>55.4%</i> | <i>5.4%</i> | <i>3,115</i> |

» Of the youth who were detained in non-judge-ordered pre-D detention in FY 2022, 55.4% had a DAI score indicating secure detention.



Capacity and ADP, FY 2022*

| JDC | Certified Capacity | ADP by Dispositional Status | | | | Total ADP |
|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| | | Pre-D | Post-D (No Programs) | Post-D (Programs) | Other | |
| Blue Ridge | 40 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 |
| Chesapeake | 100 | 18 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 28 |
| Chesterfield | 90 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 16 |
| Crater | 22 | 6 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 7 |
| Fairfax | 121 | 13 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 19 |
| Henrico | 20 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Highlands | 35 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
| James River | 60 | 11 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 18 |
| Loudoun | 24 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Lynchburg | 48 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 14 |
| Merrimac | 48 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| New River Valley | 24 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
| Newport News | 110 | 18 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 28 |
| Norfolk | 80 | 18 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 33 |
| Northern Virginia | 70 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 9 |
| Northwestern | 32 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 9 |
| Piedmont | 20 | 4 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 5 |
| Prince William | 72 | 10 | 0 | N/A | 0 | 10 |
| Rappahannock | 80 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 15 |
| Richmond | 60 | 13 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 23 |
| Roanoke Valley | 81 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 |
| Shenandoah Valley | 58 | 7 | 2 | N/A | 0 | 9 |
| Virginia Beach | 90 | 23 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 29 |
| W. W. Moore, Jr. | 60 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 |
| <i>Total</i> | <i>1,445</i> | <i>246</i> | <i>16</i> | <i>53</i> | <i>35</i> | <i>349</i> |

* Capacities are determined on the last day of the FY and represent the number of certified beds; they may not represent the number of "operational" or "staffed" beds, which may be substantially lower.

* ADPs by dispositional status, ADPs by facility, and statewide ADPs may not be equal due to differences in the tracking of dispositional statuses, facility movements, and detainments/releases; therefore, the sum of ADPs presented in the table may not equal the totals.

* N/A indicates that the JDC does not operate post-D detention with programs. While Henrico JDC does not operate post-D detention with programs, an ADP of 0.1 is reported due to temporary transfers from James River JDC.



Direct Care

DJJ utilizes multiple placement options for youth in direct care; as of June 30, 2022, DJJ operates one JCC (Bon Air JCC) with an operating capacity of 272 beds. An additional 91 beds are available in the CPPs operated at Blue Ridge, Chesterfield, Merrimac, Northern Virginia, Prince William, Rappahannock, Shenandoah Valley, and Virginia Beach JDCs. Some JDCs also house youth for admissions and evaluation services and detention reentry programs. Youth in direct care also may be placed in individually purchased JDC beds and other contracted alternatives. DJJ implements direct care programs to ensure that committed youth receive effective treatment and educational services.

Admission and Evaluation

The CAP Unit receives and reviews all commitment documentation and coordinates the admission, orientation, and evaluation process.

Youth admitted to direct care are evaluated at either the JCC or a JDC. The process includes medical, psychological, behavioral, educational, and career readiness evaluations. A team meets to discuss and identify each youth's treatment and mental health needs, determine LOS, recommend placement, and develop a CRCP.

Depending on the youth's individual needs, youth may be assigned to one or more treatment programs to include aggression management, substance abuse, and sex offender treatment. Although treatment needs generally are identified during the evaluation process, a youth can be reassessed at any time while in direct care.

Placement recommendations at the conclusion of the evaluation process may include a referral to a CPP or another alternative placement. If a youth is eligible, a referral is submitted through the case management review process, and a transfer is coordinated as needed.

LOS Guidelines

The LOS Guidelines were developed to promote accountability and rehabilitation by using data-driven decision-making to support youth's successful reentry from commitment to the community. These guidelines provide consistency while allowing reasonable flexibility in accommodating case differences and treatment needs.

The most recent LOS Guidelines took effect on October 15, 2015. (See Appendix D.) The assigned LOS for an indeterminate commitment is a calculated range of time (e.g., 6-9 months) from their commitment date; the first

number in the range represents the youth's ERD, and the second number represents the youth's LRD. Youth's projected LOSs are calculated using their assessed YASI risk level and the MSO for the current commitment.

Youth with indeterminate commitments may not be held past their statutory release date (typically 36 continuous months or their 21st birthday). If a youth is committed for violating the terms of probation, the underlying MSO is used in determining the projected LOS. If a youth is determined to need inpatient sex offender treatment services, the youth receives a treatment override and is not assigned a projected LOS. Youth who receive a treatment override are eligible for consideration for release upon completion of the designated treatment program. Youth may be assigned other treatment needs as appropriate, but they are not required to complete those treatment programs to be eligible for consideration for release.

JCC Programs

JCC programs offer community reintegration and specialized services in a secure residential setting on a 24-hour basis. Youth are assigned to appropriate housing units based on age, sex, vulnerability, and other factors. In addition, some designated units house youth with significant issues involving mental health, low intellectual functioning, poor adaptive functioning, or individual vulnerabilities that hinder their ability to adequately and safely function in other units.

Case management and treatment staff collaborate to coordinate and deliver services for youth based on risk and treatment needs. Staff facilitate groups as well as address individual needs. Progress is assessed and reviewed regularly via multi-disciplinary treatment team meetings. Staff also work with CSUs and the Reentry Unit to provide a transition and parole plan for reentry. BSU, Health Services, Recreation, Food Services, and Maintenance provide support to JCC operations. The Division of Education provides educational and career readiness services to meet the needs of youth in direct care. Residents also engage in extra-curricular programming that develops leadership and life skills by providing real-world opportunities and connections, such as SGA, voting and mock elections, the Institutional Work Program, and more.

CTM

During FY 2015, the JCCs began implementing CTM as a way to support youth rehabilitation while decreasing inappropriate behaviors during commitment. Given that many youth in state custody have experienced



significant exposure to adverse childhood experiences, CTM integrates elements of trauma-informed care to promote the development of resilience and improve self-regulation, decision-making, moral reasoning, and skill-building. The main tenets of the relationship-oriented model include conducting therapeutic structured activities, maintaining consistent staffing in each housing unit, and keeping youth in the same unit throughout their stays. CTM uses a blend of positive peer culture and group processing to address concerns and celebrate accomplishments within the unit. Using this approach, staff develop treatment-oriented relationships with the youth and act as advocates.

As part of CTM, youth progress through a phase system (Phases I to IV) with clearly defined behavioral expectations. Youth receive additional expectations, responsibilities, and privileges with each phase. Eligible youth who reach higher phases can earn off-campus trips and furloughs.

Division of Education

The Division of Education provides educational opportunities for middle school, high school, and post-secondary students at the Yvonne B. Miller High School and Post-Secondary Programs in Bon Air JCC. The Division of Education offers an array of high school completion routes that include an Advanced Studies Diploma, Standard Diploma, Applied Studies Diploma, or GED®. The Division of Education also offers opportunities to earn certifications, credentials, certificates, and college credits for students interested in continuing their education after graduation. The school is staffed by administrators and teachers who are licensed by the VDOE.

When youth enter Bon Air JCC, school counselors evaluate student records and place youth in an appropriate educational program. School counselors complete a career and academic plan with each student to create a program of study for high school graduation and a post-secondary career pathway. To address educational gaps, the Division of Education uses a blended learning model to meet the unique needs of the students. This model is a combination of direct instruction, on-line modules, and hands-on learning activities. Teachers provide instruction aligned with the SOLs and actively track students' progress.

The Division of Education offers CTE courses as well as applicable certification and credentialing opportunities. These offerings prepare youth for productive employment while simultaneously meeting the Commonwealth's need for well-trained and industry-certified technical workers. For example, the WRS credential is an indicator to post-secondary educators, businesses,

and industries that students understand universal workplace behaviors and expectations. Additionally, the W!SE financial literacy credential is aligned with VDOE's personal finance course requirement.

The Division of Education utilizes the VTSS framework that combines academic, behavioral, and social-emotional wellness into a single decision-making framework to establish the supports needed for schools to be effective learning environments. VTSS requires the use of evidence-based, system-wide practices with fidelity to provide a quick response to academic, behavioral, social and emotional needs. The practices are progress-monitored frequently to enable educators to make evidence-based instructional decisions for students. Beginning in 2018, the Division of Education began implementation of Tier 1 of PBIS, which provides universal supports for students and consistent behavioral management strategies. The Division of Education also is implementing stages of Tier 1 of RTI, a multi-tier approach to the early identification and support of students with learning or behavior needs. The RTI process begins with high-quality instruction and universal screening of all students in the general education classroom. The Division of Education became an official VTSS cohort in 2021.

A higher proportion of students at Bon Air JCC (40%) receive special education compared to students in Virginia public schools (10-12%). The Yvonne B. Miller High School teaches self-advocacy skills to students with disabilities using tools and materials from established programs. The primary focus is helping students gain the confidence and skills to navigate their own lives, ask for help, solve problems, and understand their rights as people with disabilities. Students with disabilities also may participate in both the Pre-Employment Transitions Services and Pathway programs offered through DARS. These services help link students to post-secondary programming, explore career options, and prepare for reentry into the community.

The Division of Education also provides post-secondary career and college readiness opportunities for youth. Post-secondary courses are geared toward the attainment of industry certifications, credentials, or college course completion. Vendors provide programs that award industry certifications. College courses are taught via partnerships with local community colleges and universities. The Division of Education maintains partnerships with CPPs to support programming for the post-secondary youth by providing resources tailored to individual CPP needs, such as technology, on-line courses, college enrollment, funding, hands-on programming, and certificate/credentialing opportunities.



BSU

BSU is the organizational unit responsible for providing clinical treatment services for youth at the JCC. The primary services provided by BSU staff include treatment for mental health issues, aggression, substance abuse, and sex offending, as well as psychological evaluations and pre-release risk assessments. To align with CTM, a BSU therapist is assigned to each housing unit.

Aggression Management Treatment: BSU provides aggression management treatment services in all units. Intensive treatment is group oriented and more rigorous compared to prescriptive treatment, which is delivered individually as needed. Youth 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. Bon Air JCC offers ART for most youth and modified DBT in some units. Modified DBT is a treatment program originally designed to help people with emotional self-regulation difficulties who engage in self-harm, but it has been expanded to populations with other problem behaviors. Core therapeutic activities focus on teaching improved emotion regulation, interpersonal effectiveness, distress tolerance, mindfulness, and self-management skills.

Substance Abuse Treatment: BSU provides cognitive-behavioral substance abuse treatment services in all units. Track I is for youth meeting DSM criteria for substance use disorder and in need of intensive services. Track II is for youth who have experimented with substances but do not meet the DSM criteria for substance use disorder. Bon Air JCC also offers CYT, an evidence-based substance abuse program to address marijuana/drug use. 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. Depending on individual needs, completion of substance abuse treatment services requires five weeks to six months.

Sex Offender Treatment: BSU provides cognitive-behavioral sex offender evaluation and treatment services in specialized treatment units and in the general population. There are three levels of treatment: inpatient, mid-level, and prescriptive. Youth requiring inpatient or mid-level treatment services receive individual, group, and family therapy within specialized units. Prescriptive treatment is delivered individually, as needed. Youth in sex offender treatment units receive intensive treatment from specially trained therapists as part of a specialized multi-disciplinary treatment team that includes a

community coordinator, counselor, and other unit staff. Each youth receives an individualized treatment plan that addresses programmatic goals, competencies, and core treatment activities. Successful completion of sex offender treatment may require six to 36 months, depending on the youth's treatment needs, behavioral stability, and motivation.

Mental Health Services: BSU conducts comprehensive psychological evaluations and provides 24-hour 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. Mental health professionals complete risk assessments for all serious offenders, sex offender special decision cases, and other special decision cases by request.

MHSTPs: For qualifying youth in direct care, a team of direct care staff, medical and mental health professionals, the PO, service providers, family members, and the youth collaborate to develop an MHSTP. The purpose of the MHSTP is to ensure the provision and continuation of treatment services for mental health, substance use, and other needs as the youth transitions from direct care to the community.

Health Services

The Health Services Unit provides quality healthcare services to youth in the JCC. DJJ employs a staff of medical and dental providers who provide assessment, treatment, and care to meet the needs of the youth. In addition, contracted psychiatrists and optometrists provide healthcare services to the youth at the facility. Nurses are assigned to housing units to establish a primary medical relationship and educate youth on health and wellness issues. On-site staff are supplemented by a network of hospitals, physicians, and allied health providers to ensure all medically necessary healthcare services are provided in a manner consistent with community standards.

PREA

DJJ has a zero tolerance policy toward any incident involving the sexual abuse or sexual harassment of a youth. Mandated by the federal government, PREA and its associated rules and guidelines make detection and prevention of sexual abuse and sexual harassment a top priority in all facilities housing committed youth. The PREA Unit consists of a PREA coordinator, facility PREA manager, alternative placement PREA manager, and PREA analyst. All DJJ and alternative placement staff members are responsible for making DJJ-operated



and contracted facilities safe by preventing, detecting, and reporting sexual abuse and sexual harassment. This effort begins with staff being respectful of youth and supporting a culture that does not tolerate sexual abuse or sexual harassment. Staff receive extensive training on how to identify risk factors, preventive measures, and reporting mechanisms. Youth also receive extensive training, resources, and information on how to recognize and report sexual abuse and sexual harassment. Staff and youth are given multiple ways to report sexual abuse or sexual harassment. DJJ ensures all allegations of sexual abuse and sexual harassment are thoroughly investigated.

Human Rights Coordinators

A grievance program is in place at the JCC as a safeguard for youth and to provide a strong system of advocacy. The program is staffed by human rights coordinators. By monitoring living conditions and service delivery systems, the program identifies and solves problems that may harm or impede rehabilitative efforts; protects the rights of youth; promotes system accountability; and ensures safe, humane, and lawful living conditions. The human rights coordinators and their management team operate independently from the JCC in order to provide youth with a resource to address concerns.

Reentry

In order to coordinate the reentry process for youth efficiently and effectively, reentry staff assist youth and their families in preparing for the youth's transition from direct care back to the community. Reentry advocates, each serving one of the five regions across the Commonwealth, provide support and guidance in the areas of employment, education and career planning, connection to human service agencies, and obtaining identification documents.

DJJ provides additional services that promote public safety and accountability through partnerships with community organizations. These partners provide services to support a successful transition and reintegration into the community. A selection of these partnerships is described below:

Apartment Living Program: This eight-bed apartment-style residential program serves youth released from direct care. The program serves youth ages 17.5 and older and provides opportunities to learn and practice life skills in the community. The average length of stay in the program is four to six months.

Summit House: This eight-bed, single-family home designed as a residential program serves youth released

from direct care. The program serves youth ages 17.5 and older, providing an opportunity for youth to learn and practice life skills beyond a secure environment. The average length of stay is six to nine months.

DMV Connect: When youth are released from direct care without official state-issued photo identification, they can face barriers to gaining employment, housing, and access to services. To provide youth with a better chance of success when reentering the community, DJJ partners with DMV to bring a mobile office to the JCC on a regular basis to provide state-issued photo identification to youth who are in Bon Air JCC. Reentry advocates coordinate with the community DMV mobile office to provide state-issued photo identification to youth released from direct care. This partnership also certifies DJJ's reentry advocates to administer the learner's permit exam to eligible youth.

Medicaid Pre-Application: CVIU streamlines the Medicaid application and enrollment process for incarcerated individuals in Virginia. DJJ's reentry advocates submit applications for eligible youth 18 years and older to the CVIU prior to release from direct care, resulting in applications being processed in a more timely manner to prevent a gap in coverage at release.

Direct Care Youth in JDCs

CPPs are highly structured residential programs operated for direct care youth in JDCs. A goal of the CPPs is to place youth in smaller settings closer to their home communities to facilitate a smoother transition after release and to increase family engagement. CPPs focus on PYD and increasing competency in areas of education, vocational preparation, life and social skills, thinking skills, employability skills, and anger management. CPPs use YASI as the basis for case planning to address criminogenic needs. Services focus on dynamic risk factors using cognitive-behavioral techniques and are tailored to meet the individual needs outlined in the youth's CRCP. Additionally, CPPs deliver aggression management and substance abuse treatment services. Youth in CPPs are housed in units separate from the JDC population. As of June 30, 2022, the eight participating JDCs were Blue Ridge, Chesterfield, Merrimac, Northern Virginia, Prince William, Rappahannock, Shenandoah Valley, and Virginia Beach. Lynchburg CPP was closed to youth on June 30, 2022, and Northern Virginia CPP was closed to youth on July 12, 2022. Northern Virginia served females, and Merrimac has programs for both males and females. All other CPPs serve only males.

Additionally, some JDCs provide detention reentry programs for youth in direct care, allowing them to begin transitioning back to the community 30 to 120 days be-



fore their scheduled release date. Similar to CPPs, these programs facilitate parole planning services with the assigned POs and allow for increased visitation with families and community involvement. Established contracts for detention reentry with the JDCs include Blue Ridge, Crater, James River, Merrimac, Norfolk, Rappahannock, Richmond, Shenandoah, and Virginia Beach.

The CAP Unit maintains case management responsibilities for direct care youth in JDCs and acts as a liaison between the JDCs and CSUs. Although youth in CPPs, detention reentry, and individual JDC beds are housed in the JDCs, they are counted in the direct care population and not in the JDC population.

Continuum of Services

Research has demonstrated that less restrictive environments are most effective at producing successful outcomes for committed youth. As such, an important element of DJJ's transformation has been to build and expand upon its continuum of services and alternative placement options. While the JCC, CPPs, and detention reentry programs provide secure placement options for youth in direct care, the broader continuum of services includes additional contracted secure and non-secure placement options such as group homes and RTCs. The CAP Unit maintains case management responsibilities for youth in these placements and acts as a liaison between the placements and CSUs.

Beginning in FY 2017, DJJ contracted with two service coordination agencies, AMI and EBA, to serve as RSCs and assist with building a more robust statewide continuum of evidence-informed services and alternatives to placement in state-operated secure facilities. The RSCs support DJJ's continuum of services by managing centralized referrals, service coordination, billing, quality assurance, and reporting. The Practice Improvement and Services Unit manages the RSC Service Delivery Model.

In addition to increasing the number and type of direct care placement setting options, DJJ continues to add community-based alternatives designed to reduce the need for direct care and other out-of-home placements. For example, two evidence-based family interventions, FFT and MST, are available in approximately 97% of cities and counties statewide. (See page 16 for more information about the continuum of services related to community programs.)

Family Engagement

A major portion of DJJ's transformation is an increased focus on family engagement with youth in direct care.

Youth's families often live more than a one-hour drive from Bon Air JCC, and the distance can pose a barrier to families wishing to visit. To assist those families, DJJ partners with transportation companies to provide free transportation to families with youth at Bon Air JCC from various sites across the Commonwealth. In addition to standard visitation, DJJ strives to host several family engagement functions annually, with at least one campus-wide and one per housing unit. DJJ also established a Family Engagement Committee comprised of DJJ staff, committed youth, and family members. The focus of the committee is to create an environment where committed youth and their support systems have opportunities to communicate, stay connected, and make recommendations to promote family engagement. DJJ established an email address (djj4families@djj.virginia.gov) to allow parents and other supports to communicate directly with the committee. DJJ also publishes a quarterly newsletter called Family Matters and a Facebook page in an effort to inform and maintain open lines of communication with families and youth supports.


QA Unit

The QA Unit monitors the integrity and success of contracted interventions, including JDCs that provide direct care admission and evaluation services, CPPs, detention reentry programs, and the RSC Service Delivery Model. The QA Unit provides oversight and comprehensive reviews, assessments, and reports regarding fidelity to evidence-based models and compliance with contract requirements. Utilizing a collaborative approach, the QA Unit conducts strengths-based performance monitoring and assists in developing individualized CQI plans to ensure programs align with best practices, the RNR model, and DJJ's strategic framework. The QA Unit also tracks performance measures, identifies program strengths and weaknesses, confirms services are tailored to meet youth's needs, and provides support and advocacy to promote ongoing system changes across DJJ.

Additionally, the QA Unit implements SPEP™, an evaluative tool to establish sustainable performance improvement and maximize positive youth outcomes. In partnership with Vanderbilt University, a team of DJJ staff earned their Level I SPEP™ specialist certificate following a cycle of SPEP™ training, with Merrimac and Virginia Beach CPPs as volunteer pilot sites. Lastly, the QA Unit, in collaboration with JCC staff, is implementing and facilitating CQI activities and plans for each Bon Air JCC housing unit.




Commitments by Locality, FY 2022*



* CSU 12 had four subsequent commitments in FY 2022; these commitments are excluded.

- » There were 158 commitments in FY 2022.
- » The cities of Norfolk, Richmond, and Newport News had the highest number of commitments (14, 13, and 12, respectively).
- » 86 of 133 localities (64.7%) had no commitments.

Capacity, ADP, Admissions, and Releases, FY 2013-2022*



* Capacities are determined on the last day of the FY.

* Between June 10, 2015, and July 15, 2015, some youth admitted to direct care were evaluated in Chesterfield, James River, and Richmond JDCs. This temporary capacity is not included in the data presented above.

- » Due primarily to facility closures, capacity decreased 52.1% between FY 2013 and FY 2022.
- » ADP decreased 71.9% between FY 2013 and FY 2022.
- » Admissions decreased 66.5% between FY 2013 and FY 2022.
- » Releases decreased 68.0% between FY 2013 and FY 2022.



Capacity and ADP, FY 2022*

| Facility/Placement | Capacity | ADP |
|-------------------------|----------|-----|
| Bon Air JCC | 272 | 106 |
| Adm./Eval. in JDCs | N/A | 10 |
| CPPs | 91 | 75 |
| Blue Ridge | 8 | 6 |
| Chesterfield | 8 | 7 |
| Lynchburg | N/A | 5 |
| Merrimac-Females | 5 | 4 |
| Merrimac-Males | 8 | 8 |
| Northern Virginia | 5 | 2 |
| Prince William | 8 | 6 |
| Rappahannock | 16 | 12 |
| Shenandoah Valley | 8 | 7 |
| Virginia Beach | 20 | 18 |
| Contracted Alternatives | N/A | 2 |
| Detention Reentry | N/A | 0 |
| Individual JDC Beds | N/A | 2 |
| <i>Total</i> | 363 | 195 |

* Capacities are determined on the last day of the FY.

* Lynchburg CPP was closed to youth on June 30, 2022.

* The sum of individual CPP capacities does not equal the total CPP capacity because five CPP beds included in the total may be used at any CPP based on need and availability.

* Admission and Evaluation in JDCs, Contracted Alternatives, Detention Reentry, and Individual JDC Beds do not have capacity as there are no dedicated beds.

* ADPs may not add to totals due to rounding.

- » The ADP in FY 2022 was 195 youth.
- » 54.4% of the direct care ADP was in the JCC.

Admissions with Prior Successful Diversion Plans, Probation Placements, or Direct Care Admissions, FY 2020-2022*

| | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Prior Successful Diversion Plans | 21.9% | 22.7% | 25.9% |
| Prior Probation Placements | 65.7% | 76.1% | 72.8% |
| Prior Direct Care Admissions | 11.6% | 15.3% | 15.0% |
| <i>Total Admissions</i> | 233 | 163 | 147 |

* A prior successful diversion plan is defined as an intake case earlier than the committing offenses with at least one complaint with a successful diversion plan and no complaints with a petition.

- » 25.9% of admissions in FY 2022 had at least one prior successful diversion plan.
- » 72.8% of admissions in FY 2022 had at least one prior probation placement.
- » 15.0% of admissions in FY 2022 had at least one prior direct care admission.

In FY 2022, 54.4% of the direct care ADP was in the JCC, 38.5% was in a CPP, and 7.1% was in another alternative placement.

Admission Demographics, FY 2020-2022

| Demographics | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Race | | | |
| Asian | 0.9% | 0.6% | 0.0% |
| Black | 67.8% | 71.8% | 71.4% |
| White | 26.6% | 24.5% | 23.8% |
| Other/Unknown | 4.7% | 3.1% | 4.8% |
| Ethnicity | | | |
| Hispanic | 10.3% | 6.7% | 8.8% |
| Non-Hispanic | 81.1% | 85.9% | 78.2% |
| Unknown/Missing | 8.6% | 7.4% | 12.9% |
| Sex | | | |
| Female | 3.4% | 9.2% | 8.2% |
| Male | 96.6% | 90.8% | 91.8% |
| Age | | | |
| Under 14 | 1.3% | 1.2% | 0.7% |
| 14 | 4.3% | 6.1% | 4.1% |
| 15 | 14.6% | 13.5% | 13.6% |
| 16 | 24.9% | 21.5% | 22.4% |
| 17 | 39.9% | 38.7% | 45.6% |
| 18 | 13.3% | 18.4% | 10.2% |
| 19-20 | 1.7% | 0.6% | 3.4% |
| <i>Total Admissions</i> | 233 | 163 | 147 |

- » 71.4% of admissions in FY 2022 were Black, and 23.8% were White.
- » 78.2% of admissions in FY 2022 were non-Hispanic, and 8.8% were Hispanic. 12.9% had unknown ethnicity information.
- » 91.8% of admissions in FY 2022 were male, and 8.2% were female.
- » Approximately two-thirds (60.1-68.0%) of admissions since FY 2020 were 16 or 17 years of age.
- » The average age of youth admitted in FY 2022 was 17.1 years.



Admission Demographics by Commitment Type and Committing Court Type, FY 2022*

| Demographics | Commitment Type | | Committing Court Type | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| | Determinate/ Blended | Indeterminate | J&DR District Court | Appeal to Circuit Court | Circuit Court |
| Race | | | | | |
| Asian | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Black | 83.7% | 65.3% | 70.8% | 50.0% | 75.0% |
| White | 14.3% | 28.6% | 24.8% | 50.0% | 18.8% |
| Other/Unknown | 2.0% | 6.1% | 4.4% | 0.0% | 6.3% |
| Ethnicity | | | | | |
| Hispanic | 6.1% | 10.2% | 9.7% | 0.0% | 6.3% |
| Non-Hispanic | 79.6% | 77.6% | 77.0% | 100.0% | 81.3% |
| Unknown/Missing | 14.3% | 12.2% | 13.3% | 0.0% | 12.5% |
| Sex | | | | | |
| Female | 6.1% | 9.2% | 8.8% | 0.0% | 6.3% |
| Male | 93.9% | 90.8% | 91.2% | 100.0% | 93.8% |
| Age | | | | | |
| Under 14 | N/A | 1.0% | 0.9% | 0.0% | N/A |
| 14 | 0.0% | 6.1% | 5.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| 15 | 14.3% | 13.3% | 14.2% | 0.0% | 12.5% |
| 16 | 18.4% | 24.5% | 25.7% | 0.0% | 12.5% |
| 17 | 44.9% | 45.9% | 45.1% | 100.0% | 43.8% |
| 18 | 12.2% | 9.2% | 8.0% | 0.0% | 18.8% |
| 19-20 | 10.2% | 0.0% | 0.9% | 0.0% | 12.5% |
| Total Admissions | 49 | 98 | 113 | 2 | 32 |

* Youth with multiple commitments for a single admission are counted once. If an admission is for at least one determinate commitment or blended sentence, the admission is counted as "Determinate/Blended."

- » 33.3% of admissions were for determinate commitments or blended sentences, and 66.7% were for indeterminate commitments.
- » 76.9% of admissions were committed by a J&DR district court, 1.4% by a J&DR district court with the commitment upheld in circuit court on appeal, and 21.8% by a circuit court.
- » The average ages at admission by commitment type were as follows:
 - › Determinate/Blended – 17.4 years
 - › Indeterminate – 16.9 years
- » The average ages at admission by committing court type were as follows:
 - › J&DR district court – 16.9 years
 - › Appeal to circuit court – 17.8 years
 - › Circuit court – 17.6 years



Admissions by Committing MSO Category, FY 2022*

| MSO Category | Det./Blend. | Indeterminate | | | Overall | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|---------------|----------|-----------|------------|----------|------------|
| | Felony | Felony | Misd. | Total | Felony | Misd. | Total |
| Arson | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.7% | 0.0% | 0.7% |
| Assault | 18.4% | 20.5% | 62.5% | 23.5% | 19.7% | 62.5% | 21.8% |
| Burglary | 2.0% | 11.4% | N/A | 10.2% | 8.0% | N/A | 7.5% |
| Fraud | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.7% | 0.0% | 0.7% |
| Kidnapping | 0.0% | 1.1% | 0.0% | 1.0% | 0.7% | 0.0% | 0.7% |
| Larceny | 10.2% | 26.1% | 12.5% | 24.5% | 20.4% | 12.5% | 19.7% |
| Murder | 18.4% | 4.5% | N/A | 4.1% | 9.5% | N/A | 8.8% |
| Narcotics | 2.0% | 2.3% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 2.2% | 0.0% | 2.0% |
| Parole Violation | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.4% |
| Robbery | 36.7% | 17.0% | N/A | 15.3% | 24.1% | N/A | 22.4% |
| Sexual Abuse | 6.1% | 3.4% | 0.0% | 3.1% | 4.4% | 0.0% | 4.1% |
| Traffic | 2.0% | 3.4% | 0.0% | 3.1% | 2.9% | 0.0% | 2.7% |
| Vandalism | 2.0% | 0.0% | 12.5% | 1.0% | 0.7% | 12.5% | 1.4% |
| Weapons | 2.0% | 8.0% | 12.5% | 8.2% | 5.8% | 12.5% | 6.1% |
| Total Admissions | 49 | 88 | 8 | 98 | 137 | 8 | 147 |

* Youth with multiple commitments for a single admission are counted once. If an admission is for at least one determinate commitment or blended sentence, the admission is counted as "Determinate/Blended."

* N/A indicates an offense severity (e.g., misdemeanor) that does not exist for that offense category.

* Total includes felonies, misdemeanors, and other offenses; the sum of felonies and misdemeanors may not equal the total. The "Other" offenses include two indeterminate admissions for parole violations.

* "Narcotics" no longer includes marijuana possession offenses that are captured under the new VCC prefix, MRJ.

- » The majority of total admissions (93.2%) were for felonies; 5.4% were for misdemeanors.
- » The highest percentage of total admissions were for robbery (22.4%).
- » 66.7% of admissions were for indeterminate commitments.
 - › The majority of admissions for indeterminate commitments were for felonies (89.8%); 8.2% were for misdemeanors.
 - › The highest percentage of admissions for indeterminate commitments were for larceny (24.5%) and assault (23.5%).
- » 33.3% of total admissions were for determinate commitments or blended sentences.
 - › The highest percentage of admissions for determinate commitments or blended sentences were for robbery (36.7%).



Admissions by Committing MSO, FY 2022*


| MSO Severity | Determinate/ Blended | Indeterminate | Total |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------|
| DAI Ranking | | | |
| Felony | | | |
| Against Persons | 91.8% | 59.2% | 70.1% |
| Weapons/Narcotics Dist. | 2.0% | 7.1% | 5.4% |
| Other | 6.1% | 23.5% | 17.7% |
| Class 1 Misdemeanor | | | |
| Against Persons | 0.0% | 6.1% | 4.1% |
| Other | 0.0% | 2.0% | 1.4% |
| Parole Violation | 0.0% | 2.0% | 1.4% |
| VCSC Ranking | | | |
| Person | 75.5% | 56.1% | 62.6% |
| Property | 14.3% | 32.7% | 26.5% |
| Narcotics | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% |
| Other | 8.2% | 9.2% | 8.8% |
| <i>Total Admissions</i> | 49 | 98 | 147 |

- » MSO by DAI ranking:
 - › The highest percentage of determinate or blended and indeterminate admissions were for felonies against persons (91.8% and 59.2%, respectively).
- » MSO by VCSC ranking:
 - › The highest percentage of determinate or blended and indeterminate admissions were for person offenses (75.5% and 56.1%, respectively).

* Youth with multiple commitments for a single admission are counted once. If an admission is for at least one determinate commitment or blended sentence, the admission is counted as "Determinate/Blended."

The majority of admissions were high risk based on YASI.

Admissions by Risk Levels, FY 2018-2022*




- » 98.6% of admissions had a YASI completed in FY 2022.
- » Over 80.0% of direct care admissions were high risk between FY 2018 and FY 2022.

* Percentages may not add to 100% due to missing YASIs. For example, in FY 2022, two direct care admissions were missing YASIs.

* The closest YASI within 90 days of the admission date was selected.



Admissions by Commitment Type and Assigned LOS (Months), FY 2022*



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

* Data are not comparable to previous reports. In prior reports, youth with a treatment override were categorized according to the assigned LOS calculation; these youth are now excluded. In FY 2022, four admissions had a treatment override.

- » 65.7% of admissions were for indeterminate commitments.
- » An assigned LOS of 6-9 months was the most common for indeterminate commitments.
- » 39.2% of admissions had an assigned indeterminate LOS with a maximum of nine months or less.

See Appendix D for an explanation of the LOS Guidelines.

Releases by LOS, FY 2022*

| Assigned LOS Category | Releases | % of All Releases | Average Actual LOS (Months) |
|-----------------------|------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Blended | 17 | 10.5% | 29.7 |
| Determinate | 56 | 34.6% | 25.8 |
| Indeterminate | 89 | 54.9% | 8.9 |
| 2-4 months | 1 | 0.6% | 12.5 |
| 3-6 months | 0 | 0.0% | N/A |
| 5-8 months | 18 | 11.1% | 7.0 |
| 6-9 months | 37 | 22.8% | 8.3 |
| 7-10 months | 21 | 13.0% | 8.3 |
| 9-12 months | 8 | 4.9% | 9.8 |
| 9-15 months | 1 | 0.6% | 9.0 |
| Treatment Override | 3 | 1.9% | 28.6 |
| Total Releases | 162 | 100.0% | 16.9 |

* Youth with multiple commitments for a single admission are counted once. The longest blended or determinate assigned LOS was selected, even if the assigned LOS for an indeterminate commitment was longer. If the youth had only indeterminate commitments, the longest LOS category was selected. Youth with treatment overrides for their indeterminate assigned LOS range are included but are likely to have longer LOSs.


* Subsequent commitments are included because of their impact on actual LOS. There were two subsequent indeterminate commitments and no subsequent determinate commitments.

* Data are not comparable to previous reports. In prior reports, youth with a treatment override were categorized according to the assigned LOS calculation; this report categorizes youth with treatment overrides separately.

- » The average actual LOS for all youth released in FY 2022 was 16.9 months.
- » Youth with indeterminate commitments comprised 54.9% of releases, and their average actual LOS was 8.9 months.
 - » Youth with treatment overrides have inpatient or mid-level sex offender treatment needs. Successful completion of sex offender treatment may require six to 36 months, depending on the youth's treatment needs, behavioral stability, and motivation. In FY 2022, their average actual LOS was 28.6 months.
- » Youth with determinate commitments or blended sentences comprised 45.1% of releases. Their assigned LOSs ranged from 6.0 to 69.9 months, averaging 39.4 months. Their average actual LOS was 26.7 months.
- » The average age of youth released was 18.6 years.




Admissions by Treatment Need, FY 2022



- » 98.6% of admissions were identified as having an aggression management treatment need.
 - › Intensive is more rigorous compared to prescriptive, which is delivered individually as needed.
- » 87.1% of admissions were identified as having a substance abuse treatment need.
 - › Track I is for youth meeting the DSM criteria for substance use disorder and in need of intensive services.
 - › Track II is for youth who have experimented with substances but do not meet the DSM criteria for substance use disorder.
- » 6.8% of admissions were identified as having a sex offender treatment need.
 - › Youth requiring inpatient or mid-level treatment services receive individual, group, and family therapy within specialized units. In FY 2022, 5.4% of admissions had an inpatient and 1.4% had a mid-level sex offender treatment need.
 - › Youth identified as having a prescriptive sex offender treatment need are given treatment individually, as needed. In FY 2022, there were no admissions with a prescriptive sex offender treatment need.


Admissions by Symptoms of Select Mental Health Disorders, FY 2022*



* Disorder data include youth who appear to have significant symptoms of a mental health disorder according to diagnostic criteria in the DSM.

- » 93.2% of admissions appeared to have at least one symptom of ADHD, CD, ODD, or substance use disorder.

Admissions by Prescribed Psychotropic Medication and Symptoms of Other Mental Health Disorders, FY 2022*



* Medication data include past, current, and newly prescribed psychotropic medication at the time of admission. The data include stimulant medication and exclude sleep medication.


* Disorder data include youth who appear to have significant symptoms of a mental health disorder according to diagnostic criteria in the DSM. ADHD, CD, ODD, and substance use disorder are excluded.

- » The majority (76.2%) of admissions were prescribed psychotropic medication at some point in their lives.
- » 35.4% of admissions had current or newly prescribed psychotropic medication at the time of admission.
- » The majority (76.9%) of youth appeared to have significant symptom(s) of a mental health disorder at the time of admission, excluding those disorders listed in the caveat.



Division of Education

SOL Pass Rates, SY 2021-2022*



* Youth are counted as passing if they fail the initial test and pass the retest.

* Locally awarded verified credits were not offered during SY 2021-2022.

* EOC Reading and EOC Writing include WorkKeys exams. WorkKeys exams are an alternative testing option for students who have failed the EOC Reading or EOC Writing SOL twice. This exam allows students to earn verified credits for graduation.

» The highest pass rate was in EOC Reading (66.7%).

Virginia and Penn Foster High School Diplomas and GED® Certificates Earned, SY 2020-2021 and SY 2021-2022*

| Type | 2020-2021 | 2021-2022 |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Advanced Studies Diploma | 1 | 1 |
| Standard Diploma | 13 | 7 |
| Applied Studies Diploma | 3 | 2 |
| Penn Foster High School Diploma | 1 | N/A |
| GED® Certificate | 16 | 12 |
| Total | 34 | 22 |

* As of SY 2021-2022, the Penn Foster High School Diploma is no longer offered.

» During SY 2021-2022, 10 youth earned Virginia high school diplomas and 12 youth earned GED® certificates.

» During SY 2021-2022, 30.8% of eligible high school seniors graduated. (The graduation rate calculation was changed in SY 2021-2022 to align with the methodology of surrounding public schools. Therefore, rates are not comparable to previous reports.)

CTE Credentials, SY 2021-2022*

| Course | Assessment | Pass Rate 2021-2022 |
|--------------------------------------|------------|---------------------|
| Advertising Design I | SkillsUSA® | 55.6% |
| Advertising Design II | | |
| Entrepreneurship | | |
| Economics and Personal Finance | WISE | 86.7% |
| Introduction to Marketing | | |
| Principles of Business and Marketing | | |

* Youth may be released from direct care or change classes, preventing them from completing a CTE course.

» During SY 2021-2022, nine youth took the SkillsUSA® assessment and 15 took the WISE assessment.

College Courses and Post-Secondary Enrichment Programs, SY 2021-2022*

| Type | Enrolled | Completed |
|----------------------------------|----------|-----------|
| Students | | |
| Reynolds Community College | 20 | 17 |
| University of Virginia | 5 | 4 |
| Virginia Commonwealth University | 5 | 3 |
| Certification Courses | 68 | 41 |
| Enrichment Courses | 54 | 25 |
| Courses | | |
| Reynolds Community College | 42 | 33 |
| University of Virginia | 5 | 4 |
| Virginia Commonwealth University | 24 | 18 |
| Certification Courses | 114 | 41 |
| Enrichment Courses | 182 | 44 |

* Youth may be released from direct care or change classes, preventing them from completing a course.

» The Division of Education offers youth the opportunity to take college courses and certification programs in the areas of business, entrepreneurship, media production, and Russian literature. For example, during SY 2021-2022:

- » 20 youth enrolled in seven college courses at Reynolds Community College; 17 youth completed 33 courses, earning a total of 89 credits.
- » Five youth enrolled in one college course at the University of Virginia; four youth completed the course, earning a total of four credits.
- » Five youth enrolled in the Advanced Media Production Technologies Certification Program at Virginia Commonwealth University; three youth completed the program to earn a certificate.
- » 41 youth completed certification courses, and 25 youth completed enrichment courses.



Direct Care Population on June 30, 2022

Demographics

| Demographics | Bon Air | Non-JCC | Total |
|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Race | | | |
| Asian | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Black | 69.2% | 80.0% | 73.4% |
| White | 28.2% | 17.3% | 24.0% |
| Other/Unknown | 2.6% | 2.7% | 2.6% |
| Ethnicity | | | |
| Hispanic | 7.7% | 6.7% | 7.3% |
| Non-Hispanic | 80.3% | 86.7% | 82.8% |
| Unknown/Missing | 12.0% | 6.7% | 9.9% |
| Sex | | | |
| Female | 4.3% | 8.0% | 5.7% |
| Male | 95.7% | 92.0% | 94.3% |
| Age | | | |
| Under 14 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| 14 | 1.7% | 1.3% | 1.6% |
| 15 | 6.8% | 9.3% | 7.8% |
| 16 | 15.4% | 12.0% | 14.1% |
| 17 | 21.4% | 22.7% | 21.9% |
| 18 | 31.6% | 34.7% | 32.8% |
| 19-20 | 23.1% | 20.0% | 21.9% |
| <i>Total Youth</i> | <i>117</i> | <i>75</i> | <i>192</i> |

- » 73.4% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2022, were Black, and 24.0% were White.
- » 82.8% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2022, were non-Hispanic, and 7.3% were Hispanic. 9.9% had unknown ethnicity information.
- » 94.3% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2022, were male, and 5.7% were female.
- » 54.7% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2022, were 17 or 18 years.
- » The average age of youth in direct care on June 30, 2022, was 18.0 years.

YASI Risk Levels

| YASI Risk Level | Bon Air | Non-JCC | Total |
|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Low | 0.9% | 0.0% | 0.5% |
| Moderate | 17.9% | 21.3% | 19.3% |
| High | 79.5% | 78.7% | 79.2% |
| Missing | 1.7% | 0.0% | 1.0% |
| <i>Total Youth</i> | <i>117</i> | <i>75</i> | <i>192</i> |

- » 79.2% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2022, were high risk.

Committing MSO Category*

| MSO Category | Bon Air | Non-JCC | Total |
|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Arson | 1.7% | 0.0% | 1.0% |
| Assault | 18.8% | 18.7% | 18.8% |
| Burglary | 2.6% | 5.3% | 3.6% |
| Fraud | 0.9% | 0.0% | 0.5% |
| Kidnapping | 0.9% | 0.0% | 0.5% |
| Larceny | 8.5% | 20.0% | 13.0% |
| Murder | 13.7% | 5.3% | 10.4% |
| Narcotics | 1.7% | 1.3% | 1.6% |
| Parole Violation | 2.6% | 0.0% | 1.6% |
| Robbery | 27.4% | 37.3% | 31.3% |
| Sexual Abuse | 17.1% | 0.0% | 10.4% |
| Traffic | 1.7% | 0.0% | 1.0% |
| Vandalism | 0.9% | 2.7% | 1.6% |
| Weapons | 1.7% | 8.0% | 4.2% |
| Other | 0.0% | 1.3% | 0.5% |
| <i>Total Youth</i> | <i>117</i> | <i>75</i> | <i>192</i> |

* "Narcotics" no longer includes marijuana possession offenses that are captured under the new VCC prefix, MRJ. There were no youth in direct care on June 30, 2022, with an MSO of marijuana.

- » The highest percentage of youth in direct care on June 30, 2022, were committed with robbery as the committing MSO (31.3%).

Committing MSO Severity

| MSO Severity | Bon Air | Non-JCC | Total |
|-------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| DAI Ranking | | | |
| Felony | | | |
| Against Persons | 87.2% | 72.0% | 81.3% |
| Weapons/Narcotics Dist. | 1.7% | 8.0% | 4.2% |
| Other | 6.8% | 16.0% | 10.4% |
| Class 1 Misdemeanor | | | |
| Against Persons | 1.7% | 1.3% | 1.6% |
| Other | 0.0% | 2.7% | 1.0% |
| Parole Violation | 2.6% | 0.0% | 1.6% |
| VCSC Ranking | | | |
| Person | 79.5% | 64.0% | 73.4% |
| Property | 12.8% | 24.0% | 17.2% |
| Narcotics | 1.7% | 1.3% | 1.6% |
| Other | 6.0% | 10.7% | 7.8% |
| <i>Total Youth</i> | <i>117</i> | <i>75</i> | <i>192</i> |

- » 95.8% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2022, had a felony as the committing MSO according to the DAI ranking.
- » 81.3% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2022, had a felony against persons as the committing MSO according to the DAI ranking.
- » 73.4% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2022, had a person offense as the committing MSO according to the VCSC ranking.



Committing Court Type*

| Committing Court Type | Bon Air | Non-JCC | Total |
|-------------------------|---------|---------|-------|
| J&DR District Court | 61.5% | 65.3% | 63.0% |
| Appeal to Circuit Court | 1.7% | 0.0% | 1.0% |
| Circuit Court | 36.8% | 34.7% | 35.9% |
| <i>Total Youth</i> | 117 | 75 | 192 |

* Youth with multiple commitments for a single admission are counted once. If an admission is for at least one determinate commitment or blended sentence, the admission is counted as "Determinate" or "Blended" and the committing court of the commitment type is selected.

- » Of the youth in direct care on June 30, 2022, 63.0% were committed by a J&DR district court, 35.9% by a circuit court, and 1.0% by a J&DR district court with the commitment upheld in circuit court on appeal.

Commitment Type*

| Commitment Type | Bon Air | Non-JCC | Total |
|--------------------|---------|---------|-------|
| Blended | 15.4% | 2.7% | 10.4% |
| Determinate | 42.7% | 54.7% | 47.4% |
| Indeterminate | 41.9% | 42.7% | 42.2% |
| <i>Total Youth</i> | 117 | 75 | 192 |

* Youth with multiple commitments for a single admission are counted once. If an admission is for at least one determinate commitment or blended sentence, the admission is counted as "Determinate" or "Blended."


- » 42.2% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2022, had an indeterminate commitment.
- » 57.8% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2022, had a determinate commitment or blended sentence.

Placement Type

| Placement Type | Count | % |
|-------------------------|-------|--------|
| Bon Air JCC | 117 | 60.9% |
| Adm./Eval. in JDCs | 7 | 3.6% |
| CPPs | 65 | 33.9% |
| Contracted Alternatives | 0 | 0.0% |
| Detention Reentry | 0 | 0.0% |
| Individual JDC Beds | 3 | 1.6% |
| <i>Total Youth</i> | 192 | 100.0% |

- » Of the youth in direct care on June 30, 2022, 60.9% were at Bon Air JCC, 33.9% were in a CPP, and 5.2% were in another alternative placement.

Time in Direct Care*



* This graph does not reflect youth's entire LOSs; rather, it is a one-day snapshot of the number of days youth spent in direct care from their admission date through June 30, 2022. The graph displays up to 365 days.

- » There were 111 youth with a determinate commitment or blended sentence and 81 youth with an indeterminate commitment on June 30, 2022.
- » Among youth with a determinate commitment or blended sentence, 89.2% had been in direct care for at least 90 days, and 56.8% had been in direct care for at least one year. The average time in direct care was 1.3 years.
- » Among youth with an indeterminate commitment, 74.1% had been in direct care for at least 90 days, and 21.0% had been in direct care for at least one year. The average time in direct care was 251 days.

The proportion of determinate commitments and blended sentences is larger for the direct care population (57.8% on June 30, 2022) than for admissions (33.3% in FY 2022) due to longer LOSs.





3 Special Topics

DJJ's Research Unit analyzes data to evaluate programs, initiatives, and trends in order to provide meaningful information to decision-makers for improving services and outcomes. The following studies represent a selection of the projects completed during the past year. Data in this section of the report may not match other sections due to different dates of data download.

Youth Violence and Weapon Trends


The COVID-19 pandemic directly affected the juvenile justice system (e.g., reduced court operations) and led to different behaviors among the general public (e.g., state of emergency, stay-at-home orders, in-person school closures), impacting actual and tracked criminal and

delinquent behavior. At the national level, OJJDP estimated that the violent crimes¹ arrest rate decreased by only 9.3% between CY 2015 and CY 2019 but by 26.2% in CY 2020, an acceleration of previous downward trends in violent crime.² As a result, the following section investigates Virginia trends in violent offenses and weapon-related offenses among youth after the initial decline during the pandemic.

¹ Violent crimes reported by OJJDP include the offenses of murder, robbery, and aggravated assault.

² OJJDP. (2022, July 8). *OJJDP Statistical Briefing Book*. Retrieved December 14, 2022, from https://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/crime/JAR_Display.asp?ID=qa05218&selOffenses=35

Felony Against Persons, Violent Felony, and Violent Juvenile Felony Intake Complaints, FY 2013-2022*




* Felony against persons complaints are categorized based on the DAI ranking. Violent felony complaints include offenses enumerated in § 19.2-297.1 in addition to aggravated murder in § 18.2-31 of the *Code of Virginia*. Violent juvenile felony complaints are defined on page 8; only offenses considered violent juvenile felonies without being contingent on a youth's other offenses are included. The three groups are not mutually exclusive.

- » Felony against persons, violent felony, and violent juvenile felony complaints increased from FY 2013 to FY 2017, each by at least 8%. Across this timeframe, FY 2017 had the highest count of felony against persons complaints, and FY 2014 had the highest counts of violent felony and violent juvenile felony complaints.
- » All three types of complaints decreased from FY 2017 to FY 2020. Each type of complaint decreased by at least 8% across this time period. Declines accelerated from FY 2020 to FY 2021, with each type of complaint decreasing by at least 22%.
- » From FY 2021 to FY 2022, the complaint types fluctuated differently. While felony against persons and violent felony complaints increased by 22.8% and 5.5%, respectively, counts remained lower than prior to the pandemic. Violent juvenile felony complaints decreased by 14.6%.



Weapon and Specified Firearm Intake Complaints, FY 2013-2022*



* Specified firearm complaints include VCCs listed in DJJ's Administrative Directive A-2022-005 (Mandatory Overrides for Weapons Offenses on the DAI), including WPN-5253-M1. Weapon complaints are offenses with a VCC prefix of WPN. The two groups are not mutually exclusive.

- » From FY 2013 to FY 2017, specified firearm and weapon complaints increased by at least 34% each.
- » From FY 2017 to FY 2019, both types of complaints decreased by at least 13% before increasing in FY 2020.
- » From FY 2020 to FY 2021, specified firearm and weapon complaints decreased by 10.1% and 12.3%, respectively.
- » From FY 2021 to FY 2022, specified firearm and weapon complaints increased by 35.9% and 53.0%, respectively, reaching 10-year highs.

Conclusion

Violent and weapon-related juvenile intake complaints across different definitions decreased from FY 2020 to FY 2021 during the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. In the following year, different patterns emerged based on the complaint type. Weapon and firearm complaints reached 10-year highs in FY 2022. Meanwhile, most measures of violent crime indicated violent offenses among youth returned to approximately pre-pandemic trends. DJJ will continue to monitor trends in youth violence and weapon-related complaints and share this information with stakeholders.

Violent and weapon-related complaints across different definitions decreased in FY 2021, but different patterns emerged in FY 2022; weapon and firearm complaints increased to 10-year highs while most types of violent offenses returned to approximately pre-pandemic trends.



Initiative-Specific Performance Measures, FY 2020-2021

Purpose

Performance measures serve as an important tool for DJJ to examine, understand, and improve the agency's programs and services. Performance measures are created to align with the goals and objectives of each initiative, providing a quantifiable way to monitor implementation, identify areas of improvement, and create a feedback loop between partners. Through a collaborative process, DJJ has established performance measures for both CPPs and RSCs, such as how many youth received services, how quickly services were offered, and if youth made progress in the provided services. After analysis, the QA Unit uses the results to make recommendations and create individualized CQI plans. Some of these performance measures are highlighted below.

Examples of CPP Performance Measures

CPPs are highly structured residential programs operated for direct care youth in JDCs. A goal of the CPPs is to place youth in smaller settings closer to their home communities to facilitate a smoother transition after release and to increase family engagement. (See page 44 for more detail.) Two examples of CPP performance measures are listed below:

| | 2020 | 2021 |
|--|-------|-------|
| The percentage of youth who began services within 14 days of placement at a CPP* | 46.4% | 56.9% |

* Services include aggression management treatment, substance abuse treatment, and therapy (family or individual).

- » During FY 2020, 151 youth were placed in a CPP, and 46.4% of those youth started services within 14 days of placement.
- » During FY 2021, 109 youth were placed in a CPP, and 56.9% of those youth started services within 14 days of placement.

| | 2020 | 2021 |
|---|-------|-------|
| The percentage of youth whose families were actively engaged while the youth was at the CPP | 88.7% | 88.1% |

- » During FY 2020, 238 youth were in a CPP at least one day, and 88.7% of those youth had a family member actively engaged in their treatment (i.e., a family member must have attended at least one treatment team meeting).

- » During FY 2021, 176 youth were in a CPP at least one day, and 88.1% of those youth had a family member actively engaged in their treatment.

Examples of RSC Performance Measures

DJJ utilizes a continuum of services and alternative placements that offer programs to meet treatment needs, divert youth from future involvement with DJJ, provide appropriate dispositional options for youth under supervision, and support successful reentry upon return to the community. (See page 45 for more detail.) Two examples of RSC performance measures are listed below:

| | 2020 | 2021 |
|---|-------|-------|
| The percentage of youth who ended services with at least some progress* | 87.1% | 79.1% |

* Assessments/evaluations, monitoring services, and non-intervention services are excluded.

- » During FY 2021, 465 youth were referred to RSC services and ended at least one service by the time of the report; 79.1% of those youth made at least some progress (i.e., met some or all of their overarching and/or service goals). Because the service FYs are determined by the referral date, some FY 2021 services may not have ended by the time of reporting; therefore, FY 2021 rates may change as more services finish.

| | 2020 | 2021 |
|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| The percentage of services completed | 84.6% | 83.2% |

- » During FY 2020, 2,745 referred services were approved and began; 84.6% of those services were completed.
- » During FY 2021, 1,243 referred services were approved and began; 83.2% of those services were completed.




Types of Reoffenses

As part of a multi-phase recidivism project, the Research Unit analyzed rearrest offense category and severity, along with several other factors, including risk level, timing from placement or release to first rearrest, and frequency of rearrests. Select results are presented below.

Due to the quality of data received from collaborating agencies, distinction between types of felonies and misdemeanors cannot be determined. Therefore, all felo-


nies are grouped together, and all misdemeanors are grouped together. Youth may be rearrested for more than one offense. Between FY 2016 and FY 2020, there were an average of 1.5 complaints per rearrest. Reoffense data is presented on a two-year time lag to allow adequate time for data cleaning. The analysis below includes placements and releases from FY 2016 through FY 2020 (tracked through FY 2021). Data in this section of the report may not match other sections due to the time lag and different date of data download. (See pages 71-84 for an explanation of DJJ's recidivism methodology and the annual recidivism rates.)

12-Month Rearrest Rates for Placements/Releases by Reoffense Severity



- » 34.9% of probation placements and 58.1% of parole placements were rearrested within 12 months of placement.
- » A smaller proportion of youth were rearrested for a felony; 19.2% of probation placements and 43.4% of parole placements were rearrested for a felony within 12 months of placement.


12-Month Felony Rearrest Rates for Placements/Releases by Risk Level



- » High-risk youth were the most likely to be rearrested for a felony.
 - › Among probation releases, 30.9% of high-risk youth were rearrested for a felony within 12 months of release, compared to 16.8% of moderate-risk and 6.4% of low-risk youth.
 - › Among direct care releases, 44.8% of high-risk youth were rearrested for a felony within 12 months of release, compared to 25.4% of moderate-risk and 15.4% of low-risk youth.
 - › Among parole releases, 44.6% of high-risk youth were rearrested for a felony within 12 months of release, compared to 28.8% of moderate-risk and 6.7% of low-risk youth.



12-Month Rearrest Rates for Placements/Releases by Reoffense Category*



* Percentages below 2.0% and missing reoffense information are not shown.

* Youth may be rearrested for more than one offense. Between FY 2016 and FY 2020, there were an average of 1.5 complaints per rearrest.

- » Approximately two-thirds of probation placements and probation releases were not rearrested within 12 months of placement/release.
- » Among probation placements and probation releases, the most common types of reoffenses were larceny and assault.
 - › 13.1% of probation placements and 10.8% of probation releases were rearrested for larceny.
 - › 12.8% of probation placements and 10.5% of probation releases were rearrested for assault.
- » Less than half of direct care releases, parole placements, and parole releases were not rearrested within 12 months of placement/release.
- » For direct care releases, parole placements, and parole releases, the most common types of reoffenses were larceny, assault, and weapons offenses.
 - › 22.6% of direct care releases, 26.2% of parole placements, and 21.2% of parole releases were rearrested for larceny.
 - › 18.8% of direct care releases, 20.9% of parole placements, and 20.0% of parole releases were rearrested for assault.
 - › 14.2% of direct care releases, 15.9% of parole placements, and 14.9% of parole releases were rearrested for weapons.






4 Trends and Forecast

10-Year Trends

Juvenile Intake Complaints by Offense Severity, FY 2013-2022*




* Violations consist of probation, parole, and court order violations.

- » There were 32,803 juvenile intake complaints in FY 2022, a decrease of 46.7% from FY 2013.
- » There were 6,184 felony juvenile intake complaints in FY 2022, a decrease of 44.4% from FY 2013.
- » There were 12,906 Class 1 misdemeanor juvenile intake complaints in FY 2022, a decrease of 47.5% from FY 2013.
- » Following the substantial decreases in intake complaints from FY 2020 to FY 2021, there was an increase of 24.5% from FY 2021 to FY 2022.



DR/CW Complaints, FY 2013-2022




- » There were 115,992 DR/CW complaints in FY 2022, a decrease of 17.1% from FY 2013 and an increase of 4.3% from FY 2020.
- » There were 51,905 custody complaints in FY 2022, a decrease of 22.1% from FY 2013.
- » There were 12,324 support/desertion complaints in FY 2022, a decrease of 40.6% from FY 2013.
- » There were 18,334 protective order/ECO complaints in FY 2022, an increase of 21.0% from FY 2013.
- » There were 33,429 visitation complaints in FY 2022, a decrease of 10.6% from FY 2013.

There were 115,992
 DR/CW complaints in
 FY 2022, a decrease of
 17.1% from FY 2013 and an
 increase of 4.3% from FY 2020.




Juvenile Intake, Petitioned, and Diversion Plan Complaints, FY 2013-2022*



* Unsuccessful diversion plans with petitions filed are counted as both diversion plans and petitioned. Furthermore, juvenile intake complaints include other intake decisions; therefore, the sum of diversion plan complaints and petitioned complaints does not equal the total juvenile intake complaints.

- » Following a substantial decrease in juvenile intake complaints in FY 2021, there was an increase of 24.5% in juvenile intake complaints from FY 2021 to FY 2022. During the same time period, complaints with a petition increased by 22.4%, and complaints with a diversion plan increased by 50.3%.
- » There were 32,803 juvenile intake complaints in FY 2022, a decrease of 46.7% from FY 2013.
- » There were 20,807 petitioned juvenile intake complaints in FY 2022, a decrease of 52.4% from FY 2013.
- » There were 6,003 juvenile intake complaints with a diversion plan in FY 2022, a decrease of 28.6% from FY 2013.

Juvenile Intake, Petitioned, and Diversion Plan Cases, FY 2013-2022*



* Juvenile intake cases include all initial intake decisions; therefore, the sum of diversion plan cases and petitioned cases does not equal the total juvenile intake cases.


* In order to be categorized as a petitioned intake case, at least one intake complaint associated with the case must be petitioned.

* In order to be categorized as a case with a diversion plan, at least one complaint associated with the case must have a diversion plan, and no complaints can be petitioned.

- » Following a substantial decrease in juvenile intake cases in FY 2021, there was an increase of 31.7% in juvenile intake cases from FY 2021 to FY 2022. During the same time period, cases with a petition increased by 27.0%, and cases with a diversion plan increased by 64.6%.
- » There were 23,562 juvenile intake cases in FY 2022, a decrease of 49.1% from FY 2013.
- » There were 13,806 juvenile intake cases with at least one petitioned intake complaint in FY 2022, a decrease of 56.2% from FY 2013.
- » There were 5,164 juvenile intake cases with a diversion plan in FY 2022, a decrease of 31.1% from FY 2013.




Probation Placements and Probation ADP, FY 2013-2022*




* "Probation Placements" data values are below, and "Probation ADP" data values are above.
 » There were 1,543 probation placements in FY 2022, a decrease of 68.7% from FY 2013.
 » The probation ADP was 1,368 youth in FY 2022, a decrease of 74.0% from FY 2013.

Detainments and JDC ADP, FY 2013-2022



» There were 4,226 detainments in FY 2022, a decrease of 59.7% from FY 2013. Despite this substantial ten year decrease, there was a 16.5% increase in detainments from FY 2021 to FY 2022.
 » The JDC ADP was 349 youth in FY 2022, a decrease of 52.0% from FY 2013.


Direct Care Admissions and Direct Care ADP, FY 2013-2022*



* "Direct Care Admissions" data values are below, and "Direct Care ADP" data values are above.
 » There were 147 direct care admissions in FY 2022, a decrease of 66.5% from FY 2013.
 » The direct care ADP was 195 youth in FY 2022, a decrease of 71.9% from FY 2013.




Parole ADP, FY 2013-2022



» The parole ADP was 161 youth in FY 2022, a decrease of 45.4% from FY 2013.


Average LOS for Direct Care Releases (Months), FY 2013-2022



» The average LOS for direct care releases was 16.9 months in FY 2022.

» From FY 2013 to FY 2018, the average LOS decreased by 30.8% before increasing by 42.9% from FY 2018 to FY 2021. From FY 2021 to FY 2022, there was a decrease of 7.1%.

Average LOS for Probation and Parole Releases (Months), FY 2013-2022



» The average LOS for probation releases was 12.4 months in FY 2022.

» The average LOS for parole releases was 13.4 months in FY 2022.



Forecast


Forecasts of persons confined 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 392 of Chapter 2 of the 2022 Acts of Assembly, Special Session I, the SPSHS presents updated forecasts annually for the juvenile local-responsible (JDC) population, juvenile state-responsible (direct care) population, adult local-responsible (jail) population, and adult state-responsible (prison) population. Summaries of the juvenile population forecasts are presented in this section.

As a result of COVID-19 and response policies implemented specifically to reduce the spread of the virus, Virginia experienced dramatic reductions in the confined offender populations beginning in March 2020,

and it remained unclear at the time of developing the forecasts when, and to what extent, the populations would return to pre-pandemic levels or trends. Therefore, the SPSHS opted to abbreviate the forecasting process in 2020, 2021, and 2022. The full impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the confined populations may not yet be known. The confined offender populations also have been impacted by recent policy changes, such as the increase in the dollar value at which larceny becomes a felony and the decriminalization and then legalization of marijuana. Forecasting populations in such circumstances is particularly challenging.

For the full forecast report by the SPSHS, view the “Report on the Offender Population Forecasts (FY 2023 to FY 2028)” on Virginia’s Legislative Information System’s website (lis.virginia.gov).

JDC ADP and Forecast, FY 2013-2028*




* Data may not match the values presented in other sections of the DRG because of different data download dates.

- » The average JDC ADP is projected to increase to 406 in FY 2023.
- » The average JDC ADP is projected to increase to 441 by FY 2028.




Direct Care Admissions and Forecast, FY 2013-2028*



* Data may not match the values presented in other sections of the DRG because of different data download dates.

- » A flat forecast was selected by averaging the direct care admissions in FYs 2019, 2020, and 2021.
- » Direct care admissions are projected to remain at 244 from FY 2023 through FY 2028.

Direct Care ADP and Forecast, FY 2013-2028*



* Data may not match the values presented in other sections of the DRG because of different data download dates.

- » With a shift toward determinate commitments, the direct care population forecast projects growth after FY 2022.
- » The direct care ADP is projected to increase to 229 in FY 2023.
- » The direct care ADP is projected to increase to 305 by FY 2028.





5 Recidivism

Methodology

Recidivism, or reoffending, is an important concept for juvenile and adult criminal justice systems because it provides a measure of outcome success. Use of standardized measures of recidivism allows for evaluations across different types of programs; however, a comparison of results is difficult because evaluation methodologies vary widely among organizations. Definitions of recidivism differ from study to study, and characteristics of the youth studied may not be similar or adequately identified.

DJJ uses the following three measures of recidivism:

Rearrest: a petitioned juvenile intake complaint for a new delinquent act or an adult arrest for a new criminal offense, regardless of the court's determination of delinquency or guilt.

Reconviction: a delinquent adjudication for a new delinquent act or a guilty conviction for a new criminal offense.

Reincarceration: a return to commitment, incarceration, or secure confinement subsequent to a rearrest and reconviction for a new delinquent act or criminal offense.

Recidivism data for youth served from FY 2017 through FY 2021 are presented for the following groups:

- » Intake cases with diversion plans,
- » Intake cases with first-time diversion plans (a subgroup of intake cases with diversion plans),
- » Successful diversion plans,
- » Probation placements,
- » Probation releases,
- » Direct care releases,
- » Parole placements (a subgroup of direct care releases with a parole start date within 30 days of release from direct care),
- » Parole releases,
- » Youth placed in VJCCCA programs,
- » Youth released from VJCCCA programs, and

» Releases from post-D detention with programs.

The rearrest rates for diversion plans were expanded with improvements to the methodology. Reports prior to FY 2021 presented rearrest rates for successful diversions over multiple years and rearrest rates for intake cases with first-time diversion plans for one year. In FY 2021, all intake cases with diversion plans were added as a new group, and intake cases with first-time diversion plans were expanded to multiple years. The methodology for successful diversions was also improved. (See page 74 for more details.)

Each year, the reoffense data are updated for all of the groups reported. Rates may increase when re-examined next year because of updated final case dispositions. Due to cases still pending at the time of analysis, reconviction and reincarceration rates for FY 2021 groups are unavailable.

DJJ's recidivism analysis is based on data from several collaborating organizations: DJJ, VSP, VCSC, VADOC, and the State Compensation Board. Data on youth are maintained in DJJ's electronic data management system, which contains information on juvenile intakes, detentions, probation and parole statuses, and commitments for all localities in Virginia. DJJ obtains statewide adult arrest and conviction information from VSP and VCSC and statewide adult incarceration information from VADOC and the State Compensation Board. Individuals' information is matched between data systems primarily by name and date of birth. Due to the lack of available data, deaths and out-of-state reoffenses during the follow-up period are not accounted for in this analysis.

Over time, DJJ removes identifying information from cases due to expungements and record retention practices. Youth with missing names or birth dates the first year they are in a recidivism group are excluded from the analysis because missing information prevents the matching of cases with different data systems. Newly added or modified recidivism groups have more cases with missing information in earlier years due to the time delay. Due to the additions and modifications to the diversion groups, many cases in earlier years would need to be excluded due to missing identifying information (e.g., 28.5% of successful diversions in FY 2017 are miss-



ing names or birth dates). Therefore, FY 2018 is the earliest year with sufficient identifiable cases to present rearrest rates for the three diversion groups (less than 9% of cases were excluded in FY 2018). Less than 3% of any other recidivism group were excluded due to missing data. Total counts in this section may not match values in other sections of the DRG due to these exclusions.

The measurement date determines the beginning of the follow-up period for each youth. For all groups, the measurement date itself is not included in the follow-up period. The length of time to rearrest indicates the difference between the measurement date and the first new petitioned juvenile intake or adult arrest. The length of time to reconviction indicates the difference between the measurement date and the first new petitioned juvenile intake or adult arrest that resulted in a delinquent or guilty finding. However, if a youth with a reconviction is missing rearrest data, the date of reconviction is used for both the rearrest and reconviction calculations. The length of time to reincarceration indicates the difference between the measurement date and the date of the first return to commitment, incarceration, or secure confinement subsequent to a reconviction.

Recidivism data exclude the following offenses: violation of probation or parole, contempt of court, non-criminal DR/CW complaints, and non-criminal traffic violations. More specifically, all violations of probation, parole, and conditions of release (all VCCs with the following prefixes: CBC, CDI, SSV, PRB, PRP, PAR, CON, BND, or PRE) are excluded. Recidivism data exclude failure to appear offenses with the VCC prefixes listed above, but felony and misdemeanor failure to appear offenses with the VCC prefix of FTA are included. Youth

transferred directly to a VADOC facility are excluded from direct care releases and parole placements. Youth transferred directly to jail cannot be identified and therefore are included in the direct care releases and parole placements.

Recidivism rates in recent FYs may be impacted by the system-wide decreases during COVID-19.

Measurement Dates*

| Reported Groups | Measurement Date |
|--|-------------------------|
| Intake Cases with Diversion Plans | Intake |
| Intake Cases with First-Time Diversion Plans | Intake |
| Successful Diversion Plans | Estimated Completion |
| Probation Placements | Probation Start |
| Probation Releases | Probation End |
| Direct Care Releases | Direct Care Release |
| Parole Placements | Direct Care Release |
| Parole Releases | Parole End |
| Youth Placed in VJCCCA | First Program Placement |
| Youth Released from VJCCCA | Last Program Release |
| Post-D Detention Releases | JDC Release |

* For groups measured from a start date, the follow-up period may extend beyond the end dates.

* Diversion plans do not constitute petitioned intakes, and VJCCCA placements may not have petitioned intakes; however, rearrest rates are reported to indicate subsequent petitioned intakes or adult arrests.


* Successful diversion plans are counted for each intake case with a successful diversion. The estimated completion for successful diversion plans is either 90 days (for truancy-only diversions through FY 2020) or 120 days (for all other diversion plans) after the intake date.

* VJCCCA groups use the first placement date or last release date in the FY, regardless of whether multiple programs are continuous or overlap FYs.

* Canceled, rescinded, and successfully appealed commitments and youth transferred directly to a VADOC facility are excluded from direct care releases and parole placements.

12-Month Recidivism Rate Overview


12-Month Rearrest Rates for Intake Cases with Diversion Plans, Probation Placements, Direct Care Releases, and Parole Placements in FY 2018-2021, Tracked through FY 2022



» 12-month rearrest rates decreased for all reported groups since FY 2018. 12-month rearrest rates for direct care releases and parole placements decreased substantially in FY 2021.



12-Month Recidivism Rates for Probation Placements, Direct Care Releases, and Parole Placements in FY 2018-2020, Tracked through FY 2022



- » 12-month recidivism rates decreased for all reported groups since FY 2018.
- » 12-month recidivism rates for probation placements were lower than direct care releases and parole placements.

12-Month Recidivism Rates for Intake Cases with Diversion Plans, Probation Placements and Releases, Direct Care Releases, and Parole Placements and Releases in FY 2018-2021, Tracked through FY 2022

| | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Diversion Plans | | | | |
| Rearrest | 12.5% | 12.2% | 10.6% | 12.1% |
| Total | 6,151 | 7,002 | 6,309 | 2,795 |
| Probation Placements | | | | |
| Rearrest | 34.1% | 34.4% | 29.7% | 27.8% |
| Reconviction | 22.1% | 21.3% | 16.5% | N/A |
| Total | 3,000 | 2,637 | 1,877 | 1,480 |
| Probation Releases | | | | |
| Rearrest | 32.7% | 31.6% | 26.7% | 25.4% |
| Reconviction | 24.7% | 22.8% | 16.9% | N/A |
| Total | 3,110 | 2,974 | 2,481 | 1,898 |
| Direct Care Releases | | | | |
| Rearrest | 56.3% | 54.4% | 50.3% | 39.8% |
| Reconviction | 46.6% | 46.9% | 38.3% | N/A |
| Reincarceration | 23.4% | 17.8% | 12.7% | N/A |
| Total | 320 | 309 | 308 | 191 |
| Parole Placements | | | | |
| Rearrest | 61.9% | 60.3% | 55.1% | 41.3% |
| Reconviction | 50.8% | 53.1% | 43.0% | N/A |
| Reincarceration | 26.2% | 21.8% | 14.5% | N/A |
| Total | 252 | 239 | 256 | 155 |
| Parole Releases | | | | |
| Rearrest | 55.5% | 57.6% | 52.7% | 43.5% |
| Reconviction | 48.5% | 51.7% | 41.4% | N/A |
| Reincarceration | 22.3% | 19.0% | 14.2% | N/A |
| Total | 301 | 290 | 239 | 232 |



Diversion Plans

Rearrest Rates for Intake Cases with Diversion Plans, Intake Cases with First-Time Diversion Plans, and Successful Diversion Plans in FY 2019-2021, Tracked through FY 2022*

| Time to Reoffense | Diversion Plans | | | | First-Time Diversion Plans | | | | Successful Diversion Plans | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| 3 months | 3.1% | 3.5% | 3.6% | 2.5% | 2.6% | 2.8% | 2.9% | 1.6% | 3.6% | 3.9% | 3.3% | 2.7% |
| 6 months | 6.4% | 7.0% | 6.6% | 6.2% | 5.6% | 5.5% | 5.4% | 4.7% | 6.9% | 6.7% | 5.7% | 5.4% |
| 12 months | 12.5% | 12.2% | 10.6% | 12.1% | 11.1% | 10.3% | 8.8% | 9.8% | 12.2% | 12.4% | 8.9% | 10.0% |
| 24 months | 20.7% | 18.6% | 17.5% | N/A | 19.1% | 16.1% | 15.0% | N/A | 19.9% | 18.6% | 15.1% | N/A |
| 36 months | 25.9% | 24.1% | N/A | N/A | 24.3% | 21.4% | N/A | N/A | 25.5% | 24.3% | N/A | N/A |
| Total | 6,151 | 7,002 | 6,309 | 2,795 | 5,521 | 6,091 | 5,300 | 2,366 | 5,199 | 6,057 | 7,287 | 2,465 |

* Counts are based on intake cases, so a youth with multiple qualifying intake cases is counted multiple times.

* For all diversion groups, intake cases are excluded if a complaint within the same intake case was petitioned, including an unsuccessful diversion with a petition filed. In reports prior to FY 2021, diversion plans were included if a complaint within the same intake case was petitioned. Additionally, FYs for successful diversion plans are determined by the estimated completion date. In reports prior to FY 2021, FYs were determined by the intake date, resulting in incomplete follow-up timeframes for some youth. Therefore, counts and rates are not comparable to reports prior to FY 2021.

» Rearrest rates for diversion plans were lower than rearrest rates for probation placements and releases for each follow-up time period in each FY.

Probation

Rearrest Rates for Probation Placements and Probation Releases in FY 2017-2021, Tracked through FY 2022

| Time to Reoffense | Probation Placements | | | | | Probation Releases | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| 3 months | 14.4% | 12.9% | 13.7% | 13.5% | 11.3% | 12.1% | 11.2% | 10.8% | 10.0% | 8.3% |
| 6 months | 24.2% | 23.1% | 22.3% | 20.7% | 17.8% | 20.4% | 20.2% | 19.0% | 17.1% | 14.9% |
| 12 months | 37.8% | 34.1% | 34.4% | 29.7% | 27.8% | 34.4% | 32.7% | 31.6% | 26.7% | 25.4% |
| 24 months | 51.6% | 49.0% | 47.3% | 42.0% | N/A | 51.1% | 47.2% | 44.5% | 41.2% | N/A |
| 36 months | 60.1% | 56.2% | 54.7% | N/A | N/A | 59.0% | 55.2% | 52.2% | N/A | N/A |
| Total | 3,057 | 3,000 | 2,637 | 1,877 | 1,480 | 3,579 | 3,110 | 2,974 | 2,481 | 1,898 |

» Rearrest rates for probation placements and releases were lower than rearrest rates for direct care releases, parole placements, and parole releases for each follow-up time period in each FY. (See pages 76-77 for rearrest rates for direct care releases, parole placements, and parole releases.)

Reconviction Rates for Probation Placements and Probation Releases in FY 2017-2020, Tracked through FY 2022

| Time to Reoffense | Probation Placements | | | | Probation Releases | | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| 3 months | 8.5% | 8.0% | 7.4% | 7.2% | 8.6% | 7.6% | 7.6% | 5.8% |
| 6 months | 15.3% | 14.6% | 13.0% | 10.7% | 15.1% | 14.4% | 13.2% | 10.0% |
| 12 months | 24.9% | 22.1% | 21.3% | 16.5% | 26.2% | 24.7% | 22.8% | 16.9% |
| 24 months | 38.9% | 34.6% | 31.6% | N/A | 41.4% | 38.0% | 33.8% | N/A |
| 36 months | 47.7% | 42.2% | N/A | N/A | 50.2% | 45.5% | N/A | N/A |
| Total | 3,057 | 3,000 | 2,637 | 1,877 | 3,579 | 3,110 | 2,974 | 2,481 |

» Reconviction rates for probation placements and releases were lower than reconviction rates for direct care releases, parole placements, and parole releases for each follow-up time period in each FY.



12-Month Rearrest and Reconviction Rates by CSU for Probation Placements and Probation Releases in FY 2020-2021, Tracked through FY 2022*

| CSU | Probation Placements | | | | Probation Releases | | | |
|--------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2021 | | 2020 | | 2021 | | 2020 | |
| | Total | Rearrest | Total | Reconviction | Total | Rearrest | Total | Reconviction |
| 1 | 54 | 18.5% | 62 | 14.5% | 54 | 20.4% | 80 | 15.0% |
| 2 | 89 | 22.5% | 89 | 12.4% | 88 | 19.3% | 103 | 18.4% |
| 2A | 8 | 37.5% | 14 | 7.1% | 9 | 33.3% | 23 | 0.0% |
| 3 | 25 | 48.0% | 36 | 19.4% | 48 | 33.3% | 28 | 21.4% |
| 4 | 55 | 34.5% | 71 | 38.0% | 79 | 40.5% | 100 | 24.0% |
| 5 | 39 | 23.1% | 29 | 24.1% | 40 | 40.0% | 37 | 27.0% |
| 6 | 14 | 21.4% | 17 | 11.8% | 25 | 24.0% | 28 | 21.4% |
| 7 | 58 | 25.9% | 85 | 10.6% | 92 | 22.8% | 81 | 13.6% |
| 8 | 36 | 13.9% | 38 | 36.8% | 26 | 34.6% | 52 | 23.1% |
| 9 | 22 | 45.5% | 32 | 12.5% | 30 | 23.3% | 22 | 13.6% |
| 10 | 26 | 11.5% | 34 | 11.8% | 31 | 12.9% | 45 | 22.2% |
| 11 | 13 | 23.1% | 19 | 15.8% | 24 | 45.8% | 33 | 24.2% |
| 12 | 48 | 45.8% | 45 | 40.0% | 55 | 43.6% | 52 | 17.3% |
| 13 | 64 | 51.6% | 94 | 18.1% | 91 | 37.4% | 162 | 22.8% |
| 14 | 85 | 21.2% | 89 | 7.9% | 85 | 29.4% | 110 | 21.8% |
| 15 | 51 | 33.3% | 55 | 7.3% | 67 | 20.9% | 78 | 23.1% |
| 16 | 60 | 28.3% | 83 | 15.7% | 88 | 26.1% | 112 | 12.5% |
| 17 | 25 | 24.0% | 52 | 13.5% | 45 | 20.0% | 100 | 9.0% |
| 18 | 24 | 41.7% | 36 | 11.1% | 33 | 21.2% | 42 | 7.1% |
| 19 | 68 | 27.9% | 153 | 21.6% | 160 | 24.4% | 218 | 12.8% |
| 20L | 24 | 29.2% | 43 | 11.6% | 48 | 16.7% | 72 | 11.1% |
| 20W | 13 | 7.7% | 27 | 7.4% | 19 | 5.3% | 23 | 13.0% |
| 21 | 35 | 22.9% | 46 | 13.0% | 56 | 19.6% | 54 | 7.4% |
| 22 | 68 | 38.2% | 60 | 23.3% | 54 | 25.9% | 70 | 24.3% |
| 23 | 19 | 42.1% | 12 | 0.0% | 12 | 50.0% | 26 | 3.8% |
| 23A | 17 | 29.4% | 14 | 28.6% | 19 | 36.8% | 22 | 27.3% |
| 24 | 69 | 30.4% | 77 | 20.8% | 79 | 24.1% | 102 | 23.5% |
| 25 | 49 | 22.4% | 51 | 13.7% | 55 | 16.4% | 64 | 23.4% |
| 26 | 67 | 38.8% | 83 | 21.7% | 86 | 24.4% | 78 | 26.9% |
| 27 | 70 | 11.4% | 61 | 13.1% | 62 | 8.1% | 80 | 16.3% |
| 28 | 18 | 0.0% | 46 | 8.7% | 31 | 9.7% | 48 | 10.4% |
| 29 | 20 | 5.0% | 26 | 7.7% | 31 | 22.6% | 30 | 16.7% |
| 30 | 54 | 20.4% | 47 | 6.4% | 49 | 26.5% | 73 | 11.0% |
| 31 | 93 | 25.8% | 151 | 13.2% | 127 | 23.6% | 233 | 11.6% |
| <i>Total</i> | <i>1,480</i> | <i>27.8%</i> | <i>1,877</i> | <i>16.5%</i> | <i>1,898</i> | <i>25.4%</i> | <i>2,481</i> | <i>16.9%</i> |

* The CSU for probation placements is identified by the J&DR district court that originally placed the youth on probation. The CSU for probation releases is identified by the CSU supervising the case at the time of release from probation supervision.

* Some groups were comprised of a small number of youth; therefore, rates can be strongly influenced by the reoffense of only a few youth.

* Effective in FY 2022, CSUs 23 and 23A are combined (CSU 23), and CSUs 20L and 20W are combined (CSU 20).

See pages 81-82 for recidivism rates for probation placements and releases by risk level.



Direct Care

Rearrest and Reconviction Rates for Direct Care Releases in FY 2017-2021, Tracked through FY 2022

| Time to Reoffense | Rearrest | | | | | Reconviction | | | |
|-------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| 3 months | 17.3% | 22.5% | 15.2% | 14.0% | 14.7% | 12.5% | 16.6% | 13.3% | 9.7% |
| 6 months | 35.9% | 38.1% | 35.0% | 30.2% | 25.1% | 27.1% | 28.8% | 27.8% | 23.4% |
| 12 months | 55.0% | 56.3% | 54.4% | 50.3% | 39.8% | 45.3% | 46.6% | 46.9% | 38.3% |
| 24 months | 75.1% | 71.3% | 72.5% | 66.6% | N/A | 68.7% | 62.8% | 63.4% | N/A |
| 36 months | 82.7% | 78.8% | 81.2% | N/A | N/A | 78.4% | 70.6% | N/A | N/A |
| <i>Total</i> | 329 | 320 | 309 | 308 | 191 | 329 | 320 | 309 | 308 |

- » Rearrest rates for direct care releases were lower than rearrest rates for parole placements for each follow-up time period in each FY. (See page 77 for rearrest rates for parole placements.)
- » Reconviction rates for direct care releases were lower than reconviction rates for parole placements for each follow-up time period in each FY. (See page 78 for reconviction rates for parole placements.)
- » 12-month rearrest rates for direct care releases fluctuated between 50.3% and 56.3% between FY 2017 and FY 2020 before decreasing to 39.8% in FY 2021.
- » 12-month reconviction rates for direct care releases fluctuated between 45.3% and 46.9% between FY 2017 and FY 2019 before decreasing to 38.3% in FY 2020.

Reincarceration Rates for Direct Care Releases in FY 2017-2020, Tracked through FY 2022*

| Time to Reoffense | Direct Care Releases | | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| 3 months | 2.7% | 3.1% | 3.6% | 0.3% |
| 6 months | 7.9% | 9.4% | 8.7% | 5.5% |
| 12 months | 20.1% | 23.4% | 17.8% | 12.7% |
| 24 months | 40.7% | 40.0% | 33.0% | N/A |
| 36 months | 52.3% | 46.3% | N/A | N/A |
| <i>Total</i> | 329 | 320 | 309 | 308 |

* Due to variations in data received from the State Compensation Board regarding reincarcerations in jail, FY 2017 rates may not be comparable to previous reports or to other FYs.

- » Reincarceration rates for direct care releases were lower than reincarceration rates for parole placements for each follow-up time period in each FY (with the exception of the 3- and 6-month follow-up time periods in FY 2017). (See page 78 for reincarceration rates for parole placements.)
- » Of the 39 direct care releases in FY 2020 reincarcerated within 12 months of release, 46.2% were reincarcerated in a local jail, 41.0% in direct care, 5.1% in a VADOC facility, and 7.7% in a JDC.

See pages 81-82 for recidivism rates for direct care releases by risk level.



12-Month Recidivism Rates for Direct Care Releases by Treatment Need in FY 2019-2021, Tracked through FY 2022*

| Treatment Need | Total Youth | | | Rearrest | | | Reconviction | | Reincarceration | |
|-----------------------|-------------|------|------|----------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2019 | 2020 | 2019 | 2020 |
| Aggression Management | 295 | 301 | 189 | 54.2% | 49.8% | 40.2% | 46.4% | 37.9% | 18.0% | 12.3% |
| Sex Offender | 24 | 31 | 36 | 33.3% | 25.8% | 30.6% | 29.2% | 19.4% | 4.2% | 3.2% |
| Substance Abuse | 264 | 259 | 151 | 55.3% | 52.5% | 40.4% | 47.3% | 41.3% | 17.8% | 12.7% |

* Treatment needs are subgroups of direct care releases and include youth with any level of treatment needs. One youth may have multiple treatment needs.

* An assigned treatment need does not indicate treatment completion.

* Some groups were comprised of a small number of youth; therefore, rates can be strongly influenced by the reoffense of only a few youth.

- » Direct care releases with a sex offender treatment need had lower rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration rates than direct care releases with an aggression management or substance abuse treatment need.

Parole

Rearrest Rates for Parole Placements and Parole Releases in FY 2017-2021, Tracked through FY 2022

| Time to Reoffense | Parole Placements | | | | | Parole Releases | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| 3 months | 19.0% | 27.4% | 17.6% | 15.6% | 16.8% | 22.9% | 23.9% | 30.7% | 19.7% | 16.8% |
| 6 months | 39.8% | 44.8% | 40.2% | 33.2% | 25.8% | 35.0% | 36.9% | 48.3% | 35.6% | 27.6% |
| 12 months | 59.5% | 61.9% | 60.3% | 55.1% | 41.3% | 53.5% | 55.5% | 57.6% | 52.7% | 43.5% |
| 24 months | 79.2% | 77.4% | 79.5% | 71.5% | N/A | 69.7% | 71.8% | 66.2% | 72.0% | N/A |
| 36 months | 86.2% | 83.7% | 87.9% | N/A | N/A | 78.3% | 79.4% | 74.1% | N/A | N/A |
| Total | 269 | 252 | 239 | 256 | 155 | 314 | 301 | 290 | 239 | 232 |

- » Parole placements had lower rearrest rates than parole releases at the 3-month follow-up time period for FY 2017, FY 2019, and FY 2020. Parole releases had lower rearrest rates than parole placements at the 12- (with the exception of FY 2021), 24- (with the exception of FY 2020), and 36-month follow-up time periods for each FY.
- » 12-month rearrest rates for parole placements fluctuated between 55.1% and 61.9% between FY 2017 and FY 2020 before decreasing to 41.3% in FY 2021.
- » 12-month rearrest rates for parole releases fluctuated between 52.7% and 57.6% between FY 2017 and FY 2020 before decreasing to 43.5% in FY 2021.



Reconviction Rates for Parole Placements and Parole Releases in FY 2017-2020, Tracked through FY 2022

| Time to Reoffense | Parole Placements | | | | Parole Releases | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| 3 months | 13.0% | 19.8% | 15.9% | 10.9% | 18.8% | 19.9% | 25.2% | 13.4% |
| 6 months | 29.4% | 32.9% | 32.6% | 26.2% | 30.6% | 30.9% | 40.7% | 26.4% |
| 12 months | 48.7% | 50.8% | 53.1% | 43.0% | 49.4% | 48.5% | 51.7% | 41.4% |
| 24 months | 73.2% | 68.3% | 69.9% | N/A | 65.0% | 68.1% | 58.3% | N/A |
| 36 months | 82.2% | 75.8% | N/A | N/A | 73.6% | 75.7% | N/A | N/A |
| <i>Total</i> | 269 | 252 | 239 | 256 | 314 | 301 | 290 | 239 |

- » Parole placements had lower reconviction rates than parole releases at the 3- and 6-month follow-up time periods for each FY (with the exception of FY 2018). Parole releases had lower reconviction rates than parole placements at the 12- (with the exception of FY 2017), 24-, and 36-month follow-up time periods for each FY.
- » 12-month reconviction rates for parole placements fluctuated between 48.7% and 53.1% between FY 2017 and FY 2019 before decreasing to 43.0% in FY 2020.
- » 12-month reconviction rates for parole releases fluctuated between 48.5% and 51.7% between FY 2017 and FY 2019 before decreasing to 41.4% in FY 2020.

Reincarceration Rates for Parole Placements and Parole Releases in FY 2017-2020, Tracked through FY 2022*

| Time to Reoffense | Parole Placements | | | | Parole Releases | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| 3 months | 1.9% | 3.6% | 4.2% | 0.4% | 2.2% | 5.6% | 4.8% | 1.7% |
| 6 months | 7.8% | 10.7% | 10.5% | 6.6% | 7.3% | 9.6% | 9.0% | 5.4% |
| 12 months | 21.9% | 26.2% | 21.8% | 14.5% | 15.3% | 22.3% | 19.0% | 14.2% |
| 24 months | 43.9% | 46.4% | 38.9% | N/A | 34.7% | 39.2% | 33.8% | N/A |
| 36 months | 56.5% | 52.4% | N/A | N/A | 46.8% | 49.5% | N/A | N/A |
| <i>Total</i> | 269 | 252 | 239 | 256 | 314 | 301 | 290 | 239 |

* Due to variations in data received from the State Compensation Board regarding reincarcerations in jail, FY 2017 rates may not be comparable to previous reports or to other FYs.

- » Parole placements had lower reincarceration rates than parole releases at the 3-month follow-up time period for each FY. Parole releases had lower reincarceration rates than parole placements at the 6-, 12-, 24-, and 36-month follow-up time periods for each FY.
- » 12-month reincarceration rates for parole placements fluctuated between 21.8% and 26.2% between FY 2017 and FY 2019 before decreasing to 14.5% in FY 2020.
- » 12-month reincarceration rates for parole releases increased from 15.3% in FY 2017 to 22.3% in FY 2018 before decreasing to 14.2% in FY 2020.

See pages 81-82 for
recidivism rates for parole
placements and releases by
risk level.



12-Month Rearrest, Reconviction, and Reincarceration Rates by CSU for Parole Placements in FY 2020-2021, Tracked through FY 2022*

| CSU | 2021 | | 2020 | | |
|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|-----------------|
| | Total | Rearrest | Total | Reconviction | Reincarceration |
| 1 | 5 | 40.0% | 8 | 50.0% | 37.5% |
| 2 | 11 | 18.2% | 15 | 40.0% | 6.7% |
| 2A | 2 | 0.0% | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 3 | 2 | 100.0% | 5 | 60.0% | 0.0% |
| 4 | 18 | 61.1% | 26 | 46.2% | 19.2% |
| 5 | 9 | 33.3% | 4 | 50.0% | 0.0% |
| 6 | 4 | 25.0% | 5 | 40.0% | 0.0% |
| 7 | 13 | 30.8% | 19 | 36.8% | 21.1% |
| 8 | 9 | 11.1% | 18 | 27.8% | 11.1% |
| 9 | 3 | 33.3% | 2 | 50.0% | 50.0% |
| 10 | 2 | 50.0% | 7 | 57.1% | 0.0% |
| 11 | 6 | 50.0% | 7 | 57.1% | 28.6% |
| 12 | 11 | 63.6% | 14 | 21.4% | 7.1% |
| 13 | 9 | 77.8% | 24 | 50.0% | 12.5% |
| 14 | 6 | 16.7% | 15 | 46.7% | 20.0% |
| 15 | 5 | 20.0% | 10 | 60.0% | 20.0% |
| 16 | 10 | 20.0% | 11 | 45.5% | 9.1% |
| 17 | 1 | 0.0% | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 18 | 0 | N/A | 6 | 50.0% | 33.3% |
| 19 | 3 | 33.3% | 18 | 16.7% | 0.0% |
| 20L | 1 | 0.0% | 2 | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| 20W | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 21 | 1 | 100.0% | 1 | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| 22 | 3 | 66.7% | 7 | 28.6% | 14.3% |
| 23 | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 23A | 1 | 100.0% | 2 | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| 24 | 5 | 40.0% | 10 | 70.0% | 30.0% |
| 25 | 5 | 60.0% | 6 | 66.7% | 33.3% |
| 26 | 5 | 40.0% | 3 | 33.3% | 0.0% |
| 27 | 2 | 50.0% | 1 | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| 28 | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 29 | 1 | 0.0% | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 30 | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 31 | 2 | 100.0% | 10 | 60.0% | 0.0% |
| <i>Total</i> | <i>155</i> | <i>41.3%</i> | <i>256</i> | <i>43.0%</i> | <i>14.5%</i> |

* The CSU is identified by the CSU originally providing parole supervision upon release from direct care.

* Some groups were comprised of a small number of youth; therefore, rates can be strongly influenced by the reoffense of only a few youth.

* Effective in FY 2022, CSUs 23 and 23A are combined (CSU 23), and CSUs 20L and 20W are combined (CSU 20).



12-Month Rearrest, Reconviction, and Reincarceration Rates by CSU for Parole Releases in FY 2020-2021, Tracked through FY 2022*

| CSU | 2021 | | 2020 | | |
|--------------|-------|----------|-------|--------------|-----------------|
| | Total | Rearrest | Total | Reconviction | Reincarceration |
| 1 | 4 | 25.0% | 7 | 14.3% | 0.0% |
| 2 | 14 | 28.6% | 15 | 6.7% | 0.0% |
| 2A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 3 | 5 | 60.0% | 6 | 33.3% | 16.7% |
| 4 | 21 | 61.9% | 33 | 57.6% | 21.2% |
| 5 | 7 | 42.9% | 7 | 28.6% | 14.3% |
| 6 | 8 | 37.5% | 10 | 50.0% | 20.0% |
| 7 | 14 | 21.4% | 18 | 16.7% | 11.1% |
| 8 | 17 | 23.5% | 12 | 16.7% | 0.0% |
| 9 | 2 | 0.0% | 2 | 100.0% | 50.0% |
| 10 | 5 | 60.0% | 5 | 80.0% | 20.0% |
| 11 | 7 | 57.1% | 7 | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| 12 | 14 | 42.9% | 9 | 44.4% | 0.0% |
| 13 | 21 | 57.1% | 15 | 40.0% | 40.0% |
| 14 | 11 | 54.5% | 11 | 45.5% | 18.2% |
| 15 | 12 | 41.7% | 13 | 53.8% | 23.1% |
| 16 | 5 | 20.0% | 9 | 11.1% | 0.0% |
| 17 | 0 | N/A | 2 | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| 18 | 6 | 66.7% | 1 | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| 19 | 13 | 30.8% | 11 | 72.7% | 27.3% |
| 20L | 2 | 50.0% | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 20W | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 21 | 4 | 50.0% | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 22 | 6 | 16.7% | 9 | 22.2% | 0.0% |
| 23 | 1 | 0.0% | 1 | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| 23A | 4 | 75.0% | 5 | 80.0% | 0.0% |
| 24 | 8 | 50.0% | 8 | 37.5% | 25.0% |
| 25 | 8 | 87.5% | 1 | 100.0% | 0.0% |
| 26 | 3 | 33.3% | 4 | 25.0% | 0.0% |
| 27 | 2 | 0.0% | 3 | 33.3% | 0.0% |
| 28 | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 29 | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 30 | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | N/A |
| 31 | 8 | 37.5% | 15 | 53.3% | 20.0% |
| <i>Total</i> | 232 | 43.5% | 239 | 41.4% | 14.2% |

* The CSU is identified by the CSU supervising the case at the time of release from parole supervision.

* Some groups were comprised of a small number of youth; therefore, rates can be strongly influenced by the reoffense of only a few youth.

* Effective in FY 2022, CSUs 23 and 23A are combined (CSU 23), and CSUs 20L and 20W are combined (CSU 20).



Risk Levels

YASIs are completed by CSU and direct care staff to determine a youth's relative risk of reoffending. (See Appendix B). According to the assessment, a youth's recidivism risk is classified as low, moderate, or high. A youth's risk assessment score is one factor examined when probation and parole supervision levels are established, with high-risk youth typically receiving more intensive services.

Youth under probation or parole supervision or in direct care are reassessed at least every 180 days; therefore, the closest risk assessment completed within 180 days before or after the measurement date is used in this analysis. Youth with no risk assessment completed in that timeframe are excluded.

High-risk youth had the highest recidivism rates for all groups.

12-Month Rearrest Rates by Risk Levels in FY 2017-2021, Tracked through FY 2022*

| | Total Youth | | | | | Rearrest | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| Low Risk | | | | | | | | | | |
| Probation Placement | 650 | 568 | 501 | 315 | 253 | 18.0% | 13.6% | 13.4% | 11.7% | 4.7% |
| Probation Releases | 800 | 738 | 724 | 624 | 437 | 16.4% | 12.7% | 17.7% | 12.7% | 11.2% |
| Direct Care Releases | 8 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 0.0% | 28.6% | 0.0% | 12.5% | 50.0% |
| Parole Placements | 6 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 0.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 20.0% | 50.0% |
| Parole Releases | 10 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 30.0% | 16.7% | 10.0% | 0.0% | 16.7% |
| Moderate Risk | | | | | | | | | | |
| Probation Placement | 1,560 | 1,584 | 1,402 | 991 | 759 | 36.8% | 33.8% | 31.9% | 26.0% | 28.5% |
| Probation Releases | 1,509 | 1,397 | 1,403 | 1,193 | 955 | 35.5% | 34.2% | 31.3% | 28.0% | 24.4% |
| Direct Care Releases | 75 | 79 | 63 | 65 | 35 | 49.3% | 34.2% | 39.7% | 33.8% | 22.9% |
| Parole Placements | 60 | 55 | 40 | 52 | 29 | 55.0% | 36.4% | 42.5% | 36.5% | 24.1% |
| Parole Releases | 100 | 79 | 68 | 66 | 62 | 52.0% | 48.1% | 54.4% | 42.4% | 35.5% |
| High Risk | | | | | | | | | | |
| Probation Placement | 790 | 788 | 703 | 542 | 451 | 56.5% | 49.5% | 54.5% | 48.0% | 39.9% |
| Probation Releases | 816 | 754 | 726 | 601 | 468 | 51.7% | 49.9% | 47.0% | 39.9% | 40.8% |
| Direct Care Releases | 234 | 224 | 229 | 232 | 151 | 60.7% | 65.6% | 61.1% | 56.5% | 43.7% |
| Parole Placements | 198 | 191 | 194 | 198 | 124 | 63.6% | 70.7% | 64.4% | 60.6% | 45.2% |
| Parole Releases | 173 | 197 | 191 | 166 | 160 | 56.1% | 57.9% | 61.3% | 57.8% | 47.5% |

* Some groups were comprised of a small number of youth; therefore, rates can be strongly influenced by the reoffense of only a few youth.



12-Month Reconviction Rates by Risk Levels in FY 2017-2020, Tracked through FY 2022*

| | Total Youth | | | | Reconviction | | | |
|----------------------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| Low Risk | | | | | | | | |
| Probation Placement | 650 | 568 | 501 | 315 | 10.2% | 7.0% | 6.0% | 4.8% |
| Probation Releases | 800 | 738 | 724 | 624 | 10.1% | 7.6% | 11.7% | 7.1% |
| Direct Care Releases | 8 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 0.0% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Parole Placements | 6 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Parole Releases | 10 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 30.0% | 16.7% | 10.0% | 0.0% |
| Moderate Risk | | | | | | | | |
| Probation Placement | 1,560 | 1,584 | 1,402 | 991 | 22.8% | 21.1% | 18.5% | 12.9% |
| Probation Releases | 1,509 | 1,397 | 1,403 | 1,193 | 27.5% | 24.9% | 22.2% | 17.1% |
| Direct Care Releases | 75 | 79 | 63 | 65 | 40.0% | 29.1% | 30.2% | 21.5% |
| Parole Placements | 60 | 55 | 40 | 52 | 45.0% | 30.9% | 32.5% | 21.2% |
| Parole Releases | 100 | 79 | 68 | 66 | 49.0% | 44.3% | 47.1% | 33.3% |
| High Risk | | | | | | | | |
| Probation Placement | 790 | 788 | 703 | 542 | 40.8% | 35.2% | 37.8% | 30.8% |
| Probation Releases | 816 | 754 | 726 | 601 | 41.1% | 41.4% | 35.3% | 27.6% |
| Direct Care Releases | 234 | 224 | 229 | 232 | 50.9% | 54.0% | 53.7% | 44.4% |
| Parole Placements | 198 | 191 | 194 | 198 | 52.5% | 58.1% | 57.7% | 49.5% |
| Parole Releases | 173 | 197 | 191 | 166 | 51.4% | 48.7% | 55.0% | 45.2% |

* Some groups were comprised of a small number of youth; therefore, rates can be strongly influenced by the reoffense of only a few youth.

12-Month Reincarceration Rates by Risk Levels in FY 2017-2020, Tracked through FY 2022*

| | Total Youth | | | | Reincarceration | | | |
|----------------------|-------------|------|------|------|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| Low Risk | | | | | | | | |
| Direct Care Releases | 8 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Parole Placements | 6 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Parole Releases | 10 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 0.0% | 0.0% | 10.0% | 0.0% |
| Moderate Risk | | | | | | | | |
| Direct Care Releases | 75 | 79 | 63 | 65 | 16.0% | 12.7% | 7.9% | 6.2% |
| Parole Placements | 60 | 55 | 40 | 52 | 18.3% | 12.7% | 10.0% | 5.8% |
| Parole Releases | 100 | 79 | 68 | 66 | 6.0% | 25.3% | 16.2% | 7.6% |
| High Risk | | | | | | | | |
| Direct Care Releases | 234 | 224 | 229 | 232 | 23.1% | 27.7% | 21.8% | 15.1% |
| Parole Placements | 198 | 191 | 194 | 198 | 24.2% | 30.9% | 24.7% | 17.2% |
| Parole Releases | 173 | 197 | 191 | 166 | 21.4% | 20.3% | 19.9% | 17.5% |

* Some groups were comprised of a small number of youth; therefore, rates can be strongly influenced by the reoffense of only a few youth.

* Due to variations in data received from the State Compensation Board regarding reincarcerations in jail, FY 2017 rates may not be comparable to previous reports or to other FYs.



VJCCCA

Rearrest Rates for Youth Placed in VJCCCA Programs and Youth Released from VJCCCA Programs in FY 2017-2021, Tracked through FY 2022*

| Time to Rearrest | Youth Placed in VJCCCA Programs | | | | | Youth Released from VJCCCA Programs | | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| 3 months | 14.1% | 13.1% | 11.3% | 11.3% | 10.8% | 12.1% | 11.4% | 9.9% | 8.6% | 8.6% |
| 6 months | 23.1% | 21.6% | 19.0% | 17.6% | 17.3% | 19.9% | 18.2% | 17.2% | 14.2% | 15.3% |
| 12 months | 34.4% | 32.6% | 29.8% | 25.5% | 27.2% | 32.0% | 29.8% | 28.2% | 21.3% | 24.8% |
| <i>Total</i> | 6,989 | 6,728 | 6,649 | 5,641 | 3,554 | 7,128 | 6,901 | 6,605 | 5,989 | 3,727 |

* VJCCCA groups use the first placement date or last release date in the FY, regardless of whether multiple programs are continuous or overlap FYs.

* The VJCCCA groups may overlap with probation and diversion plan groups.

- » 12-month rearrest rates for youth placed in VJCCCA programs generally decreased over five years, from 34.4% in FY 2017 to 27.2% in FY 2021.
- » 12-month rearrest rates for youth released from VJCCCA programs generally decreased over five years, from 32.0% in FY 2017 to 24.8% in FY 2021.

Post-D Detention with Programs

12-Month Recidivism Rates for Releases from Post-D Detention with Programs in FY 2017-2021, Tracked through FY 2022*

| | Post-D Detention with Programs Releases | | | | |
|-----------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| Rearrest | 56.8% | 54.4% | 59.1% | 59.5% | 46.7% |
| Reconviction | 46.2% | 40.5% | 45.2% | 41.7% | N/A |
| Reincarceration | 20.3% | 17.3% | 26.9% | 12.3% | N/A |
| <i>Total</i> | 266 | 237 | 186 | 163 | 120 |

* Releases from post-D detention with programs are youth released from a JDC who were in a post-D detention with programs during the detainment.

* Due to variations in data received from the State Compensation Board regarding reincarcerations in jail, FY 2017 rates may not be comparable to previous reports or to other FYs.

- » 12-month rearrest rates for releases from post-D detention with programs fluctuated between 54.4% and 59.5% between FY 2017 and FY 2020 before decreasing to 46.7% in FY 2021.
- » 12-month reconviction rates for releases from post-D detention with programs fluctuated between 40.5% and 46.2% between FY 2017 and FY 2020.
- » 12-month reincarceration rates for releases from post-D detention with programs fluctuated between 17.3% and 26.9% between FY 2017 and FY 2019 before decreasing to 12.3% in FY 2020.



12-Month Recidivism Rates for Releases from Post-D Detention with Programs in FY 2017-2021 by Risk Levels, Tracked through FY 2022*

| | Post-D Detention with Programs Releases | | | | |
|----------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| Low Risk | | | | | |
| Rearrest | 0.0% | 25.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Reconviction | 0.0% | 12.5% | 25.0% | 0.0% | N/A |
| Reincarceration | 0.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | N/A |
| <i>Total</i> | 7 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Moderate Risk | | | | | |
| Rearrest | 52.7% | 44.2% | 52.1% | 50.8% | 35.0% |
| Reconviction | 36.6% | 32.6% | 38.4% | 38.1% | N/A |
| Reincarceration | 12.5% | 13.7% | 23.3% | 15.9% | N/A |
| <i>Total</i> | 112 | 95 | 73 | 63 | 40 |
| High Risk | | | | | |
| Rearrest | 63.1% | 65.1% | 67.0% | 66.7% | 55.4% |
| Reconviction | 55.7% | 48.8% | 51.9% | 44.8% | N/A |
| Reincarceration | 30.3% | 21.7% | 30.2% | 10.4% | N/A |
| <i>Total</i> | 122 | 129 | 106 | 96 | 74 |

* Releases from post-D detention with programs are youth released from a JDC who were in a post-D detention with programs during the detainment.

* Some groups were comprised of a small number of youth; therefore, rates can be strongly influenced by the reoffense of only a few youth.


* Due to variations in data received from the State Compensation Board regarding reincarcerations in jail, FY 2017 rates may not be comparable to previous reports or to other FYs.



6 Expenditures and Staffing

Expenditures

DJJ Operating Expenditures, FY 2022*



* JCC expenditures include the CAP Unit; direct care admission and evaluations in the JDCs; and facilities that no longer house youth, including the operation of VPSTC.

- » DJJ expended a total of \$212,029,212.
- » 98.5% (\$208,935,680) was General Fund expenditures.
- » Transfer payments to localities for VJCCCA, JDCs, and locally operated CSUs accounted for 24.4% (\$51,787,534) of all expenditures.



JCC Expenditures, FY 2022*

| Bon Air | |
|---|---------------------|
| Division of Residential Services | |
| Administration | \$7,357,695 |
| Classification | \$631,281 |
| Food Services | \$1,080,365 |
| Maintenance | \$3,177,835 |
| Medical Services | \$4,423,227 |
| Treatment Services | \$4,000,783 |
| Youth Supervision | \$13,671,403 |
| <i>Total for Division of Residential Services</i> | <i>\$34,342,590</i> |
| Division of Education | |
| Career & Technical Education | \$1,063,247 |
| Instructional Leadership & Support Services | \$1,354,551 |
| Youth Instructional Services | \$5,949,386 |
| <i>Total for Division of Education</i> | <i>\$8,367,184</i> |
| Total JCC Expenditures | \$42,709,774 |

* All JCC-related expenses are included. Expenditures for CPPs, detention reentry, contracted alternatives, and facilities that do not house youth or provide office space for direct care staff, including VPSTC, are excluded.

Direct Care Per Capita Cost, FY 2022*

| | Expenditures | ADP | Per Capita |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|------------|-------------------|
| All Direct Care | \$45,974,188 | 195 | \$235,789 |
| JCC: Division of Residential Services | \$34,342,590 | 106 | \$323,620 |
| JCC: Division of Education | \$8,367,184 | | \$78,846 |
| CPPs | \$2,674,518 | 85 | \$31,450 |
| Contracted Alternatives | \$565,496 | 4 | \$160,652 |
| Detention Reentry | \$24,400 | 0 | \$81,333 |

* All direct care-related expenses are included. Expenditures for facilities that do not house youth or provide office space for direct care staff (e.g., VPSTC) are excluded.

* Expenditures for operating the CAP Unit are allocated across placement types.

* Youth receiving admission and evaluation services in JDCs are included in CPPs.

* Expenditures for individual JDC beds for direct care youth are included in Contracted Alternatives.

* Decimal values of ADPs are used in per capita calculations; therefore, dividing the expenditures by the rounded ADP presented in the table will not equal the exact per capita cost.



Staffing

Direct Care Staffing (Filled Positions) as of June 30, 2022*

| Job Title | Total |
|--|------------|
| Division of Residential Services | |
| Superintendent | 1 |
| Assistant Superintendent | 2 |
| Administrative Program Manager | 1 |
| BSU Staff | 21 |
| Community Coordinator | 11 |
| Food Service Staff | 10 |
| Health Services Staff | 32 |
| Human Resources/Finance Field Offices | 7 |
| Human Rights Coordinators | 3 |
| Maintenance Staff | 17 |
| Operations Manager | 2 |
| Recreation Specialist | 4 |
| Rehab Counselor | 19 |
| Rehab Counselor Supervisor | 1 |
| Residential Community Manager | 4 |
| RS | 29 |
| RS I | 72 |
| RS II | 42 |
| Security Coordinator | 9 |
| Security Manager | 5 |
| Security Specialist | 2 |
| Administrative/Other Staff | 21 |
| <i>Total Filled Residential Services Positions</i> | <i>315</i> |
| Division of Education | |
| Principal | 1 |
| Assistant Principal | 2 |
| Program Administrator | 1 |
| Program Specialist | 1 |
| School Counselor | 2 |
| Instructor/Teacher | 34 |
| Instructional Assistant | 2 |
| Administrative/Other Staff | 18 |
| <i>Total Filled Education Positions</i> | <i>61</i> |
| Total Filled Direct Care Positions | 376 |

* Data are not comparable to previous reports due to a change in the data source.

* Central Office staff (including RS trainees) and contracted personnel are not included.

* "Administrative/Other Staff" under the Division of Residential Services includes office services staff and the following titles: alternative placement PREA manager, facility training registrar and monitor, institutional safety officer, juvenile justice program analyst, PREA analyst, program support technician, residential practice improvement coach, and volunteer services coordinator.

* "Administrative/Other Staff" under the Division of Education includes office services staff and the following titles: assessment specialist, behavioral analysis administrator, behavior specialist, behavior technician, career and academic coordinator, compliance specialist, data specialist, education transition specialist, instructional technology resource teacher, lead transition specialist, library media specialist, program support technician, reading specialist, and school psychologist.

» 30.3% of filled direct care positions were RSs I or II.

» 16.2% of filled direct care positions were part of the Division of Education.



CSU Staffing (Filled Positions) as of June 30, 2022*

| CSU | Director/Deputy Director | Supervisor/Manager | PO/Senior PO | Administrative/Other Staff | Total |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 4 | 24 |
| 2 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 5 | 23 |
| 2A | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 10 |
| 3 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 17 |
| 4 | 2 | 6 | 27 | 10 | 45 |
| 5 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 4 | 21 |
| 6 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 16 |
| 7 | 2 | 5 | 18 | 6 | 31 |
| 8 | 1 | 4 | 17 | 5 | 27 |
| 9 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 7 | 25 |
| 10 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 6 | 21 |
| 11 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 15 |
| 12 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 6 | 25 |
| 13 | 2 | 5 | 19 | 6 | 32 |
| 14 | 1 | 6 | 22 | 6 | 35 |
| 15 | 1 | 6 | 14 | 6 | 27 |
| 16 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 6 | 22 |
| 18 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 18 |
| 20 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 17 |
| 21 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 17 |
| 22 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 19 |
| 23 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 5 | 21 |
| 24 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 5 | 25 |
| 25 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 6 | 20 |
| 26 | 1 | 4 | 15 | 5 | 25 |
| 27 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 6 | 21 |
| 28 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 14 |
| 29 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 4 | 17 |
| 30 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 16 |
| 31 | 1 | 6 | 24 | 6 | 37 |
| <i>Total Filled Positions</i> | <i>34</i> | <i>101</i> | <i>389</i> | <i>159</i> | <i>683</i> |

* Data are not comparable to previous reports due to a change in the data source.

* CSUs 17 and 19 are not included because they are locally funded.

* Central Office staff and locally funded CSU positions are not included.

* "PO/Senior PO" includes intake, probation, and parole staff.

* "Administrative/Other Staff" includes office services staff and the following titles: fiscal technician, operations program assistant, procurement technician, program support technician, and psychologist.

» 57.0% of filled positions in the CSUs were POs and Senior POs.



7 Appendices

The appendices include references, forms, and other resources as additional information on DJJ operations and the data presented in this report. For further clarifications about data, refer to page 14.

Appendix A: CSUs and FIPS

Appendix B: YASI

Appendix C: DAI

Appendix D: LOS Guidelines

Appendix E: "Other" Categories

Appendix F: Probation and Parole Statuses



Appendix A: CSUs and FIPS (Ordered by CSU)*

| CSU | Name | FIPS | CSU | Name | FIPS | CSU | Name | FIPS |
|-----|--------------------|------|-----|--------------------|------|-----|--------------------|------|
| 1 | Chesapeake | 550 | 13 | Richmond | 760 | 25 | Augusta Co. | 015 |
| 2 | Virginia Beach | 810 | 14 | Henrico Co. | 087 | 25 | Bath Co. | 017 |
| 2A | Accomack Co. | 001 | 15 | Caroline Co. | 033 | 25 | Botetourt Co. | 023 |
| 2A | Northampton Co. | 131 | 15 | Essex Co. | 057 | 25 | Craig Co. | 045 |
| 3 | Portsmouth | 740 | 15 | Hanover Co. | 085 | 25 | Highland Co. | 091 |
| 4 | Norfolk | 710 | 15 | King George Co. | 099 | 25 | Rockbridge Co. | 163 |
| 5 | Isle of Wight Co. | 093 | 15 | Lancaster Co. | 103 | 25 | Buena Vista | 530 |
| 5 | Southampton Co. | 175 | 15 | Northumberland Co. | 133 | 25 | Covington | 580 |
| 5 | Franklin | 620 | 15 | Richmond Co. | 159 | 25 | Lexington | 678 |
| 5 | Suffolk | 800 | 15 | Spotsylvania Co. | 177 | 25 | Staunton | 790 |
| 6 | Brunswick Co. | 025 | 15 | Stafford Co. | 179 | 25 | Waynesboro | 820 |
| 6 | Greensville Co. | 081 | 15 | Westmoreland Co. | 193 | 26 | Clarke Co. | 043 |
| 6 | Prince George Co. | 149 | 15 | Fredericksburg | 630 | 26 | Frederick Co. | 069 |
| 6 | Surry Co. | 181 | 16 | Albemarle Co. | 003 | 26 | Page Co. | 139 |
| 6 | Sussex Co. | 183 | 16 | Culpeper Co. | 047 | 26 | Rockingham Co. | 165 |
| 6 | Emporia | 595 | 16 | Fluvanna Co. | 065 | 26 | Shenandoah Co. | 171 |
| 6 | Hopewell | 670 | 16 | Goochland Co. | 075 | 26 | Warren Co. | 187 |
| 7 | Newport News | 700 | 16 | Greene Co. | 079 | 26 | Harrisonburg | 660 |
| 8 | Hampton | 650 | 16 | Louisa Co. | 109 | 26 | Winchester | 840 |
| 9 | Charles City Co. | 036 | 16 | Madison Co. | 113 | 27 | Bland Co. | 021 |
| 9 | Gloucester Co. | 073 | 16 | Orange Co. | 137 | 27 | Carroll Co. | 035 |
| 9 | James City Co. | 095 | 16 | Charlottesville | 540 | 27 | Floyd Co. | 063 |
| 9 | King and Queen Co. | 097 | 17 | Arlington Co. | 013 | 27 | Giles Co. | 071 |
| 9 | King William Co. | 101 | 17 | Falls Church | 610 | 27 | Grayson Co. | 077 |
| 9 | Mathews Co. | 115 | 18 | Alexandria | 510 | 27 | Montgomery Co. | 121 |
| 9 | Middlesex Co. | 119 | 19 | Fairfax Co. | 059 | 27 | Pulaski Co. | 155 |
| 9 | New Kent Co. | 127 | 19 | Fairfax | 600 | 27 | Wythe Co. | 197 |
| 9 | York Co. | 199 | 20 | Fauquier Co. | 061 | 27 | Galax | 640 |
| 9 | Poquoson | 735 | 20 | Loudoun Co. | 107 | 27 | Radford | 750 |
| 9 | Williamsburg | 830 | 20 | Rappahannock Co. | 157 | 28 | Smyth Co. | 173 |
| 10 | Appomattox Co. | 011 | 21 | Henry Co. | 089 | 28 | Washington Co. | 191 |
| 10 | Buckingham Co. | 029 | 21 | Patrick Co. | 141 | 28 | Bristol | 520 |
| 10 | Charlotte Co. | 037 | 21 | Martinsville | 690 | 29 | Buchanan Co. | 027 |
| 10 | Cumberland Co. | 049 | 22 | Franklin Co. | 067 | 29 | Dickenson Co. | 051 |
| 10 | Halifax Co. | 083 | 22 | Pittsylvania Co. | 143 | 29 | Russell Co. | 167 |
| 10 | Lunenburg Co. | 111 | 22 | Danville | 590 | 29 | Tazewell Co. | 185 |
| 10 | Mecklenburg Co. | 117 | 23 | Roanoke Co. | 161 | 30 | Lee Co. | 105 |
| 10 | Prince Edward Co. | 147 | 23 | Roanoke | 770 | 30 | Scott Co. | 169 |
| 11 | Amelia Co. | 007 | 23 | Salem | 775 | 30 | Wise Co. | 195 |
| 11 | Dinwiddie Co. | 053 | 24 | Amherst Co. | 009 | 30 | Norton | 720 |
| 11 | Nottoway Co. | 135 | 24 | Bedford Co. | 019 | 31 | Prince William Co. | 153 |
| 11 | Powhatan Co. | 145 | 24 | Campbell Co. | 031 | 31 | Manassas | 683 |
| 11 | Petersburg | 730 | 24 | Nelson Co. | 125 | 31 | Manassas Park | 685 |
| 12 | Chesterfield Co. | 041 | 24 | Lynchburg | 680 | | | |
| 12 | Colonial Heights | 570 | 25 | Alleghany Co. | 005 | | | |

* Fairfax City (FIPS 600) records information as part of Fairfax County (FIPS 059).




Appendix A, continued: CSUs and FIPS (Ordered by FIPS)*

| FIPS | Name | CSU | FIPS | Name | CSU | FIPS | Name | CSU |
|------|------------------|-----|------|--------------------|-----|------|------------------|-----|
| 001 | Accomack Co. | 2A | 093 | Isle of Wight Co. | 5 | 191 | Washington Co. | 28 |
| 003 | Albemarle Co. | 16 | 095 | James City Co. | 9 | 193 | Westmoreland Co. | 15 |
| 005 | Alleghany Co. | 25 | 097 | King and Queen Co. | 9 | 195 | Wise Co. | 30 |
| 007 | Amelia Co. | 11 | 099 | King George Co. | 15 | 197 | Wythe Co. | 27 |
| 009 | Amherst Co. | 24 | 101 | King William Co. | 9 | 199 | York Co. | 9 |
| 011 | Appomattox Co. | 10 | 103 | Lancaster Co. | 15 | 510 | Alexandria | 18 |
| 013 | Arlington Co. | 17 | 105 | Lee Co. | 30 | 520 | Bristol | 28 |
| 015 | Augusta Co. | 25 | 107 | Loudoun Co. | 20 | 530 | Buena Vista | 25 |
| 017 | Bath Co. | 25 | 109 | Louisa Co. | 16 | 540 | Charlottesville | 16 |
| 019 | Bedford Co. | 24 | 111 | Lunenburg Co. | 10 | 550 | Chesapeake | 1 |
| 021 | Bland Co. | 27 | 113 | Madison Co. | 16 | 570 | Colonial Heights | 12 |
| 023 | Botetourt Co. | 25 | 115 | Mathews Co. | 9 | 580 | Covington | 25 |
| 025 | Brunswick Co. | 6 | 117 | Mecklenburg Co. | 10 | 590 | Danville | 22 |
| 027 | Buchanan Co. | 29 | 119 | Middlesex Co. | 9 | 595 | Emporia | 6 |
| 029 | Buckingham Co. | 10 | 121 | Montgomery Co. | 27 | 600 | Fairfax | 19 |
| 031 | Campbell Co. | 24 | 125 | Nelson Co. | 24 | 610 | Falls Church | 17 |
| 033 | Caroline Co. | 15 | 127 | New Kent Co. | 9 | 620 | Franklin | 5 |
| 035 | Carroll Co. | 27 | 131 | Northampton Co. | 2A | 630 | Fredericksburg | 15 |
| 036 | Charles City Co. | 9 | 133 | Northumberland Co. | 15 | 640 | Galax | 27 |
| 037 | Charlotte Co. | 10 | 135 | Nottoway Co. | 11 | 650 | Hampton | 8 |
| 041 | Chesterfield Co. | 12 | 137 | Orange Co. | 16 | 660 | Harrisonburg | 26 |
| 043 | Clarke Co. | 26 | 139 | Page Co. | 26 | 670 | Hopewell | 6 |
| 045 | Craig Co. | 25 | 141 | Patrick Co. | 21 | 678 | Lexington | 25 |
| 047 | Culpeper Co. | 16 | 143 | Pittsylvania Co. | 22 | 680 | Lynchburg | 24 |
| 049 | Cumberland Co. | 10 | 145 | Powhatan Co. | 11 | 683 | Manassas | 31 |
| 051 | Dickenson Co. | 29 | 147 | Prince Edward Co. | 10 | 685 | Manassas Park | 31 |
| 053 | Dinwiddie Co. | 11 | 149 | Prince George Co. | 6 | 690 | Martinsville | 21 |
| 057 | Essex Co. | 15 | 153 | Prince William Co. | 31 | 700 | Newport News | 7 |
| 059 | Fairfax Co. | 19 | 155 | Pulaski Co. | 27 | 710 | Norfolk | 4 |
| 061 | Fauquier Co. | 20 | 157 | Rappahannock Co. | 20 | 720 | Norton | 30 |
| 063 | Floyd Co. | 27 | 159 | Richmond Co. | 15 | 730 | Petersburg | 11 |
| 065 | Fluvanna Co. | 16 | 161 | Roanoke Co. | 23 | 735 | Poquoson | 9 |
| 067 | Franklin Co. | 22 | 163 | Rockbridge Co. | 25 | 740 | Portsmouth | 3 |
| 069 | Frederick Co. | 26 | 165 | Rockingham Co. | 26 | 750 | Radford | 27 |
| 071 | Giles Co. | 27 | 167 | Russell Co. | 29 | 760 | Richmond | 13 |
| 073 | Gloucester Co. | 9 | 169 | Scott Co. | 30 | 770 | Roanoke | 23 |
| 075 | Goochland Co. | 16 | 171 | Shenandoah Co. | 26 | 775 | Salem | 23 |
| 077 | Grayson Co. | 27 | 173 | Smyth Co. | 28 | 790 | Staunton | 25 |
| 079 | Greene Co. | 16 | 175 | Southampton Co. | 5 | 800 | Suffolk | 5 |
| 081 | Greensville Co. | 6 | 177 | Spotsylvania Co. | 15 | 810 | Virginia Beach | 2 |
| 083 | Halifax Co. | 10 | 179 | Stafford Co. | 15 | 820 | Waynesboro | 25 |
| 085 | Hanover Co. | 15 | 181 | Surry Co. | 6 | 830 | Williamsburg | 9 |
| 087 | Henrico Co. | 14 | 183 | Sussex Co. | 6 | 840 | Winchester | 26 |
| 089 | Henry Co. | 21 | 185 | Tazewell Co. | 29 | | | |
| 091 | Highland Co. | 25 | 187 | Warren Co. | 26 | | | |

* Fairfax City (FIPS 600) records information as part of Fairfax County (FIPS 059).



Appendix B: 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 B, 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 C: 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/dispositions 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 D: LOS Guidelines for Indeterminately Committed Juveniles, Effective October 15, 2015

Using guidelines issued by the Board of Juvenile Justice, effective October 15, 2015, DJJ assigns the LOS for indeterminately committed youth based on the committing MSO and the risk to reoffend as indicated on the most recently administered YASI at the time of admission to direct care. LOS categories are defined by an anticipated minimum and maximum number of months that the youth will remain with DJJ. The actual LOS is determined through case-specific reviews depending on the youth's behavior, facility adjustment, and progress in treatment.

Committing MSO

- » Tier I - misdemeanor against persons, any other misdemeanor, or violation of parole
- » Tier II - weapons felony, narcotics distribution felony, or other felony that is not punishable for 20 or more years of confinement if the offense were committed by an adult
- » Tier III - felony against persons that is not punishable for 20 or more years of confinement if the offense were committed by an adult
- » Tier IV - felony offense punishable for 20 or more years of confinement if the offense were committed by an adult

Risk Level Categories

- » A - Overall Risk Score of none/low or moderate
- » B - Overall Risk Score of high and Dynamic Protective Score of moderate-high to very high
- » C - Overall Risk Score of high, Dynamic Protective Score of none to moderate, and Dynamic Risk Score of less than very high
- » D - Overall Risk Score of high, Dynamic Protective Score of none to moderate, and Dynamic Risk Score of very high

LOS Ranges

| Committing MSO** | | Risk Level | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | A | B | C | D |
| Tier I | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misdemeanor Offenses • Violations of Parole | 2-4 months* | 3-6 months* | 5-8 months* | 6-9 months* |
| Tier II | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-person Felony Offenses | 3-6 months* | 5-8 months* | 6-9 months* | 7-10 months* |
| Tier III | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Person Felony Offenses | 5-8 months* | 6-9 months* | 7-10 months* | 9-12 months* |
| Tier IV | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class 1 and 2 Felony Offenses | 6-9 months* | 7-10 months* | 9-12 months* | 9-15 months* |
| Tier V | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treatment Override | Juveniles who have been assessed as needing inpatient sex offender treatment are managed as an exception to the grid.* | | | |

* Statutory Release: Juveniles may be held in direct care due to negative behavior, poor adjustment, or lack of progress in treatment for any period of time until their statutory release date.

* Treatment Override: These cases will not be assigned a projected LOS. The juveniles who receive a treatment override will be eligible for consideration for release upon completion of the designated treatment program.

** Violations of Probation: Violations of probation shall be categorized by the underlying MSO.



Appendix E: “Other” Categories

The following were combined into “Other” groups:

“Delinquent – Other” Offense Category

- » Accomplice
- » Agriculture, Horticulture, & Food
- » Aircraft/Aviation
- » Animals
- » Arrests
- » Auto Dealers
- » Boating
- » Bribery
- » Conservation
- » Dangerous Conduct
- » Family Offense
- » Fare, Fail to Pay, etc.
- » Fire Protection/Safety
- » Gambling
- » Game, Fish, Wildlife
- » Interstate Compact
- » Judicial Reviews
- » J&DR Court – Other
- » Labor
- » Mental Health
- » Military & Emergency
- » Miscellaneous Crime
- » Ordinance, City or County
- » Peace, Conservator of the
- » Pornography Registry, Child
- » Prisoners
- » Prisoners – Juvenile Facility
- » Professions and Occupations
- » Racketeer/Corrupt Organization
- » Riot and Unlawful Assembly
- » School – Student’s Behavior
- » School Attendance
- » Solicitation
- » Tax Laws
- » Terrorism
- » Traffic – Perjury
- » Treason
- » Violent Activities
- » Waters, Ports, & Harbors

“Status/Other – Other” Offense Category

- » Curfew Violation Between 10 PM and 6 AM
- » Motion to Show Cause – Parents Fail to Obey CHINS/Delinquent Order
- » Purchase, Attempted Purchase or Possession of Tobacco by Minor

“Other” Juvenile Intake Decisions

- » Accepted via ICJ
- » Adult Criminal
- » Consent Agreement Signed
- » Pending
- » Returned to Out-of-State
- » Shelter Care Only

“Other” Detention Dispositional Statuses

- » Appealed
- » Awaiting Placement
- » Committed to State
- » Committed to State – Pending Charges
- » Removed from Post-D Pending Court
- » Restoration of Mental Competency
- » Transferred to Circuit Court



Appendix F: Probation and Parole Statuses

A continuous probation case is defined as a primary status followed by any combination of primary or linking statuses with no more than five days between statuses. A continuous parole case is defined as a primary status followed by any combination of primary or linking statuses with no more than 30 days between statuses. The supervision levels require a different number of contacts per month, with Level 4 requiring the most contacts. ADP for probation and parole is calculated using only the primary statuses. LOS for probation and parole is calculated using the entire continuous placement. Reports prior to FY 2021 stated only primary statuses were used to calculate LOS.

Primary Probation Statuses

- » Post-D Residential (Judicially Ordered) with Probation
- » Probation – Contacts Less than 1 Per Month
- » Probation – Level 1
- » Probation – Level 2
- » Probation – Level 3
- » Probation – Level 4
- » Probation – Residential Treatment Program (Not Judicially Ordered)

Linking Probation Statuses

- » Absconder/Whereabouts Unknown (1 Contact/Month, 1 Contact/Week, or 3 Contacts/Week)
- » Inactive Supervision According to Supervision Plan
- » Inactive Supervision by Another State
- » Inactive Supervision – Courtesy Supervision in Another CSU
- » ICJ Pending
- » Judicially Ordered Unsupervised Probation
- » Pending CSU Supervision Transfer (Receiving CSU Only)
- » Post-D Detention Placement (<30 Days) with Probation
- » Post-D Detention with Programs (>30 Days) with Probation

Primary Parole Statuses

- » Parole – Level 1
- » Parole – Level 2
- » Parole – Level 3
- » Parole – Level 4
- » Parole – Residential Placement
- » Post-Commitment Halfway House

Linking Parole Statuses

- » Absconder/Whereabouts Unknown (1 Contact/Month, 1 Contact/Week, or 3 Contacts/Week)
- » Inactive Supervision According to Supervision Plan
- » Inactive Supervision by Another State
- » Inactive Supervision – Courtesy Supervision in Another CSU
- » ICJ Pending
- » Pending CSU Supervision Transfer (Receiving CSU Only)





