

Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice

DATA RESOURCE GUIDE

FISCAL YEAR 2025



Data Resource Guide

Fiscal Year 2025

Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice
Amy Floriano, Director
December 2025



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 412 of the 2025 Appropriations Act.



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
	Court Dispositions in Secure Facilities	13
	DJJ System Flow Chart	14
	Data in the DRG	15
2	<i>Programs and Services</i>	17
	Community Programs	17
	VJCCA	34
	JDCs	37
	Direct Care	44
3	<i>Special Topics</i>	59
	DRT Evaluation	59
	FOCUS Model Evaluation	61
4	<i>Trends and Forecast</i>	65
	10-Year Trends.	65
	Forecast	70
5	<i>Recidivism</i>	73
	Methodology	73
	12-Month Recidivism Rate Overview.	74
	Diversion Plans	76
	Probation	76
	Direct Care	78
	Parole	79
	Risk Levels	83
	VJCCA	85
	Post-D Detention with Programs	85
6	<i>Expenditures and Staffing</i>	87
	Expenditures	87
	Staffing.	89
7	<i>Appendices</i>	91
	Appendix A: CSUs and FIPS	92
	Appendix B: “Other” Categories	94
	Appendix C: DAI	95
	Appendix D: LOS Guidelines for Indeterminately Committed Juveniles	96
	Appendix E: YASI	98
	Appendix F: Probation and Parole Statuses	100





1 Introduction and Overview

The Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) provides services to youth and families. In FY 2025, DJJ operated 30 court service units (CSUs) (see Appendix A) and Bon Air Juvenile Correctional Center (JCC). As of June 30, 2025, DJJ audits and certifies 32 CSUs, including two locally operated units; 24 juvenile detention centers (JDCs); the JCC; and 16 group homes, shelter care facilities, transitional living programs, and independent living programs. As of June 30, 2025, DJJ also oversees six community placement programs (CPPs), seven individual bed placements (IBPs), and five detention reentry 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 and committed 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.

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 through structured community supervision or secure confinement of youth, (ii) a 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 use and aggression management treatment, education, career readiness). 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-Need-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 reduction in 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-based 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 uses a continuum of services and alternative placements that (i) offer programs and treatments to divert youth from further involvement in the justice system, (ii) provide appropriate dispositional options for youth under supervision, and (iii) enable committed youth to return successfully to the community. DJJ uses a regional service coordination model to help assess existing programming, develop new service capacity, and select and subcontract with direct service providers (DSPs). Additionally, the CPPs, IBPs, 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 the public and private sectors as well as families are key to its work. For example, local governments and multijurisdictional 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 entities. DJJ also secures services from private providers to assist in treating youth and strengthening community ties. These partnerships enable DJJ to intervene effectively and efficiently in addressing the needs of youth, their families, and communities.

Guiding Values

Values are part of every culture. DJJ has identified four guiding values to support the growth and development of the youth in its care: safety, responsibility, communication, and respect.

- » **Safety** involves maintaining security and keeping everyone free from harm. When everyone feels safe, they can focus on other needs, such as learning new skills.
- » **Responsibility** involves everyone's obligation to care for and help themselves and others. It means making decisions and being accountable for those decisions.
- » **Communication** helps everyone obtain needs and wants as well as accomplish goals faster, more often, and in the ways they want. Effective communication can also promote safety and is important in all areas of life.
- » **Respect** involves honoring the differences, abilities, preferences, and experiences of others. It also means taking care of oneself, other people, others' belongings, and shared environments.

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 B for a listing of "Other" categories.)

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACA:	American Correctional Association
ADHD:	Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder
ADP:	Average Daily Population
ART®:	Aggression Replacement Training
AWOL:	Absent Without Leave
BADGE:	Balanced Approach Data Gathering Environment
BAU:	Behavioral Assessment Unit
BSU:	Behavioral Services Unit
CANS:	Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths
CAP:	Central Admission and Placement
CBT:	Cognitive Behavioral Therapy
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
CSB:	Community Services Board
CSU:	Court Service Unit
CTE:	Career and Technical Education
CTM:	Community Treatment Model



CTST: Classification and Treatment Services Team	HVACR: Heating, Ventilation, Air Conditioning, and Refrigeration
CVIU: Cover Virginia Incarcerated Unit	IBP: Individual Bed Placement
CY: Calendar Year	ICJ: Interstate Compact for Juveniles
CYT: Cannabis Youth Treatment	ICN: Intake Case Number
DAI: Detention Assessment Instrument	ICRC: Institutional Classification and Review Committee
DARS: Virginia Department for Aging and Rehabilitative Services	IEP: Individualized Education Program
DBHDS: Virginia Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services	J&DR: Juvenile and Domestic Relations
DBT: Dialectical Behavior Therapy	JCC: Juvenile Correctional Center
DCJS: Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services	JCS: Juvenile Correctional Specialist
DGS: Virginia Department of General Services	JDAI: Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative
DJJ: Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice	JDC: Juvenile Detention Center
DMAS: Virginia Department of Medical Assistance Services	JP: Juvenile Profile
DMV: Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles	LEA: Local Education Agency
DPB: Virginia Department of Planning and Budget	LOS: Length of Stay (used for probation, detention, direct care, and parole)
DR/CW: Domestic Relations and Child Welfare	LOS Guidelines: LOS Guidelines for Indeterminately Committed Juveniles
DRG: Data Resource Guide	LRD: Late Release Date
DRT: Disposition Recommendation Tool	MHSTP: Mental Health Services Transition Plan
DSM: Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders	MOA: Memorandum of Agreement
DSP: Direct Service Provider	MOE: Maintenance of Effort
DSS: Virginia Department of Social Services	MSO: Most Serious Offense
EBA: Evidence-Based Associates	MST: Multisystemic Therapy
ECO: Emergency Custody Order	NCCER: National Center for Construction Education and Research
EOC: End of Course	OCS: Virginia Office of Children's Services
ERD: Early Release Date	ODD: Oppositional Defiant Disorder
FAPT: Family Assessment and Planning Team	OJJDP: United States Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
FFT: Functional Family Therapy	PBIS: Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports
FIPS: Federal Information Processing Standards	PO: Probation/Parole Officer
FOCUS: Focus on Clients Under Supervision	Post-D: Post-Dispositional
FY: Fiscal Year	Pre-D: Pre-Dispositional
GED®: General Educational Development	
G.R.E.A.T.: Gang Resistance Education And Training	



PREA: Prison Rape Elimination Act

PYD: Positive Youth Development

QA: Quality Assurance

RDC: Reception and Diagnostic Center

R/ED: Racial and Ethnic Disparities

RNR: Risk-Need-Responsivity

RSC: Regional Service Coordinator

RTC: Residential Treatment Center

RTI: Response to Intervention

SEAS: Screening for Experiences and Strengths

SOL: Standards of Learning

SOP: Standard Operating Procedure

SPEP™: Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol

SPSHS: Virginia Secretary of Public Safety and Homeland Security

SY: School Year

TDO: Temporary Detention Order

TYSC: Tidewater Youth Services Commission

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

W!SE: Working in Support of Education

YASI: Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument

Definitions

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.

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

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. See page 9 and §§ 16.1-269.1 and 16.1-271 of the *Code of Virginia*.

CHINS: a child (i) whose behavior, conduct, or condition presents or results in a serious threat to the well-being and physical safety of that child, (ii) who remains away from or deserts or abandons their family or lawful custodian during one occasion and is demonstrably at risk of coercion, exploitation, abuse, or manipulation or has been lured from their parent or lawful custodian by means of trickery or misrepresentation or under false pretenses, or (iii) if under the age of 14, whose behavior, conduct, or condition presents or results in a serious threat to the well-being and physical safety of another per-



son. 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 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, 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 provide youth with a stepdown option to help reintroduce them back to the community. Youth are placed in detention reentry 30 to 180 days before their scheduled release.

Determinate Commitment: the commitment of a youth 14 years of age or older to DJJ as a serious 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 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 or supervision.

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. Supervision for diversion 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.

DRT: a standardized tool that guides POs' recommendations for disposition to the court. The tool is designed to encourage a greater degree of consistency, reliability, and equity of recommendations in pre-D social history reports.

FY: the time period measured from July 1 of one year to June 30 of the following year. For example, FY 2025 began July 1, 2024, and ended June 30, 2025.

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 §§ 16.1-278.8(A)(14) and 16.1-285 of the *Code of Virginia*.

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

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, di-

version, or the filing of a petition initiating formal court action.

JCC: a DJJ-operated 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, educational and vocational accomplishments, and behavior may 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, 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. In general, 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 without special programs



provided, typically up to 30 days. In general, 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, also known as social history reports, that 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. These reports are prepared within the timelines established by approved procedures (i) 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.

Probable Cause: 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 2025 began July 1, 2024, and ended September 30, 2024.

Recidivism Rate: the percentage of individuals who commit a subsequent offense, measured in this report by rearrest, reconviction, and reincarceration. See page 73.

Region: DJJ divides Virginia into six 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 nonsecure facility or emergency shelter specifically approved to provide a range of as-needed services on an individual basis for up to 90 days. See § 16.1-248.1 of the *Code of Virginia*.

Status Offense: an act prohibited by law that would not be an offense if committed by an adult, such as truancy, curfew violation, or running away. See § 16.1-228 of the *Code of Virginia*.

Subsequent Commitment: a commitment to DJJ for a new offense committed after the date of commitment that requires 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 reason-



ably 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 § 16.1-335 et seq. of the *Code of Virginia*.

Technical Violation: an act which violates a court order but does not necessarily violate a law, such as a violation of terms and conditions of probation, parole, or release from secure detention.

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 but are not limited to 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 E.

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; and
- » 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.

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.

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 is transferred 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 direct 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 eligible to be sentenced by a jury. Pursuant to § 16.1-271 of the *Code of Virginia*, 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 the most recent VCSC study on the topic, 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 2015. (See DJJ's website for a complete historical timeline of the juvenile justice system in Virginia.)

2015: RDC closed.

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 to develop a statewide continuum of evidence-based services and additional alternatives to placement in secure facilities.

2017: Beaumont JCC closed.

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, which impacted DJJ operations and juvenile justice trends. For more information, see DRGs from FY 2020 and FY 2021.

2021: Chesapeake CPP closed.

2022: Lynchburg and Northern Virginia CPPs closed.

DJJ began offering pre-court services as a resource to youth and families.

2023: The Board of Juvenile Justice's revised LOS Guidelines took effect.

DJJ partnered with Newport News JDC to establish a CPP.

Merrimac CPP closed.

Workforce development programs were launched.

2024: Bon Air JCC launched Facility-Wide PBIS.

Rappahannock CPP closed.

DJJ created the Mid-West administrative region.

DJJ consolidated by contracting with one service coordination agency.

DJJ began implementing pre-placement services for direct care youth.

DJJ implemented the G.R.E.A.T. program at CSUs.

2025: Prince William CPP closed.

DJJ implemented the DRT and the FOCUS model at CSUs.

DJJ created the Family Engagement Unit.


DJJ began working directly with service providers to implement the RSC model.

DJJ implemented The Seven Challenges® at Bon Air JCC and began a reentry partnership with Dominion Energy.



Regional Map


DJJ’s Division of Community Programs is organized into six 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, Mid-West, Northern, Southern, and Western. There are 32 CSUs that service 133 localities. CSUs 17 and 19 are locally operated.



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



Juvenile Justice System Process



Steps in the Juvenile Justice System

Intake

- » When an offense is alleged against a youth, any individual (e.g., parents, agency representatives, law enforcement personnel) may file a complaint with a CSU 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 many 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 and pre-court services are offered to youth and families prior to scheduled court hearings.
- » 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.


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.



Court Dispositions in Secure Facilities

The information below provides a general overview of dispositions for post-D detention and commitment. This page is not inclusive of all possible dispositions. (See page 8 for examples of court dispositions.) Committed youth may move between placements while in direct care.



Post-D Detention


- » JDCs provide temporary care for youth in secure custody pending a court appearance (pre-D) and those held after disposition (post-D). Dispositions for post-D detention include the following:
 - › **Post-D Detention without Programs:** the youth is ordered to a JDC without special programs provided, typically up to 30 days. All JDCs offer post-D detention without programs. In FY 2025, the average LOS for post-D detention without programs was 12.7 days.
 - › **Post-D Detention with Programs:** the youth is ordered 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. As of June 30, 2025, 19 JDCs offer post-D detention with programs. In FY 2025, the average LOS for post-D detention with programs was 5.0 months.

Commitment

- » Commitment places youth in the custody of DJJ for a determinate or indeterminate period of time. Most youth await admission to direct care in a JDC before officially entering the direct care population.
 - › **Indeterminate Commitment:** DJJ calculates the youth's LOS based on statutory requirements and the LOS Guidelines. In FY 2025, the average LOS for direct care releases with an indeterminate commitment was 19.8 months.
 - › **Determinate Commitment:** the court specifies the length of the commitment. In FY 2025, the average LOS for direct care releases with a determinate commitment was 28.6 months.
 - › **Blended Sentence:** the circuit court orders the youth to an active sentence to VADOC upon completion of their commitment to DJJ. In FY 2025, the average LOS for blended sentences was 34.5 months.
- » Once youth are admitted to direct care, they are evaluated at either a JDC or the JCC. The process includes medical, psychological, behavioral, educational, and career-readiness assessments. A team meets to discuss and identify each youth's treatment and mental health needs, determine projected LOS (for indeterminate commitments), recommend where the youth should be placed, and develop a CRCP.
- » DJJ uses multiple placement options for youth in direct care. Placement options include Bon Air JCC; JDC-based direct care placements, including CPPs, IBPs, individually purchased JDC beds, and detention reentry; and other contracted alternatives. CPPs are intended to place youth in smaller settings closer to their home communities to facilitate a smoother transition after release and increase family engagement. IBPs are individualized programs operated in local JDCs for direct care youth. Detention reentry allows youth to begin transitioning back to the community 30 to 180 days before their scheduled release date.



DJJ System Flow Chart, FY 2025*



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

* The initial intake decision is counted. Unsuccessful diversions with a petition filed are included in "Diversion Plan" because diversion is the initial 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 2025; they do not necessarily connect to the intakes or intake decisions above.

Intakes

- » There were 27,743 juvenile intake cases and 39,882 juvenile intake complaints. Juvenile intake cases may be comprised of one or more intake complaints. In FY 2025, juvenile intake cases had an average of 1.4 complaints.

Intake Decisions

- » A petition was filed for 74.5% of the juvenile intake complaints.
- » Overall, 5.7% 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 juvenile intake complaints that were not petitioned, 56.7% had a diversion plan and 26.6% were resolved.

Dispositions

- » Of probation, post-D detention, and direct care dispositions, probation was the most common.
- » There were 2,241 probation placements, 853 statuses for post-D detention without programs, 156 statuses for post-D detention with programs, and 173 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).
- » DJJ uses the *Code of Virginia* and VCC information published by VCSC to designate offenses as felonies; misdemeanors (Class 1 and Class 2-4); CHINS, CHINSup, and status; and other. These designations are checked periodically and updated accordingly.
- » 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 23, 41, 52, and 57 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. For example, in FY 2025, the "Abusive Language," "Computer," "Paraphernalia," and "Telephone" categories were added to the "Delinquent — Other" offense category. (See Appendix B for a full list of offenses included in the "Delinquent — Other" offense category.)
- » 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.)
- » Statewide probation, parole, and commitment ADPs count only one status per youth per day, even if multiple statuses were open simultaneously. However, for CSU or FIPS ADPs, each status is counted even if multiple statuses were open for the same youth simultaneously. Therefore, the sum of CSU or FIPS ADPs may not equal the statewide total. In previous reports, each status was counted in the probation, parole, and commitment ADPs even if multiple statuses were opened simultaneously.
- » 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.
- » 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 and not subsequent commitments unless otherwise specified.
- » Canceled, rescinded, and successfully appealed commitments are not included except in the direct care ADP and education data.





2 Programs and Services

Community Programs

DJJ is responsible for the operation of 30 CSUs and the coordination of community-based services for individuals who come in contact with the juvenile justice system. DJJ provides a continuum of community-based interventions to youth and families through partnerships with localities, non-profits, and contracted providers.

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, CHINS, CHINSup, 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 as an alternative to official court processing, which may include informal counseling or monitoring, skills coaching delivered by CSU staff, or referrals to community resources or services. (See pages 5-6 for information on diversion.)

DJJ has an After-Hours Video Intake Program to provide secure, remote intake coverage during non-business hours. It is used by all but one state-operated CSU, which conducts after-hours intakes locally.

If a petition is filed, the intake officer decides 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 pre-D detention-eligible if at least one of the associated intake complaints is pre-D detention-eligible. (See page 7 for pre-D detention eligibility criteria.) Decisions by intake officers concerning whether pre-D 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. CSU personnel complete a YASI 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 E.) The information in the social history report and YASI provide the basis for CSU personnel to develop assessment-driven case plans for youth. Pre-D social history reports include a disposition recommendation to the court. Most recommendations are guided by the DRT, a standardized tool that considers the seriousness of current and prior offenses, current and prior supervision statuses, YASI risk level, and criminal gang affiliation.

CSU personnel may complete other instruments and reports, including substance use 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, child support, abuse and neglect, family abuse, termination of parental rights, and emancipation. In some CSUs, services such as treatment referral, supervision, and counseling are provided in adult cases of domestic violence.



Pre-Court Services

Pre-court services are offered to youth and families prior to scheduled court hearings. The purpose of pre-court services is to offer support to youth and families who may be in crisis and in need of services immediately after a petition for delinquency is filed. At the time of intake, an intake officer may give families a list of community resources. Applicable resources and contact information provided may include the local department of social services; OCS; CSB; VJCCCA local plan services; Virginia Sexual and Domestic Violence Hotline; 2-1-1 Virginia; Virginia Workforce Connection; Unite Virginia; and food, housing, financial, and transportation assistance. Participation in services is voluntary, and the youth and families may decline any service offered or may choose to stop receiving accepted services at any time. The CSU staff may assist families in accessing services as needed. In FY 2025, 4,560 pre-court service statuses were opened, indicating youth and families were either offered or accepted the voluntary services.

Probation and Parole

Probation and parole are both forms of community supervision that place youth under the supervision of a CSU. Probation occurs as the result of a court-ordered disposition. Parole occurs following release from direct care for most youth and is designed to support the youth's successful transition back to the community by building on the programs and services received while in direct care.

Community supervision uses a balanced and evidence-based approach, emphasizing public safety, accountability, and competency development. Supervision levels are based on each youth's risk and needs, compliance with rules and expectations, and progress toward goals. Youth classified as the highest risk level receive the most intensive supervision and interventions. The length of probation is decided by the court with input from the PO. For youth with indeterminate commitments, the length of parole supervision is determined by DJJ and is based on youth's risk, needs, compliance with supervision rules, and progress toward the goals of their supervision plan. For determinate commitments, the length of parole supervision can be decided by the court or DJJ. In FY 2025, the average LOS for probation was 334 days, and the average LOS for parole was 371 days. All youth on probation or parole must be released from supervision by their 21st birthday. (See Appendix F for an overview of probation and parole statuses.)

POs provide case management for all youth on probation and parole. Case management includes assessing the risk and needs of youth; working with youth and

their families to develop individualized case plans; offering ongoing support through regular contact at specified intervals based on supervision level; ensuring youth meet the rules and conditions of their supervision; and, for youth on parole, monitoring adjustment in the community. Case management further includes linking youth to services and providing structured programming that encourages them to build cognitive-behavioral, social, and life skills.

Programming and Services

In FY 2025, DJJ developed the FOCUS model to guide POs' contacts with youth on community supervision with a practical, consistent, safe, and flexible framework. The model emphasizes providing effective supports and skills based on the needs of individual youth, rather than over-emphasizing prescriptive compliance. The model is centered around six types of contacts with youth and their families, including case management, rapport building, cognitive-behavioral skill building, social skill building, life skill building, and crisis support. The types of contacts delivered to individual youth depend on a PO's professional judgment and consideration of three core tenets: fidelity to the case plan, flexibility, and balance across the course of supervision. By using the FOCUS model, POs identify and address individualized risk factors and needs through case management, skill building, and connection to services. POs also build engagement with youth and their families and support progress toward goals. POs receive ongoing coaching and technical support on how to apply the model effectively across diverse situations. (See pages 61-63 for more information on the FOCUS model.)

As part of the case management aspect of FOCUS, POs coordinate services for youth's individualized case plans. These services may be provided by DJJ staff or procured by DJJ through the RSC model (a statewide network of approved public and private DSPs described below). Additionally, youth may receive services funded through CSA, Medicaid, and VJCCCA. Services may include individual and family counseling, life skills coaching, career-readiness education, substance use treatment, gang prevention, and other community-based services. Youth on parole may also receive workforce coordination and other transitional services as part of their reentry plan. The QA Unit provides implementation and operational support to CSU staff to ensure supervision and service delivery adhere to best practices, RNR principles, and DJJ's guiding values.



RSC Model

For services provided through the RSC model, POs connect youth and families to a continuum of community-based and residential services that offer programs and treatments to meet their needs. The RSC model includes evidence-based services such as the adolescent community reinforcement approach, brief strategic family therapy, FFT, MST, high fidelity wraparound intensive care coordination, The Seven Challenges®, substance use intensive outpatient programs, and trauma-focused CBT. In FY 2025, DJJ continued to contract with EBA to serve as an RSC and assist DJJ with implementing this continuum of services for youth and families. (See pages 47-48 for more information about the continuum of services related to direct care.)

The RSC supports 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 QA Unit manages the RSC model and facilitates quality improvement initiatives and technical assistance. In FY 2026, DJJ works directly with DSPs and exercises full responsibility for service coordination.

Residential Parole Programs

Through the RSC model, DJJ also provides funding for residential placements for youth on parole. Residential programs include transitional living programs certified by DJJ and utilized solely for DJJ youth, independent living programs licensed by DSS, and group homes licensed by DBHDS. These programs provide an opportunity for youth to learn and practice life skills in the community with wraparound support. The average LOS in these programs is approximately nine months.

TYSC: TYSC operates one transitional living program, the Apartment Living Program (Virginia Beach). This program includes eight beds in four apartments for youth ages 17.5 and older.

Intercept Health: Intercept Health operates two transitional living programs, Summit House (Chesterfield) and Summit West (Roanoke). Each program includes eight beds in a single-family home. Summit House serves youth ages 17.5 and older, and Summit West serves youth ages 17 and older.

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, youth, and their families in order to create a seamless transition back to the community and improve youth outcomes. This includes strengthening family engagement; enrollment in school or trade programs; connections to employment, internships, and apprenticeships; participation in positive extracurricular activities; and ongoing mentorship and support to help youth feel valued and hopeful about their future. Reentry advocates are assigned regionally to connect youth and families with these resources and supports. (See pages 44-48 for more information on services for youth in direct care.)

ICJ

ICJ provides for the cooperative supervision of youth on probation or 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 juvenilecompact.org.



Intake Complaints, FY 2023-2025

DR/CW Complaints	2023	2024	2025
Custody	52,148	50,377	49,054
Support/Desertion	12,854	12,621	12,238
Protective Order/ECO	19,298	20,011	19,775
Visitation	33,284	31,571	29,968
Total DR/CW Complaints	117,584	114,580	111,035
Juvenile Complaints			
Felony	7,879	7,999	7,837
Class 1 Misdemeanor	15,192	15,696	14,966
Class 2-4 Misdemeanor	2,162	2,676	2,195
CHINS/CHINSup/Status	8,317	8,296	6,052
Other			
TDO	729	661	748
Technical Violation	4,569	5,177	6,491
Traffic	788	1,032	938
Other	575	485	655
Total Juvenile Complaints	40,211	42,022	39,882
Total Complaints	157,795	156,602	150,917

- » 73.6% of total intake complaints were DR/CW complaints in FY 2025.
- » DR/CW complaints decreased by 3.1% from 114,580 in FY 2024 to 111,035 in FY 2025.
- » Juvenile complaints decreased by 5.1% from 42,022 in FY 2024 to 39,882 in FY 2025.
- » 19.7% of juvenile complaints in FY 2025 were felony complaints.


Juvenile Intake Complaint Initial Decisions, FY 2025*

Intake Decision	2025
Court Summons	5.7%
Detention Order Only	1.1%
Diversion Plan	11.2%
Open Diversion	0.3%
Successful Diversion	8.8%
Unsuccessful Diversion with Petition	1.3%
Unsuccessful Diversion with No Petition	0.8%
Petition	74.5%
Petition Filed	45.3%
Detention Order with Petition	29.3%
Resolved	5.3%
Referred to Another Agency	1.6%
Resolved	3.6%
Returned to Probation Supervision	0.0%
Unfounded	1.0%
Other	1.2%
Total Juvenile Complaints	39,882

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

- » A petition was the initial intake decision for 74.5% of juvenile complaints.
- » 70.6% of juvenile complaints were diversion eligible.
- » 16.5% of juvenile complaints were initially resolved or diverted.
- » Of the 4,466 juvenile complaints with a diversion plan, 78.4% had successful outcomes.

Initial YASIs, FY 2021-2025*



- » Initial YASIs may be completed at different points of contact and are not connected to individual intake cases.
- » 3,618 initial YASIs were completed in FY 2025.
- » The percentage of initial YASIs that were high risk decreased from 18.6% in FY 2021 to 15.7% in FY 2025.
- » Over half (60.5%) of initial YASIs were moderate or high risk in FY 2025.

* 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 2023-2025

Demographics	2023	2024	2025
Race			
Asian	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%
Black	40.8%	41.2%	44.2%
White	48.2%	46.9%	44.9%
Other/Unknown	10.0%	10.8%	9.8%
Ethnicity			
Hispanic	14.0%	15.3%	14.2%
Non-Hispanic	65.0%	63.8%	66.6%
Unknown/Missing	21.0%	20.9%	19.2%
Sex			
Female	36.6%	36.4%	35.9%
Male	63.4%	63.6%	64.1%
Age			
8-10	1.7%	1.8%	1.9%
11-12	7.9%	7.6%	7.1%
13	9.7%	9.6%	9.3%
14	14.8%	14.6%	13.9%
15	19.3%	19.6%	18.7%
16	21.7%	21.8%	22.3%
17	21.2%	21.6%	22.8%
18-20	2.6%	2.4%	2.8%
Missing	1.0%	0.9%	1.1%
<i>Total Juvenile Intake Cases</i>	<i>28,557</i>	<i>29,653</i>	<i>27,743</i>

- » Juvenile intake cases may be comprised of one or more intake complaints. In FY 2025, juvenile intake cases had an average of 1.4 complaints.
- » 44.9% of juvenile intake cases in FY 2025 were White, and 44.2% were Black.
- » 66.6% of juvenile intake cases in FY 2025 were non-Hispanic, and 14.2% were Hispanic. 19.2% had unknown or missing ethnicity information.
- » 64.1% of juvenile intake cases in FY 2025 were male, and 35.9% were female.
- » Over half (62.3-63.7%) of juvenile intake cases since FY 2023 were 15 to 17 years of age.
- » The average age of juvenile intake cases in FY 2025 was 15.6 years.

Workload Information, FY 2025*

Status	ADP	Completed Reports	Count
Probation	2,065	Pre-D Reports	1,831
Parole	100	Post-D Reports	881
Commitments	349	Transfer Reports	214

* 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 (2,065).
- » Of the 2,712 social history reports completed, 67.5% were pre-D and 32.5% were post-D.


Probation Placement Demographics, FY 2023-2025

Demographics	2023	2024	2025
Race			
Asian	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%
Black	47.8%	45.1%	45.9%
White	44.0%	45.5%	45.6%
Other/Unknown	7.3%	8.6%	7.8%
Ethnicity			
Hispanic	16.5%	17.8%	16.7%
Non-Hispanic	73.2%	70.9%	72.2%
Unknown/Missing	10.3%	11.3%	11.1%
Sex			
Female	23.1%	24.4%	24.6%
Male	76.9%	75.6%	75.4%
Age			
8-10	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%
11-12	2.9%	3.1%	4.0%
13	7.1%	7.0%	7.8%
14	15.8%	15.0%	13.3%
15	21.3%	22.0%	21.1%
16	25.3%	24.6%	25.0%
17	22.5%	23.4%	24.5%
18-20	5.0%	4.7%	4.1%
<i>Total Probation Placements</i>	<i>2,172</i>	<i>2,445</i>	<i>2,241</i>

- » 45.9% of probation placements in FY 2025 were Black, and 45.6% were White.
- » 72.2% of probation placements in FY 2025 were non-Hispanic, and 16.7% were Hispanic. 11.1% had unknown or missing ethnicity information.
- » 75.4% of probation placements in FY 2025 were male, and 24.6% were female.
- » Over two-thirds (69.1-70.5%) of probation placements since FY 2023 were 15 to 17 years of age.
- » The average age of probation placements in FY 2025 was 15.9 years.



Probation Placements by Risk Levels, FY 2021-2025*




* Percentages may not add to 100% due to missing YASIs. For example, in FY 2025, 33 probation placements were missing YASIs.

- » In FY 2025, 2,208 probation placements had a YASI completed.
- » Approximately half (49.8-54.1%) of probation placements were moderate risk between FY 2021 and FY 2025.

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 every 90 days.

Parole Placements by Risk Levels, FY 2021-2025*



* Percentages may not add to 100% due to missing YASIs. For example, in FY 2025, four parole placements were missing YASIs.

- » In FY 2025, 130 parole placements had a YASI completed.
- » The percentage of parole placements that were high risk steadily decreased from 86.3% in FY 2022 to 73.1% in FY 2025.



Juvenile Complaints and Offenses, FY 2025*

Offense Category	Felony Juvenile Intake Complaints	Misdemeanor Juvenile Intake Complaints	Total Juvenile Intake Complaints	Probation Placement Offenses	Commitment Offenses
Delinquent					
Alcohol	N/A	3.6%	1.6%	1.0%	0.3%
Arson	2.1%	0.7%	0.7%	1.0%	0.3%
Assault	18.1%	34.8%	18.5%	21.7%	18.7%
Burglary	9.2%	N/A	1.8%	3.1%	5.5%
Disorderly Conduct	N/A	1.1%	0.5%	0.6%	0.1%
Escape	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Extortion	4.7%	1.0%	1.4%	2.5%	0.4%
Fraud	3.9%	1.2%	1.3%	1.3%	1.7%
Gangs	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Kidnapping	1.6%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	1.2%
Larceny	21.1%	12.0%	9.3%	12.4%	12.2%
Marijuana	0.0%	5.4%	2.4%	1.0%	0.0%
Murder	0.8%	N/A	0.2%	0.1%	1.9%
Narcotics	2.6%	0.4%	0.7%	1.3%	1.3%
Obscenity	5.9%	1.5%	1.8%	3.5%	2.7%
Obstruction of Justice	0.5%	4.2%	1.9%	2.8%	2.6%
Robbery	8.3%	N/A	1.6%	1.8%	9.2%
Sexual Abuse	4.3%	0.5%	1.1%	3.1%	3.0%
Sexual Offense	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	0.3%
Trespassing	0.0%	3.7%	1.6%	1.9%	0.5%
Vandalism	5.6%	8.4%	4.7%	7.1%	5.8%
Weapons	4.4%	8.9%	4.7%	10.5%	16.3%
Other	2.2%	2.4%	3.0%	4.7%	0.9%
Technical					
Contempt of Court	N/A	N/A	10.7%	5.0%	1.7%
Failure to Appear	0.3%	1.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Parole Violation	N/A	N/A	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Probation Violation	N/A	N/A	5.2%	1.0%	7.8%
Traffic					
Traffic	3.6%	9.1%	7.1%	5.2%	4.4%
Status/Other					
CHINS	N/A	N/A	3.7%	0.8%	N/A
CHINSup	N/A	N/A	9.1%	4.0%	N/A
Civil Commitment	N/A	N/A	1.9%	0.0%	N/A
Marijuana	N/A	N/A	1.4%	0.9%	0.1%
Other	N/A	N/A	1.1%	0.7%	N/A
Total Complaints	7,837	17,161	39,882	4,871	743

» 59.2% of total juvenile intake complaints were for delinquent offenses, 16.6% were for technical offenses, 7.1% were for traffic offenses, and 17.1% were for status or other offenses.

» 82.3% of offenses that resulted in a probation placement were for delinquent offenses, 6.0% were for technical offenses, 5.2% were for traffic offenses, and 6.4% were for status or other offenses.

» 85.1% of offenses that resulted in commitment were for delinquent offenses, 10.4% were for technical offenses, 4.4% were for traffic offenses, and 0.1% were for status or other offenses.

» See page 41 for detaining MSO data for pre-D detention statuses.

» See pages 52-53 for MSO data for direct care admissions.

* 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*.

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

* 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.

* "Total Juvenile Intake Complaints" includes felonies, misdemeanors, and other offenses; therefore, the sum of felonies and misdemeanors does not equal the total.



Juvenile Cases by MSO, FY 2025*

MSO Severity	Juvenile Intake Cases	Probation Placements	Commitments
DAI Ranking			
Felony			
Against Persons	9.0%	23.7%	74.6%
Weapons/Narcotics Dist.	0.6%	1.2%	4.3%
Other	5.9%	13.7%	17.3%
Class 1 Misdemeanor			
Against Persons	20.4%	29.1%	2.2%
Other	14.2%	16.8%	1.1%
Prob./Parole Violation	7.6%	0.0%	0.5%
Court Order Violation	11.3%	2.2%	N/A
Status Offense	20.0%	7.8%	N/A
Other	11.1%	5.4%	N/A
VCSC Ranking			
Person	27.9%	48.4%	67.0%
Property	13.2%	18.6%	19.5%
Narcotics	0.7%	1.9%	1.6%
Other/Unspecified	58.2%	31.1%	11.9%
<i>Total Juvenile Cases</i>	<i>27,743</i>	<i>2,241</i>	<i>185</i>

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

* "Other/Unspecified" includes offenses ranked as "Other" and those that were missing a VCSC ranking.

» MSO by DAI ranking:

- › Misdemeanors against persons were the highest percentage (20.4%) of juvenile intake cases, closely followed by status offenses (20.0%).
- › Misdemeanors against persons were the highest percentage (29.1%) of probation placements.
- › Felonies against persons were the highest percentage (74.6%) of commitments.

» MSO by VCSC ranking:

- › Person offenses were the second highest percentage (27.9%) of juvenile intake cases.
- › Person offenses were the highest percentage (48.4%) of probation placements.
- › Person offenses were the highest percentage (67.0%) of commitments.

Timeframes

- » The average time from intake to adjudication in FY 2024 was 166 days. FY 2025 data are not available due to pending adjudications.
- » The average time from DJJ's receipt of commitment papers to direct care admission in FY 2025 was 42 days (excluding subsequent commitments).

66.7% (18,501) of juvenile intake cases were detention-eligible. There were 5,511 pre-D detention statuses for a rate of 3.4 detention-eligible intakes per pre-D detention status.

Placements, Releases, and Average LOS, FY 2025

	Probation	Parole
Placements	2,241	134
Releases	2,461	127
Average LOS (Days)	334	371

- » The average age for probation placements was 15.9 years.
- » The average age for parole placements was 18.5 years.
- » The average LOS on probation was 11.0 months, and the average LOS on parole was 12.2 months.



Summary by CSU

Intake Complaints, FY 2025*

CSU	Complaints		Juvenile Complaints				
	DR/CW	Juvenile	Felony	Class 1 Misdemeanor	Class 2-4 Misdemeanor	CHINS/ CHINSup/ Status	Other
1	5,952	1,015	20.5%	36.9%	3.1%	15.8%	23.7%
2	6,263	1,526	22.7%	49.9%	2.8%	7.8%	16.8%
2A	814	418	13.2%	38.5%	6.2%	24.6%	17.5%
3	3,273	585	20.5%	41.4%	1.5%	14.7%	21.9%
4	5,400	1,248	21.8%	36.1%	3.0%	5.4%	33.7%
5	2,183	833	22.0%	30.7%	4.3%	16.3%	26.7%
6	1,795	748	25.1%	39.6%	7.0%	12.7%	15.6%
7	3,669	2,445	9.8%	24.1%	2.3%	15.0%	48.7%
8	2,675	1,252	20.5%	31.8%	2.3%	20.0%	25.4%
9	2,882	1,051	21.4%	48.9%	9.2%	11.1%	9.3%
10	2,381	1,087	17.5%	28.8%	7.1%	22.4%	24.3%
11	1,775	769	19.8%	26.8%	4.8%	17.4%	31.2%
12	5,497	2,378	18.5%	48.8%	9.8%	12.7%	10.3%
13	3,071	865	28.8%	32.3%	1.8%	13.9%	23.2%
14	4,256	1,887	20.3%	52.4%	3.8%	7.5%	16.1%
15	7,349	2,999	20.2%	46.5%	6.2%	14.2%	12.9%
16	4,109	1,120	20.6%	31.8%	9.6%	17.3%	20.6%
17	960	1,043	26.3%	29.3%	3.1%	16.3%	25.0%
18	973	576	26.7%	44.8%	4.9%	9.7%	13.9%
19	5,861	2,012	34.1%	44.9%	4.8%	4.2%	12.0%
20	2,033	1,447	24.0%	41.7%	6.2%	10.2%	18.0%
21	2,921	474	16.9%	36.5%	10.8%	20.3%	15.6%
22	2,726	1,299	21.6%	18.6%	6.5%	20.9%	32.4%
23	4,606	1,791	12.1%	32.3%	7.9%	24.3%	23.5%
24	4,622	1,234	13.3%	24.1%	3.6%	28.1%	30.8%
25	3,101	1,152	15.2%	30.8%	8.2%	26.5%	19.4%
26	4,768	1,790	13.8%	34.2%	8.4%	13.3%	30.3%
27	4,326	1,245	17.4%	36.9%	8.7%	15.3%	21.7%
28	2,259	397	16.6%	37.8%	5.5%	14.9%	25.2%
29	2,320	458	11.8%	29.7%	6.8%	31.7%	20.1%
30	2,379	438	11.0%	35.8%	4.6%	37.0%	11.6%
31	3,836	2,300	21.1%	43.0%	2.4%	12.5%	21.0%
Total	111,035	39,882	19.7%	37.5%	5.5%	15.2%	22.1%

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



YASI Overall Risk Levels, FY 2025*

CSU	Initial YASIs				Probation Placement YASIs					Parole Placement YASIs				
	High	Mod.	Low	Total	High	Mod.	Low	Missing	Total	High	Mod.	Low	Missing	Total
1	15.6%	55.6%	28.9%	45	7.7%	61.5%	25.6%	5.1%	39	60.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	5
2	18.8%	47.0%	34.2%	117	28.9%	51.1%	15.6%	4.4%	90	73.3%	26.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15
2A	11.1%	63.0%	25.9%	27	12.5%	58.3%	29.2%	0.0%	24	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2
3	28.8%	42.3%	28.8%	52	39.2%	41.2%	19.6%	0.0%	51	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	3
4	25.2%	55.9%	18.9%	111	26.1%	63.0%	10.9%	0.0%	92	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6
5	18.6%	33.9%	47.5%	59	23.8%	40.5%	35.7%	0.0%	42	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	6
6	19.7%	60.7%	19.7%	61	13.9%	69.4%	16.7%	0.0%	36	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	6
7	12.8%	53.6%	33.6%	125	13.5%	60.4%	26.0%	0.0%	96	83.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	6
8	19.1%	64.7%	16.2%	68	36.4%	59.1%	4.5%	0.0%	44	62.5%	25.0%	0.0%	12.5%	8
9	24.2%	48.5%	27.3%	33	40.0%	50.0%	10.0%	0.0%	20	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2
10	19.0%	50.0%	31.0%	58	25.6%	48.7%	23.1%	2.6%	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
11	8.2%	44.9%	46.9%	49	22.2%	50.0%	27.8%	0.0%	18	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1
12	5.8%	32.0%	62.1%	359	23.6%	69.4%	6.9%	0.0%	72	60.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10
13	23.2%	49.0%	27.8%	151	32.5%	48.1%	15.6%	3.9%	77	75.0%	12.5%	0.0%	12.5%	8
14	8.9%	25.0%	66.1%	292	28.8%	49.6%	18.4%	3.2%	125	50.0%	33.3%	16.7%	0.0%	6
15	22.9%	54.3%	22.9%	105	32.8%	54.7%	12.5%	0.0%	64	55.6%	33.3%	11.1%	0.0%	9
16	26.8%	45.1%	28.0%	82	26.5%	48.5%	23.5%	1.5%	68	80.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5
17	9.3%	41.1%	49.6%	129	13.3%	47.8%	33.3%	5.6%	90	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1
18	17.5%	47.6%	34.9%	63	22.6%	43.5%	29.0%	4.8%	62	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1
19	17.6%	47.6%	34.8%	374	47.5%	43.7%	8.2%	0.6%	158	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5
20	22.1%	38.9%	38.9%	95	30.9%	52.9%	16.2%	0.0%	68	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1
21	14.9%	41.4%	43.7%	87	26.2%	50.0%	23.8%	0.0%	42	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
22	21.3%	57.5%	21.3%	80	16.5%	57.0%	26.6%	0.0%	79	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1
23	14.8%	41.3%	43.9%	155	30.0%	46.3%	23.8%	0.0%	80	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8
24	14.6%	60.4%	25.0%	96	13.4%	55.7%	27.8%	3.1%	97	71.4%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	7
25	21.1%	63.4%	15.5%	71	28.8%	58.8%	11.3%	1.3%	80	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2
26	22.7%	59.8%	17.5%	97	21.0%	58.1%	18.1%	2.9%	105	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3
27	16.9%	50.8%	32.3%	124	29.7%	58.1%	12.2%	0.0%	74	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
28	17.3%	52.0%	30.7%	75	17.1%	61.4%	20.0%	1.4%	70	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
29	4.1%	32.7%	63.3%	98	8.6%	68.6%	22.9%	0.0%	35	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1
30	4.7%	33.9%	61.4%	171	6.6%	40.7%	51.6%	1.1%	91	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
31	28.4%	47.7%	23.9%	109	20.4%	55.8%	23.9%	0.0%	113	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	6
Total	15.7%	44.8%	39.5%	3,618	24.7%	53.3%	20.6%	1.5%	2,241	73.1%	22.4%	1.5%	3.0%	134

* Only YASIs entered as "Initial Assessment" are included; data may include multiple initial YASIs for a youth if completed on different days.



Juvenile Intake Cases, Probation Placements, Detainments, and Commitments, FY 2023-2025*

CSU	Juvenile Intake Cases			Probation Placements			Detainments			Commitments		
	2023	2024	2025	2023	2024	2025	2023	2024	2025	2023	2024	2025
1	616	690	754	55	58	39	147	150	129	4	2	5
2	910	911	928	113	115	90	340	373	311	6	9	12
2A	250	244	300	9	20	24	29	31	39	2	2	2
3	364	415	432	32	36	51	87	106	101	4	6	5
4	807	867	870	112	101	92	263	271	269	28	19	12
5	517	502	529	41	49	42	135	115	140	12	9	6
6	513	516	518	39	30	36	115	113	127	10	11	9
7	1,148	1,222	1,325	77	80	96	208	276	298	11	13	7
8	729	710	807	28	28	44	146	165	184	10	9	13
9	907	862	731	30	22	20	144	201	192	7	4	2
10	816	817	836	44	56	39	120	120	116	2	4	3
11	460	548	512	21	27	18	95	129	134	2	5	2
12	1,675	1,771	1,633	59	82	72	277	304	283	3	9	5
13	553	711	593	80	81	77	254	268	189	15	12	16
14	972	1,005	1,138	124	140	125	335	376	367	11	10	12
15	2,047	2,089	2,005	37	52	64	372	456	476	12	4	13
16	1,113	1,118	850	92	84	68	178	170	159	9	7	5
17	543	585	680	80	107	90	141	220	190	2	2	0
18	442	447	442	65	78	62	126	121	136	5	2	0
19	1,698	1,600	1,192	179	195	158	505	571	420	13	5	3
20	921	983	965	68	94	68	78	102	123	2	0	0
21	317	339	362	68	57	42	40	54	59	1	2	5
22	1,066	1,108	978	91	79	79	180	189	159	9	9	8
23	1,296	1,431	1,439	44	85	80	282	324	322	5	6	7
24	1,070	1,202	1,058	84	81	97	226	219	215	8	16	9
25	949	846	862	80	87	80	158	165	192	3	6	5
26	1,612	1,681	1,393	74	97	105	276	337	407	3	11	6
27	1,068	951	836	76	86	74	133	143	155	0	1	1
28	348	415	318	49	64	70	29	54	52	0	3	3
29	673	661	392	25	23	35	42	52	41	1	1	1
30	587	609	376	80	96	91	95	83	53	0	0	0
31	1,570	1,797	1,689	116	155	113	296	317	316	7	7	8
Total	28,557	29,653	27,743	2,172	2,445	2,241	5,852	6,575	6,354	207	206	185

* 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 using the detaining FIPS (not the JDC location).

* 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.

* Subsequent commitments are excluded. In FY 2025, CSU 22 had one subsequent commitment.



Juvenile Intake Complaint Initial Decisions, FY 2025*

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	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	7.2%	0.6%	0.1%	33.5%	30.0%	26.9%	0.9%	1,015
2	2.9%	4.8%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	43.8%	39.7%	6.8%	0.0%	1,526
2A	19.9%	0.0%	0.0%	15.8%	3.1%	1.0%	31.8%	24.6%	2.6%	0.2%	418
3	10.6%	0.2%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	0.7%	28.9%	39.5%	14.4%	1.5%	585
4	8.2%	1.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	46.9%	37.7%	2.9%	0.6%	1,248
5	2.3%	0.0%	0.2%	4.4%	1.0%	1.4%	46.9%	40.1%	1.0%	1.3%	833
6	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%	9.9%	1.7%	0.5%	37.3%	36.2%	2.9%	0.1%	748
7	11.8%	2.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	60.7%	22.4%	2.1%	0.5%	2,445
8	2.7%	8.8%	0.0%	3.2%	0.1%	1.0%	51.0%	28.8%	1.8%	2.3%	1,252
9	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	12.6%	1.3%	2.0%	47.2%	26.8%	4.9%	3.2%	1,051
10	7.5%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	2.9%	0.4%	53.0%	20.5%	1.7%	0.6%	1,087
11	12.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.9%	1.4%	40.1%	26.8%	6.6%	0.9%	769
12	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	25.1%	1.3%	0.5%	47.9%	18.6%	4.5%	1.0%	2,378
13	0.3%	3.4%	0.1%	7.1%	3.0%	0.8%	32.7%	42.2%	1.2%	8.2%	865
14	8.5%	3.0%	0.5%	12.1%	1.1%	0.5%	38.4%	28.5%	6.0%	1.3%	1,887
15	2.6%	0.3%	0.7%	7.2%	1.2%	0.6%	47.5%	29.0%	6.0%	0.5%	2,999
16	4.3%	0.0%	0.1%	17.2%	2.9%	3.6%	37.0%	27.9%	5.4%	1.6%	1,120
17	9.9%	0.0%	0.4%	4.5%	1.7%	0.9%	39.3%	33.3%	8.7%	1.0%	1,043
18	6.4%	0.3%	0.0%	14.4%	2.8%	1.2%	39.9%	29.2%	3.8%	0.5%	576
19	0.7%	2.2%	1.8%	7.4%	1.0%	2.2%	25.0%	51.5%	5.1%	0.4%	2,012
20	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	8.4%	1.1%	0.2%	44.2%	25.9%	13.4%	3.2%	1,447
21	10.5%	0.0%	0.6%	13.7%	1.7%	1.3%	36.3%	24.5%	10.1%	0.4%	474
22	4.7%	0.0%	0.1%	4.2%	1.3%	0.4%	56.1%	31.1%	1.5%	0.3%	1,299
23	13.9%	0.0%	0.1%	4.3%	1.6%	0.7%	46.7%	26.0%	4.4%	0.8%	1,791
24	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%	1.5%	0.7%	56.4%	26.7%	0.9%	0.0%	1,234
25	9.5%	0.4%	0.0%	6.7%	1.2%	1.5%	45.5%	28.0%	5.8%	0.6%	1,152
26	10.6%	0.7%	0.1%	7.9%	1.4%	0.6%	54.7%	19.9%	2.2%	0.6%	1,790
27	6.7%	0.3%	0.0%	16.1%	2.7%	0.4%	43.1%	27.9%	2.3%	0.2%	1,245
28	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	18.6%	2.3%	0.3%	43.8%	24.9%	3.3%	0.3%	397
29	1.3%	0.0%	0.4%	21.0%	0.7%	0.7%	54.6%	16.2%	4.1%	0.7%	458
30	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	2.5%	0.7%	54.3%	14.4%	5.7%	0.2%	438
31	1.6%	0.0%	0.8%	8.8%	1.8%	1.6%	47.1%	30.5%	6.0%	0.5%	2,300
Total	5.7%	1.1%	0.3%	8.8%	1.3%	0.8%	45.3%	29.3%	5.3%	1.0%	39,882

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

* Percentages may not add to 100% because "Other" intake decisions are not displayed. Less than five percent of intake decisions were "Other" for each CSU.



Diversion-Eligible Juvenile Intake Complaints, FY 2025*

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	730	71.9%	80	11.0%	14.5%	25.5%	91.3%
2	1,181	77.4%	16	1.4%	5.0%	6.4%	100.0%
2A	280	67.0%	83	29.6%	3.9%	33.6%	79.5%
3	382	65.3%	24	6.3%	22.0%	28.3%	83.3%
4	741	59.4%	4	0.5%	4.2%	4.7%	25.0%
5	574	68.9%	58	10.1%	1.2%	11.3%	63.8%
6	576	77.0%	90	15.6%	3.8%	19.4%	81.1%
7	1,038	42.5%	3	0.3%	4.9%	5.2%	66.7%
8	839	67.0%	52	6.2%	2.5%	8.7%	75.0%
9	897	85.3%	169	18.8%	5.7%	24.5%	78.1%
10	733	67.4%	173	23.6%	2.3%	25.9%	79.8%
11	498	64.8%	76	15.3%	9.6%	24.9%	76.3%
12	2,002	84.2%	646	32.3%	5.2%	37.5%	92.6%
13	517	59.8%	95	18.4%	1.9%	20.3%	64.2%
14	1,405	74.5%	266	18.9%	8.1%	27.0%	85.3%
15	2,425	80.9%	288	11.9%	7.3%	19.2%	74.7%
16	804	71.8%	264	32.8%	6.8%	39.7%	72.3%
17	696	66.7%	78	11.2%	12.8%	24.0%	60.3%
18	425	73.8%	106	24.9%	4.2%	29.2%	78.3%
19	1,668	82.9%	248	14.9%	6.0%	20.9%	59.7%
20	1,099	76.0%	141	12.8%	16.4%	29.2%	86.5%
21	348	73.4%	82	23.6%	12.9%	36.5%	79.3%
22	831	64.0%	77	9.3%	1.8%	11.1%	70.1%
23	1,181	65.9%	118	10.0%	6.4%	16.4%	64.4%
24	801	64.9%	114	14.2%	1.1%	15.4%	75.4%
25	829	72.0%	104	12.5%	8.0%	20.5%	73.1%
26	1,099	61.4%	177	16.1%	3.1%	19.2%	79.1%
27	886	71.2%	237	26.7%	3.3%	30.0%	83.5%
28	256	64.5%	84	32.8%	5.1%	37.9%	88.1%
29	342	74.7%	104	30.4%	5.0%	35.4%	92.3%
30	355	81.1%	87	24.5%	7.0%	31.5%	83.9%
31	1,710	74.3%	296	17.3%	7.8%	25.1%	67.6%
Total	28,148	70.6%	4,440	15.8%	6.5%	22.2%	78.5%

* Counts are not comparable to data elsewhere in this report because only complaints that are diversion eligible based on the *Code of Virginia* are included. Statewide, 26 complaints that were not eligible for diversion resulted in a diversion plan and are not included above.



Diversion-Eligible Juvenile Intake Cases, FY 2025*

CSU	Diversion-Eligible Cases			Diversion Plan	Resolved	Diversion Plan or Resolved	Successful Diversions
	Count of Cases	% of Total Cases	Count of Diversion Cases	% of Diversion-Eligible Cases			% of Diversion-Eligible Diversion Cases
1	492	65.3%	69	14.0%	20.1%	34.1%	89.9%
2	678	73.1%	15	2.2%	7.1%	9.3%	100.0%
2A	254	84.7%	81	31.9%	3.9%	35.8%	81.5%
3	304	70.4%	21	6.9%	26.3%	33.2%	81.0%
4	468	53.8%	3	0.6%	5.1%	5.8%	33.3%
5	323	61.1%	45	13.9%	2.2%	16.1%	64.4%
6	421	81.3%	78	18.5%	5.2%	23.8%	80.8%
7	817	61.7%	3	0.4%	6.0%	6.4%	66.7%
8	530	65.7%	43	8.1%	3.8%	11.9%	76.7%
9	622	85.1%	149	24.0%	7.2%	31.2%	77.2%
10	597	71.4%	170	28.5%	2.8%	31.3%	79.4%
11	331	64.6%	68	20.5%	14.5%	35.0%	82.4%
12	1,336	81.8%	538	40.3%	6.6%	46.9%	91.4%
13	353	59.5%	81	22.9%	2.8%	25.8%	64.2%
14	869	76.4%	209	24.1%	11.5%	35.6%	85.2%
15	1,641	81.8%	256	15.6%	10.1%	25.7%	76.6%
16	622	73.2%	229	36.8%	7.9%	44.7%	72.5%
17	464	68.2%	65	14.0%	14.9%	28.9%	61.5%
18	342	77.4%	99	28.9%	5.0%	33.9%	77.8%
19	888	74.5%	188	21.2%	10.0%	31.2%	59.0%
20	703	72.8%	117	16.6%	21.6%	38.3%	84.6%
21	292	80.7%	74	25.3%	13.7%	39.0%	77.0%
22	588	60.1%	70	11.9%	2.4%	14.3%	70.0%
23	1,100	76.4%	113	10.3%	6.5%	16.7%	65.5%
24	707	66.8%	110	15.6%	1.3%	16.8%	76.4%
25	662	76.8%	97	14.7%	9.8%	24.5%	73.2%
26	913	65.5%	167	18.3%	3.5%	21.8%	79.0%
27	590	70.6%	203	34.4%	4.7%	39.2%	82.3%
28	222	69.8%	79	35.6%	5.9%	41.4%	88.6%
29	290	74.0%	103	35.5%	5.9%	41.4%	92.2%
30	315	83.8%	86	27.3%	7.9%	35.2%	83.7%
31	1,176	69.6%	253	21.5%	10.9%	32.4%	64.8%
Total	19,910	71.8%	3,882	19.5%	8.3%	27.8%	78.3%

* 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. In reports prior to FY 2023, cases were not restricted to diversion eligible.

* In order to be categorized as a resolved case, all complaints associated with the case must be resolved. In reports prior to FY 2023, cases were not restricted to diversion eligible.

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



Workload Information, FY 2025*

CSU	Completed Reports			ADP		
	Pre-D	Post-D	Transfer	Probation	Parole	Commitments
1	27	18	3	44	2	7
2	91	29	26	99	8	14
2A	24	2	3	15	2	2
3	35	23	3	51	4	13
4	128	8	1	86	9	29
5	44	12	5	59	6	14
6	54	9	7	26	4	15
7	113	18	8	79	4	21
8	76	5	19	37	3	20
9	24	11	0	20	1	11
10	38	24	4	32	0	5
11	33	6	9	28	1	7
12	99	12	9	45	7	13
13	27	69	14	90	5	27
14	97	67	1	113	7	16
15	69	21	22	61	4	17
16	55	22	10	70	2	10
17	22	39	0	79	1	3
18	51	8	8	57	1	2
19	171	27	2	136	5	7
20	65	18	0	61	1	1
21	20	35	7	45	0	4
22	76	22	9	62	3	19
23	73	11	2	69	7	13
24	50	53	10	87	6	22
25	37	48	3	72	1	10
26	18	72	6	109	3	11
27	81	23	12	74	0	1
28	60	23	3	57	0	2
29	37	15	0	33	0	2
30	8	78	1	68	0	0
31	28	53	7	121	5	14
<i>Total</i>	<i>1,831</i>	<i>881</i>	<i>214</i>	<i>2,065</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>349</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 2025*

Complaints	Central	Eastern	Mid-West	Northern	Southern	Western
DR/CW Complaints	20,831	21,702	17,436	22,540	14,321	14,205
Juvenile Complaints	9,634	4,792	6,563	10,288	5,593	3,012
Juvenile Complaints						
Felony	1,710	1,001	1,025	2,425	1,211	465
Class 1 Misdemeanor	3,887	1,991	1,787	4,028	2,197	1,076
Class 2-4 Misdemeanor	441	146	442	560	374	232
CHINS/CHINSup/Status	1,300	535	1,601	1,177	787	652
Other	2,296	1,119	1,708	2,098	1,024	587
Juvenile Intake Decisions						
Court Summons	5.9%	6.1%	8.8%	4.5%	3.6%	6.0%
Detention Order Only	2.3%	1.8%	0.1%	0.6%	0.7%	0.1%
Diversion Plan	8.1%	4.3%	9.1%	12.8%	17.3%	19.8%
Petition	76.5%	75.4%	77.8%	73.4%	71.8%	68.7%
Resolved	4.3%	10.6%	3.0%	6.3%	3.5%	4.4%
Unfounded	1.2%	0.5%	0.5%	1.1%	2.0%	0.3%
Other	1.7%	1.2%	0.8%	1.4%	1.0%	0.6%

* "Other" under "Juvenile Complaints" includes TDOs, technical violations, traffic offenses, and other offenses.

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

* Unsuccessful diversions with a petition filed are included in "Diversion Plan" because diversion is the initial decision.

Workload Information, FY 2025*

Completed Reports	Central	Eastern	Mid-West	Northern	Southern	Western
Pre-D Reports	379	305	274	410	257	206
Post-D Reports	122	80	158	239	108	174
Transfer Reports	50	36	28	33	44	23
% Pre-D and Post-D Reports						
Pre-D Reports	75.6%	79.2%	63.4%	63.2%	70.4%	54.2%
Post-D Reports	24.4%	20.8%	36.6%	36.8%	29.6%	45.8%
ADP						
Probation	310	296	322	634	247	277
Parole	20	25	17	16	23	1
Commitments	85	66	70	47	76	10

* 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.

Juvenile Cases, FY 2025*

	Central	Eastern	Mid-West	Northern	Southern	Western
Juvenile Intake Cases	6,006	3,284	5,173	7,211	3,785	2,284
Detainments	1,513	849	1,011	1,750	872	358
Probation Placements	349	296	375	664	245	312
Parole Placements	31	31	18	22	31	1
Commitments	47	36	32	22	38	10

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

* Subsequent commitments are excluded. In FY 2025, CSU 22 (Mid-West) had one subsequent commitment.

* One detainment was missing region information and is not displayed.



Initial YASIs, FY 2025*

Risk Level	Central	Eastern	Mid-West	Northern	Southern	Western
Low	44.8%	27.3%	30.0%	33.6%	48.3%	48.3%
Moderate	41.3%	51.4%	52.6%	46.9%	39.5%	41.1%
High	14.0%	21.3%	17.4%	19.5%	12.2%	10.6%
<i>Total Initial YASIs</i>	623	352	460	949	679	555

* Only YASIs entered as “Initial Assessment” are included; data may include multiple initial YASIs for a youth if completed on different days.

Juvenile Intake Cases by MSO, FY 2025*

MSO Severity	Central	Eastern	Mid-West	Northern	Southern	Western
DAI Ranking						
Felony						
Against Persons	9.0%	9.2%	6.3%	10.8%	10.1%	7.1%
Weapons/Narcotics Distribution	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.7%	1.3%	0.7%
Other	5.4%	6.4%	4.1%	7.5%	6.6%	4.7%
Class 1 Misdemeanor						
Against Persons	23.1%	25.5%	14.2%	19.9%	20.9%	20.7%
Other	17.2%	11.9%	8.9%	16.4%	15.6%	12.1%
Probation/Parole Violation	5.5%	10.4%	5.5%	9.2%	6.7%	10.5%
Court Order Violation	10.8%	2.9%	18.5%	12.0%	10.1%	7.8%
Status Offense	18.9%	14.5%	30.3%	14.7%	17.9%	27.3%
Other	9.6%	18.6%	12.0%	8.9%	10.8%	9.2%
VCSC Ranking						
Person	31.1%	34.3%	18.7%	28.3%	30.2%	26.0%
Property	15.9%	11.2%	7.1%	16.0%	15.2%	10.8%
Narcotics	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	1.3%	0.9%	0.7%
Other/Unspecified	52.5%	54.2%	73.8%	54.4%	53.8%	62.6%
<i>Total Juvenile Intake Cases</i>	6,006	3,284	5,173	7,211	3,785	2,284

* “Other/Unspecified” includes offenses ranked as “Other” and those that were missing a VCSC ranking.

Probation Placements by MSO, FY 2025*

MSO Severity	Central	Eastern	Mid-West	Northern	Southern	Western
DAI Ranking						
Felony						
Against Persons	30.1%	31.1%	29.6%	16.1%	30.2%	13.8%
Weapons/Narcotics Distribution	1.1%	1.4%	1.6%	0.5%	3.3%	1.0%
Other	18.6%	19.6%	16.8%	6.3%	16.7%	12.5%
Class 1 Misdemeanor						
Against Persons	26.4%	28.0%	25.9%	33.9%	20.8%	33.3%
Other	16.9%	14.2%	13.9%	19.4%	21.6%	13.1%
Court Order Violation	1.1%	0.0%	4.8%	1.8%	1.2%	4.2%
Status Offense	2.0%	0.7%	3.7%	15.1%	2.0%	14.7%
Other	3.7%	5.1%	3.7%	6.9%	4.1%	7.4%
VCSC Ranking						
Person	53.9%	58.1%	46.9%	44.9%	44.1%	45.8%
Property	21.2%	19.9%	19.7%	14.9%	23.7%	16.7%
Narcotics	2.0%	0.7%	1.6%	2.6%	2.4%	1.3%
Other/Unspecified	22.9%	21.3%	31.7%	37.7%	29.8%	36.2%
<i>Total Probation Placements</i>	349	296	375	664	245	312

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

* “Other/Unspecified” includes offenses ranked as “Other” and those that were missing a VCSC ranking.



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. State funding is allocated to localities through a formula based on factors such as the number and types of arrests as well as the average daily cost of serving a youth. A locality can set its MOE to an amount equal to or higher than the state funds allocated by VJCCCA.

Effective in FY 2020, VJCCCA’s statutory purpose was expanded to include the deterrence of crime through community diversion or community-based services to juveniles assessed as needing such services. 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*).

Plan Development and Evaluation

Participation requires that localities develop a biennial plan for utilizing VJCCCA funding. While DJJ and the Board of Juvenile Justice must approve these plans, communities have autonomy and flexibility in addressing their juvenile offense patterns. Localities must consult with judges, CSU directors, and CSA CPMTs (interagency bodies that manage the expenditures of CSA state funding to serve children and families) in developing their plans. 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 2025, there were a total of 73 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 available 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 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

Youth can receive VJCCCA services before or after disposition, and an adjudication is not required. Programs and services are categorized under six headings: “Accountability,” “Competency Development,” “Grant Administration,” “Group Homes,” “Individually Purchased Services,” and “Public Safety.” “Accountability” includes programs such as community service and restorative justice. “Competency Development” encompasses the largest array of services, including skill development programs, substance use education, and other clinical services. “Grant Administration” includes coordination and administrative services for localities to oversee their placement plans but does not include placements for youth. Therefore, it is not included in the placements by service category type table on page 35. “Group Homes” includes locally and privately operated community group homes that serve court-involved youth. “Public Safety” includes alternatives to detention, such as outreach and electronic monitoring. Finally, “Individually Purchased Services” consists of additional services.

In FY 2025, the average cost for a VJCCCA residential placement was \$10,294, and the average cost for a VJCCCA non-residential placement was \$1,671. 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 2023 and FY 2024 reports, some shelter care placements were miscategorized as non-residential. In FY 2025, all shelter care placements are categorized as residential. Therefore, the average costs per placement are not comparable to FY 2023 and FY 2024 reports.

In FY 2025, there were 819 placements in VJCCCA prevention services, which excluded one locality. The “Substance Use” service type had the highest percentage (58.6%) of placements. Other prevention service types included “Truancy,” “Pro-Social Skills,” “Community Service Learning,” “Life Skills,” and “Parenting.” Availability of VJCCCA prevention services varies by locality. VJCCCA prevention services data are not included in the tables and graphs of this report.



Youth Served, FY 2025

	2025
Youth Placed	5,755
Total Program Placements	9,075
Average Placements per Youth	1.6
Youth Eligible for Detention	79.7%

- » 5,755 youth were placed in VJCCCA programs for a total of 9,075 placements. On average, there were 1.6 placements per youth.
- » 79.7% of youth placed in VJCCCA programs were eligible for detention.

Placement Status, FY 2025*

Dispositional Status	Residential	Non-Residential
Pre-D	448 (4.9%)	5,805 (64.0%)
Post-D	86 (0.9%)	2,736 (30.1%)

* Data are not comparable to prior reports because some shelter care placements were miscategorized as non-residential in FY 2023 and FY 2024 reports.

- » The majority (94.1%) of placements were non-residential.
- » The majority (68.9%) of placements were pre-D.
- » Of the 534 residential placements, 83.9% were pre-D, and 16.1% were post-D.

Placements by Service Category and Type, FY 2023-2025*

Service Category and Type	2023		2024		2025	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
Accountability	2,220	21.7%	2,038	20.0%	1,743	19.2%
Community Service	1,498	14.7%	1,391	13.7%	959	10.6%
Law-Related Education	378	3.7%	325	3.2%	360	4.0%
Restitution/Restorative Justice	188	1.8%	145	1.4%	224	2.5%
Shoplifting/Larceny Reduction	156	1.5%	177	1.7%	200	2.2%
Competency Development	2,288	22.4%	2,320	22.8%	2,279	25.1%
Anger Management	572	5.6%	674	6.6%	778	8.6%
Assessment/Evaluations	15	0.1%	27	0.3%	53	0.6%
Clinical Services	83	0.8%	91	0.9%	103	1.1%
Employment/Vocational	55	0.5%	48	0.5%	22	0.2%
Gang Intervention	16	0.2%	40	0.4%	2	0.0%
Life Skills	98	1.0%	87	0.9%	73	0.8%
Mentoring	130	1.3%	122	1.2%	176	1.9%
Parenting Skills	66	0.6%	57	0.6%	26	0.3%
Prevention	0	0.0%	6	0.1%	0	0.0%
Pro-Social Skills/Activities	516	5.0%	530	5.2%	482	5.3%
Sex Offender Education/Treatment	6	0.1%	6	0.1%	2	0.0%
Substance Use Education/Treatment	648	6.3%	563	5.5%	484	5.3%
Truancy Intervention	83	0.8%	69	0.7%	78	0.9%
Group Homes	35	0.3%	49	0.5%	41	0.5%
Individually Purchased Services	362	3.5%	387	3.8%	276	3.0%
Public Safety	5,315	52.0%	5,396	53.0%	4,736	52.2%
Crisis Intervention/Shelter Care	478	4.7%	586	5.8%	493	5.4%
Intensive Supervision	61	0.6%	77	0.8%	64	0.7%
Outreach/Electronic Monitoring	4,776	46.7%	4,733	46.4%	4,179	46.0%
Total Placements	10,220	100.0%	10,190	100.0%	9,075	100.0%


* Data are not comparable to reports prior to FY 2023 due to service recategorization. For example, anger management programs and pro-social skills/activities were a combined category prior to FY 2023 but are separate service types as of FY 2023.

* As of FY 2024, detention alternatives such as shelter care, outreach, and electronic monitoring are separated by dispositional status but are combined in this table.

- » VJCCCA programs had 9,075 total placements during FY 2025, a decrease of 11.2% from FY 2023.
- » From FY 2023 to FY 2025, "Public Safety" had the highest percentage (52.0-53.0%) of placements out of all service categories.
- » From FY 2023 to FY 2025, "Outreach/Electronic Monitoring" had the highest percentage (46.0-46.7%) and "Community Service" had the second-highest percentage (10.6-14.7%) of placements out of all service types.



Expenditures, FY 2025




- » Localities paid 50.2% of the total expenditures for VJCCCA programs. Of the total local expenditures, 57.6% were MOE, and 42.4% were additional funds.
- » VJCCCA funded the equivalent of 158.1 staff positions in FY 2025.

Youth Demographics, FY 2023-2025

Demographics	2023	2024	2025
Race			
Asian	0.9%	0.7%	0.9%
Black	45.5%	45.1%	47.6%
White	45.3%	44.2%	43.4%
Other/Unknown	8.3%	10.0%	8.1%
Ethnicity			
Hispanic	12.3%	13.2%	12.5%
Non-Hispanic	64.5%	64.0%	65.6%
Unknown/Missing	23.2%	22.9%	22.0%
Sex			
Female	33.0%	32.3%	31.6%
Male	67.0%	67.7%	68.4%
Age			
8-10	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%
11-12	5.3%	5.3%	5.8%
13	8.9%	8.5%	9.0%
14	15.5%	15.9%	15.1%
15	20.9%	21.8%	20.4%
16	23.4%	23.2%	23.4%
17	22.4%	21.8%	22.7%
18-20	3.1%	3.1%	3.0%
Missing	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%
Total Youth	6,430	6,554	5,755

- » 47.6% of youth placed in VJCCCA programs in FY 2025 were Black, and 43.4% were White.
- » 65.6% of youth placed in VJCCCA programs in FY 2025 were non-Hispanic, and 12.5% were Hispanic. 22.0% had unknown or missing ethnicity information.
- » 68.4% of youth placed in VJCCCA programs in FY 2025 were male, and 31.6% were female.
- » Approximately two-thirds (66.6-66.8%) of youth placed in VJCCCA programs since FY 2023 were between 15 and 17 years of age.
- » The average age of youth placed in VJCCCA programs in FY 2025 was 15.7 years.

Completion by Status, FY 2025*



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

- » 8,995 services were closed.
- » 84.9% completed the services satisfactorily.

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 regulatory agency for 24 JDCs operated by local governments or multijurisdictional commissions. JDCs provide temporary care for youth in secure custody pending a court appearance (pre-D) and those held after disposition (post-D). Educational instruction is required within 24 hours of detainment (or the next school day) and is provided by licensed staff funded by VDOE's Division of State Operated Programs and contracted through a local school division. In addition to attending school while in a JDC, youth participate in a structured program of care, which includes medical and mental health screenings and services, recreational and psycho-educational activities, visitation, and volunteer services (e.g., services provided by religious organizations). The map on page 38 shows the area served by each JDC in FY 2025.


Each JDC provides pre-D detention, which can be ordered by a judge, intake officer, or magistrate. (See page 7 for pre-D detention eligibility criteria.) Intake officers use the DAI to make detention decisions. (See Appendix C.) All JDCs also provide post-D detention without programs, typically for up to 30 days, while some JDCs provide post-D detention with programs for up to six months 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, the CSU, and the youth's family, sometimes including local mental health and social services agencies. Individualized services such as anger management, substance use treatment, life skills, career-readiness education, and classes on victim empathy are provided to meet youth's needs. As of June 30, 2025, 219 of the 1,380 certified JDC beds were certified to facilitate post-D detention with programs.

JDC-Based Direct Care Placements

Some JDCs also provide direct care placement options. Nineteen JDCs partner with DJJ to facilitate the admission and evaluation process for youth in direct care, which includes medical and mental health assessments, behavioral reports, and education information. As of June 30, 2025, six JDCs contract with DJJ to operate CPPs, which are evidence-informed residential programs for youth in direct care with dedicated JDC staff to provide services. Seven JDCs contract with DJJ to operate IBPs, which utilize outsourced service providers through the RSC model to ensure treatment completion for youth in direct care. Five JDCs operate detention reentry programs, which allow youth in direct care to transition back to the community 30 to 180 days before release. Youth in direct care admission and evaluation, CPPs, IBPs, detention reentry, or individually purchased JDC

beds are counted in the direct care population despite being housed in JDCs. In FY 2025, the direct care ADP in JDC facilities was 137 youth. See the graphic below for an outline of detention and direct care placement types in JDCs. This section contains detention data for JDCs; see pages 49-58 for data on direct care, which are not reported here.

JDC Offerings



JDC Detention 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 B.) Statuses are counted for each new status or status change. One detainment may have multiple dispositional statuses; therefore, the total number of dispositional statuses is higher than the total number of detainments.

Individual offenses from a single intake case are associated with a detainment. Any changes to these offenses after intake (e.g., nolle prosequi, amended) or additional intake cases may not be reflected in the data, resulting in possible inaccuracies in the offense data for post-D detention. (See page 41 for detaining MSO data for pre-D detention.)



JDCs by Area Served*



* Some localities utilize multiple JDCs. The localities served are determined by the highest number of detainments in FY 2025.

* Culpeper County is served by Blue Ridge JDC; Emporia is served by Crater JDC; Galax is served by Highlands JDC; Franklin City, Isle of Wight, Portsmouth, Southampton, and Suffolk are served by Merrimac JDC.

Offerings by JDC, FY 2025*

JDC	Post-D (Programs)	Admission & Evaluation	Direct Care		Detention Reentry
			CPP	IBP	
Blue Ridge	X	X	X		X
Chesapeake	X				
Chesterfield	X	X	X	X	
Crater		X		X	
Fairfax	X	X			
Henrico					
Highlands	X	X		X	
James River	X	X			
Loudoun	X				
Lynchburg	X				
Merrimac	X	X		X	
New River Valley	X				
Newport News	X	X	X		
Norfolk	X	X			X
Northern Virginia	X	X		X	
Northwestern	X	X			
Piedmont		X		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		
W. W. Moore, Jr.	X	X			
Total	19	19	6	7	5

* All JDCs offer pre-D detention, post-D detention without programs, and other routine detention services. Individually purchased JDC beds may also be provided at any JDC.

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




Detention Demographics, FY 2025*

Demographics	Pre-D	Post-D (No Programs)	Post-D (Programs)	Total Detainments
Race				
Asian	0.9%	0.7%	0.6%	0.8%
Black	56.1%	36.1%	59.6%	53.4%
White	34.9%	51.2%	31.4%	37.2%
Other/Unknown	8.0%	12.0%	8.3%	8.6%
Ethnicity				
Hispanic	14.4%	14.0%	17.3%	14.4%
Non-Hispanic	74.4%	64.0%	78.2%	72.9%
Unknown/Missing	11.1%	22.0%	4.5%	12.6%
Sex				
Female	24.8%	31.9%	12.8%	25.4%
Male	75.2%	68.1%	87.2%	74.6%
Age				
8-12	4.1%	0.9%	0.0%	3.7%
13	8.1%	3.4%	1.9%	7.5%
14	14.5%	13.2%	14.7%	14.2%
15	21.2%	21.0%	26.9%	21.2%
16	25.5%	29.1%	30.1%	26.0%
17	26.3%	31.8%	26.3%	27.1%
18-20	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.2%
Missing	0.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%
Total	5,511	853	156	6,354

* 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 56.1% of youth with pre-D detention statuses, 36.1% of youth with statuses for post-D detention without programs, and 59.6% of youth with statuses for post-D detention with programs.
- » White youth represented 34.9% of youth with pre-D detention statuses, 51.2% of youth with statuses for post-D detention without programs, and 31.4% of youth with statuses for post-D detention with programs.
- » The average age at detainment was 15.9 years.
- » The average ages by detention status were as follows:
 - › Pre-D detention – 15.9 years
 - › Post-D detention without programs – 16.2 years
 - › Post-D detention with programs – 16.3 years

Detainments, FY 2023-2025



- » Detainments increased 8.6% from FY 2023 to FY 2025.
- » In FY 2025, there were 29 weekend detainments, which may include multiple weekend stays as part of a single detainment.

Capacity and ADP, FY 2023-2025*



* 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 2023-2025*


DAI Scores	2023	2024	2025
0-9 (Release)	26.1%	28.3%	24.5%
10-14 (Detention Alternative)	18.3%	17.5%	17.2%
15+ (Secure Detention)	50.9%	49.6%	53.3%
Missing	4.8%	4.7%	5.0%
Total Detainments	4,547	5,044	4,788

* 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 2025, 53.3% had a DAI score indicating secure detention.
- » In FY 2025, of the youth who were detained in non-judge-ordered pre-D detention and received a DAI score of 14 or less, 27.4% had mandatory overrides. (See Appendix C.)




Detention Dispositional Statuses, FY 2025*



* Youth with dispositional status changes during their detention are included more than once, as they are counted in each dispositional status.

- » 81.3% of dispositional statuses were pre-D detention.
- » 12.6% of dispositional statuses were post-D detention without programs, and 2.3% were post-D detention with programs.
- » 3.8% of dispositional statuses were other statuses. (See Appendix B.)


ADP by Dispositional Status, FY 2025



- » Pre-D detention had the highest ADP (366).
- » Post-D detention without programs had the lowest ADP (25).

Post-D detention with programs had the longest average LOS (151.4 days) and the fewest releases (152).

Average LOS (Days) by Dispositional Status, FY 2025 Releases*



- » Post-D detention with programs had the longest average LOS (151.4 days) and the fewest releases (152).
- » Pre-D detention had an average LOS of 24.8 days and the most releases (5,525).
- » Post-D detention without programs had the shortest average LOS (12.7 days).
- » See page 41 for more details on pre-D detention LOSs.

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



Pre-D Detention Statuses by MSO Category, FY 2025*

MSO Category	Felony	Misdemeanor	Total
Delinquent			
Alcohol	N/A	0.5%	0.1%
Arson	2.7%	1.7%	1.7%
Assault	23.9%	42.0%	20.3%
Burglary	6.6%	N/A	3.3%
Disorderly Conduct	N/A	0.4%	0.1%
Escapes	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Extortion	8.7%	2.5%	4.9%
Fraud	1.7%	0.5%	1.0%
Gangs	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
Kidnapping	1.8%	0.0%	0.9%
Larceny	19.3%	5.1%	10.7%
Marijuana	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Murder	1.1%	N/A	0.5%
Narcotics	2.3%	0.2%	1.2%
Obscenity	3.2%	0.3%	1.7%
Obstruction of Justice	1.1%	3.9%	1.3%
Robbery	12.8%	N/A	6.5%
Sexual Abuse	3.8%	0.5%	2.0%
Sexual Offense	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%
Trespass	0.0%	1.3%	0.3%
Vandalism	2.5%	4.7%	2.2%
Weapons	3.1%	27.1%	6.8%
Other	1.4%	2.0%	2.3%
Technical			
Contempt of Court	N/A	N/A	13.2%
Failure to Appear	0.3%	5.6%	1.3%
Parole Violation	N/A	N/A	0.3%
Probation Violation	N/A	N/A	12.4%
Traffic			
Traffic	3.3%	1.7%	2.0%
Status/Other			
CHINS	N/A	N/A	0.5%
CHINSup	N/A	N/A	0.7%
Marijuana	N/A	N/A	0.0%
Other	N/A	N/A	0.0%
Total Pre-D Statuses	2,786	1,074	5,511

* "Total" includes felonies, misdemeanors, other, and missing offenses; therefore, the sum of felonies and misdemeanors may not equal the total.


* N/A indicates an offense severity (e.g., felony, misdemeanor) that is not pre-D detention eligible.

* See the first three caveats on page 23 (bottom right) for explanations of offense category data.

- » 68.1% of pre-D detention statuses were for delinquent offenses, 27.3% were for technical offenses, 2.0% were for traffic offenses, and 1.3% were for status or other offenses. 1.4% of pre-D detention statuses were missing offense information.
- » Assault (20.3%), contempt of court (13.2%), and probation violations (12.4%) were the most common offenses among pre-D detention statuses.
 - › Assault (23.9%) and larceny (19.3%) were the most common offenses among felony pre-D detention statuses.
 - › Assault (42.0%) and weapons (27.1%) were the most common offenses among misdemeanor pre-D detention statuses.

Pre-D detention constituted the majority of both ADP (73.3%) and detention statuses (81.3%).

Pre-D Detention LOS Distribution (Days), FY 2025 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.

- » There were 5,525 pre-D detention releases.
- » Over one-third of youth (36.3%) in pre-D detention had an LOS between zero and three days while a similar proportion (33.4%) had an LOS between four and 21 days.



Summary by JDC

Detainments and DAI Scores at Detainment, FY 2025*

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	91	13.8%	20.7%	57.5%	8.0%	87
Chesapeake	130	9.6%	12.8%	77.7%	0.0%	94
Chesterfield	287	16.8%	15.2%	67.9%	0.0%	184
Crater	157	28.0%	13.6%	56.1%	2.3%	132
Fairfax	417	14.1%	20.5%	64.4%	1.1%	376
Henrico	365	28.0%	10.7%	52.4%	8.9%	271
Highlands	198	20.2%	23.3%	51.2%	5.4%	129
James River	92	25.7%	9.5%	59.5%	5.4%	74
Loudoun	122	23.5%	24.3%	47.8%	4.3%	115
Lynchburg	236	36.8%	14.5%	45.1%	3.6%	193
Merrimac	470	31.4%	13.7%	50.9%	4.1%	344
New River Valley	132	21.6%	24.7%	49.5%	4.1%	97
Newport News	485	20.1%	19.2%	50.9%	9.8%	328
Norfolk	308	32.1%	21.8%	43.9%	2.3%	262
Northern Virginia	359	31.6%	12.5%	44.1%	11.9%	345
Northwestern	314	26.9%	20.8%	48.5%	3.8%	130
Piedmont	121	21.6%	16.2%	58.1%	4.1%	74
Prince William	318	16.3%	13.2%	66.9%	3.5%	257
Rappahannock	390	24.0%	14.2%	53.5%	8.3%	325
Richmond	189	25.3%	15.8%	55.7%	3.2%	158
Roanoke Valley	365	29.3%	20.5%	44.7%	5.6%	215
Shenandoah Valley	279	36.0%	19.2%	43.6%	1.2%	172
Virginia Beach	311	20.6%	26.3%	49.2%	3.8%	262
W. W. Moore, Jr.	218	20.1%	14.0%	59.8%	6.1%	164
<i>Total Detainments</i>	<i>6,354</i>	<i>24.5%</i>	<i>17.2%</i>	<i>53.3%</i>	<i>5.0%</i>	<i>4,788</i>

* The sum of detainments for “Pre-D Non-Judge-Ordered Only” by JDC may not equal “Total Detainments” due to differences in facility movements and detainments.

» Of the youth who were detained in non-judge-ordered pre-D detention in FY 2025, 53.3% statewide had a DAI score indicating secure detention, varying by facility (43.6-77.7%).



Capacity and ADP, FY 2025*

JDC	Certified Capacity	ADP by Dispositional Status				Total ADP
		Pre-D	Post-D (No Programs)	Post-D (Programs)	Other	
Blue Ridge	40	8	0	2	0	10
Chesapeake	35	9	1	0	3	13
Chesterfield	90	15	0	4	2	21
Crater	22	13	0	N/A	1	14
Fairfax	121	16	1	3	0	20
Henrico	20	14	0	0	0	14
Highlands	35	9	2	2	0	13
James River	60	21	1	12	2	35
Loudoun	24	3	1	0	0	3
Lynchburg	48	16	1	1	1	19
Merrimac	48	25	3	0	1	29
New River Valley	24	6	0	6	0	13
Newport News	110	33	3	11	8	55
Norfolk	80	16	2	4	4	26
Northern Virginia	70	23	0	0	0	23
Northwestern	32	6	4	0	1	11
Piedmont	20	8	1	N/A	0	10
Prince William	72	21	1	N/A	1	23
Rappahannock	80	24	1	7	2	34
Richmond	60	12	0	5	9	26
Roanoke Valley	81	14	1	3	2	20
Shenandoah Valley	58	13	1	N/A	0	15
Virginia Beach	90	27	1	2	3	33
W. W. Moore, Jr.	60	16	1	0	3	20
<i>Total</i>	<i>1,380</i>	<i>366</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>499</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, detainments, and 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 0.2 is reported due to temporary transfers from another JDC.

- » JDCs consistently operate below certified capacity.
- » Pre-D detention had the highest ADP (366).
- » Post-D detention without programs had the lowest ADP (25).



Direct Care

DJJ uses multiple placement options for youth in direct care. As of June 30, 2025, DJJ operates one JCC (Bon Air JCC) with an operating capacity of 208 beds. An additional 67 beds are available in six CPPs. Some JDCs also house youth for admission and evaluation services, IBPs, individually purchased JDC beds, and detention reentry. Youth in direct care also may be placed in other contracted alternatives. DJJ implements direct care programs to ensure committed youth receive effective treatment and educational services.

Admission and Evaluation

The CAP Unit receives and reviews all commitment documentation and oversees the admission and orientation process. The BAU coordinates evaluations for youth admitted to direct care. All youth are evaluated at either the JCC or a JDC. The process includes medical, psychological, behavioral, educational, and career-readiness assessments. A team meets to discuss and identify treatment and mental health needs, determine projected LOS, recommend placement, and develop the CRCP.

Depending on a youth's individual needs, the youth may be assigned to one or more treatment programs, including aggression management, substance use, 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 seek to promote accountability and rehabilitation of indeterminately committed youth by combining data-driven decision making with an analysis of the youth's individualized therapeutic, educational, vocational, and behavioral needs. They provide a baseline for estimating the youth's LOS and build in an enhanced review and evaluation process that considers additional eligibility requirements for release. The goal is to ensure that indeterminately committed youth have obtained the skills and resources needed for successful reentry into the community.

The current LOS Guidelines took effect on March 1, 2023, and apply to youth committed on or after that date. (See Appendix D.) The assigned LOS for an indeterminate commitment is a calculated range of time (e.g., 6-9

months) from the 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.

Indeterminately committed youth 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, the youth receives a treatment override and is not assigned a projected LOS. Youth with 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 and may be required to complete those treatment programs, achieve educational and workforce-development goals, and avoid certain behavioral infractions during established timeframes to meet release eligibility criteria. Under some circumstances, the director may approve requests for release in special decision cases based on recommendations from the CCRC and unique circumstances such as medical hardship or an LOS treatment override.

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 vulnerability, treatment needs, and other factors. In addition, some designated units house youth with significant needs involving mental health, low intellectual functioning, poor adaptive functioning, or individual vulnerabilities that hinder their ability to function in other units adequately and safely.

Case management and treatment staff collaborate to coordinate and deliver services for youth based on risk and treatment needs. Staff facilitate groups and address individual needs. Progress is assessed and reviewed monthly via multidisciplinary treatment team meetings. Staff also work with CSUs and the Reentry Unit to develop a transition and parole plan for reentry. BSU, Health Services, Programming, Food Services, Case Management, Security, and Maintenance support JCC operations. DJJ provides educational and career-readiness services to meet the needs of youth in direct care. Residents also engage in extracurricular programming that develops leadership and life skills by providing real-world opportunities and connections. Opportunities include recreational services, community service activities, religious and mentoring services, incentive opportunities and events offered through PBIS, and a gang violence intervention program.



DJJ focuses on family engagement during a youth's direct care stay. 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 Assisting Families of Inmates to provide free transportation to families with youth at Bon Air JCC from various sites across the Commonwealth.

Facility-Wide PBIS

In FY 2018, DJJ educational staff began implementing PBIS, an evidence-based tiered framework that helps build protective factors for youth using universal, targeted, and intensive supports. In FY 2024, PBIS was launched facility-wide at Bon Air JCC.

PBIS encourages systematic teaching of universal behavioral expectations, positive reinforcement systems for staff and youth, and function-based responses to problem behavior. Behavioral expectations that are aligned with DJJ's four guiding values are taught directly and reinforced through immediate feedback, therapeutic structured activities, mutual help groups, check-ins, and circle-ups. (See page 2 for more information on DJJ's guiding values.)

Education

DJJ 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. Offerings include an array of high school completion routes, such as an Advanced Studies Diploma, Standard Diploma, Applied Studies Diploma, or GED®. DJJ also offers apprenticeships and 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 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, DJJ uses a blended learning model to meet the unique needs of the students. This model is a combination of direct instruction, online modules, and hands-on learning activities. Teachers provide instruction aligned with the SOL and actively track students' progress.

DJJ offers CTE courses as well as applicable certification and credentialing opportunities. These offerings prepare youth for employment while simultaneously

meeting the Commonwealth's need for well-trained and industry-certified technical workers. For example, NCCER credentials are industry-recognized trade and construction credentials that allow emerging and experienced professionals to demonstrate the skills critical for success in the industry. Additionally, the W!SE Certified Financial Literacy credential is aligned with VDOE's personal finance course requirement.

DJJ 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. Practices are subject to continuous progress evaluation to enable educators to make evidence-based instructional decisions for students within the facility-wide PBIS framework. Academically, focus remains on strengthening core instruction of Tier 1 RTI, which is the process of monitoring effective, high-quality instruction and the systematic responses to students' needs.

A higher proportion of students at Bon Air JCC (33-40%) receive special education compared to students in Virginia public schools (12-14%). 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 students connect to post-secondary programming, explore career options, and prepare for reentry into the community. Student support services are also available in the areas of English language, gifted education, and reading.

Post-Secondary and Workforce Development

DJJ provides opportunities for youth to continue learning through post-secondary education and programming. Post-secondary courses are geared toward the attainment of industry certifications, state board licenses, or the completion of college programs. While youth are in direct care at Bon Air JCC, DJJ provides opportunities to enroll in college courses and to earn credentials in skilled trades that are in high demand, including carpentry, electrical services, HVACR, and plumbing.

In addition to credentialing opportunities, DJJ supports career readiness for youth in several ways, including a Workforce Development Center at Bon Air JCC to teach



soft skills, build employment portfolios, and connect youth to employment opportunities in the community once released. DJJ also collaborates with employers to build curriculums that meet employers' needs, create opportunities for interviews and internships, and help connect youth to meaningful careers at release. Job-readiness and employment coaching are also provided.

DJJ maintains partnerships with JDCs to provide program funding for post-secondary direct care youth to support technology needs, online courses, college enrollment, and certificate and credentialing opportunities. Youth in some JDC-based placements may earn credentials in construction, welding, and C-Tech programming, which offers certification in the areas of telecommunications, network cabling, and grounding and bonding.

BSU

BSU is the organizational unit responsible for providing clinical treatment services for youth at Bon Air JCC. The primary services provided by BSU staff include treatment for mental health issues, aggression management, substance use, and sex offending, as well as prerelease risk assessments.

Aggression Management Treatment: aggression management treatment services are provided 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 daily interactions. Treatment typically lasts three months; however, time to completion may vary depending on individual needs. 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 Use Treatment: cognitive-behavioral substance use treatment services are provided to all youth with an identified treatment need. Track I is for youth meeting DSM criteria for substance use disorder. Track II is for youth who have experimented with substances but do not meet the DSM criteria for substance use disorder. Bon Air JCC offers the CYT substance use program to address marijuana and alcohol use. The Seven Challenges®, a comprehensive counseling program that addresses both substance use and underlying issues, is

also being delivered to residents with more significant substance use patterns, including opioids or polysubstance use. Bon Air JCC also offers Voices, a gender-specific program for girls, which addresses substance use as well as issues with self, relationships, life choices, and coping skills, among other topics. Depending on individual needs, completion of substance use 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. Three levels of treatment include 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. All youth in sex offender treatment units receive individualized intensive treatment from specially trained therapists as part of a specialized multidisciplinary treatment team. 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 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, 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 a residential placement to the community.

Health Services

The Health Services Unit provides quality healthcare services to youth in the JCC. DJJ employs medical and dental providers who provide assessment and treatment services as well as care for 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 makes detection and prevention of sexual abuse and sexual harassment a top priority in all facilities housing committed youth. The PREA Unit consists of an agency PREA coordinator, facility PREA compliance 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, reporting mechanisms, and maintaining professional boundaries. 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 staffed by human rights coordinators is in place at the JCC as a safeguard for youth and to provide a strong system of advocacy. 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. Human rights coordinators also serve as impartial and objective staff who conduct due process hearings for youth alleged to have committed an institutional infraction. The human rights coordinators operate independently from residential programs to provide youth with a resource to address concerns.

JDC Direct Care Placement Options

Some youth in direct care may be placed at a JDC (e.g., CPPs, IBPs, detention reentry). CPPs are structured residential programs operated in local JDCs for direct care youth. 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 increasing competency in the areas of education, vocational preparation, life and social skills, thinking skills, employability skills, and anger management. CPPs use the 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 use treatment services. Youth in CPPs are housed in units separate from the JDC population. As of June 30, 2025, the six participating JDCs were Blue Ridge, Chesterfield, Newport News, Prince William, Shenandoah Valley, and Virginia Beach. Prince William CPP closed to youth on July 2, 2025.

IBPs are individualized residential programs operated in local JDCs for direct care youth. IBPs provide case management services, general facility programming, and educational services. The YASI is used for case planning, and services are contracted through the RSC model to meet each youth's individualized treatment needs and CRCP. As of June 30, 2025, the seven participating JDCs were Chesterfield, Crater, Highlands, Merrimac, Northern Virginia, Piedmont, and Rappahannock. Additionally, individual beds may be purchased at any JDC on an as-needed basis.

Additionally, some JDCs provide detention reentry programs for youth in direct care, allowing them to begin transitioning back to the community 30 to 180 days before 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. As of June 30, 2025, the five participating JDCs were Blue Ridge, Norfolk, Rappahannock, Richmond, and Shenandoah Valley.

The CAP Unit maintains a variety of case management responsibilities for direct care youth in JDCs. The CAP Unit acts as a liaison between the JDCs and DJJ staff such as the youth's PO. Although youth in direct care admission and evaluation, CPPs, IBPs, individually purchased JDC beds, and detention reentry are housed in JDCs, they are counted in the direct care population and not in the JDC population.

Continuum of Services

While the JCC and JDC-based alternatives provide secure placement options for youth in direct care, the broader continuum of services includes additional contracted secure and nonsecure placement options, such as therapeutic group homes and RTCs that are available through the RSC model. The CAP Unit maintains case management responsibilities for youth in these place-



ments and acts as a liaison between the placements and DJJ. (See page 19 for more information about the continuum of services and the RSC model.)

Reentry

Reentry staff, including the Family Engagement Unit, assist youth and their families in preparing for the transition from direct care to the community. Reentry advocates, each serving one of the six regions across the Commonwealth, help develop and implement a comprehensive and collaborative reentry plan and support the transition of youth back to the community. Advocates provide support and guidance in the areas of employment, education and career planning, connection to human service agencies, and obtaining identification documents. Prerelease services are initiated six to nine months prior to release and typically include therapy, life skills, and mentorship.

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:

Dominion Energy: DJJ partners with Dominion Energy to provide employment opportunities for youth who complete a trades program.

Network Industries: DJJ partners with Network Industries to provide employment opportunities for youth in the maritime industry.

DMV Connect: if 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 the 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. Through this partnership, DJJ's reentry advocates 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 of age and older to 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.

Fostering Futures: DJJ and DSS have an MOA to serve youth who were in foster care immediately prior to their commitment. Youth who age out of foster care while in direct care are enrolled in the Fostering Futures program, which provides independent living resources to support youth over the age of 18 as they return to the community.

Assisting Families of Inmates: through Assisting Families of Inmates, youth are offered funds to address transition service gaps that cannot be met by DJJ. Funding may be used to help youth maintain their physical and mental health by paying for prescriptions, medical care, and health insurance co-pays. Funding also may be used to support educational goals, purchase equipment or transportation, and meet other reentry needs.


QA Unit

The QA Unit monitors the integrity and success of internal initiatives and contracted interventions, including the implementation of FOCUS; the RSC model; Bon Air JCC; and JDCs that provide direct care admission and evaluation services, CPPs, IBPs, and detention reentry programs. The unit provides oversight and comprehensive reviews, assessments, and reports regarding fidelity to evidence-based models and compliance with contract requirements. Using a collaborative approach, the QA Unit conducts strengths-based performance monitoring, provides coaching and technical assistance, and assists in developing individualized CQI plans to ensure programs align with best practices, the RNR model, and DJJ's guiding values. The 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 improvements across DJJ. The QA Unit is also the designated DJJ liaison to all JDCs and provides technical assistance to Bon Air JCC.

The QA Unit uses SPEP™ as an evaluative tool to establish sustainable quality service delivery, improve performance, and optimize youth outcomes. In partnership with Vanderbilt University, QA Unit staff have attained Level II SPEP™ Trainer certification and actively train Level I SPEP™ specialists. The QA SPEP™ teams have partnered with Bon Air JCC, CPPs, and the Rappahannock Area Office on Youth to evaluate services and provide recommendations for optimizing services for youth. The QA Unit is currently developing a plan for implementing SPEP™ with community providers.




Commitments by Locality, FY 2025*



* CSU 22 had one subsequent commitment in FY 2025; this commitment is excluded.

- » There were 185 commitments in FY 2025.
- » The city of Richmond had the highest number of commitments (16).
- » 82 of 133 localities (61.7%) had no commitments.

Capacity, ADP, Admissions, and Releases, FY 2016-2025*



* Capacities are determined on the last day of the FY. Admission and evaluation in JDCs, IBPs, individually purchased JDC beds, detention reentry, and contracted alternatives do not have reported capacity as there are no dedicated beds.

* 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.

- » Capacity decreased 52.9% between FY 2016 and FY 2025 due primarily to facility closures.
- » ADP decreased 21.7% between FY 2016 and FY 2025. (See page 50 for capacity and ADP by facility.)
- » Admissions decreased 45.8% between FY 2016 and FY 2025.
- » Releases decreased 62.0% between FY 2016 and FY 2025.



Capacity and ADP, FY 2025*

Facility/Placement	Capacity	ADP
Bon Air JCC	208	172
Adm./Eval. in JDCs	N/A	55
CPPs	67	58
Blue Ridge	8	7
Chesterfield	8	7
Newport News	8	8
Prince William	8	6
Shenandoah Valley	10	10
Virginia Beach	20	19
Contracted Alternatives	N/A	8
Detention Reentry	N/A	0
Individual JDC Beds	N/A	24
<i>Total</i>	<i>275</i>	<i>317</i>

* Capacities are determined on the last day of the FY. Admission and evaluation in JDCs, IBPs, individually purchased JDC beds, detention reentry, and contracted alternatives do not have reported capacity as there are no dedicated beds.

* IBPs and individually purchased JDC beds are included in "Individual JDC Beds."

* ADPs may not add to totals due to rounding.

* 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.

* Prince William CPP closed to youth on July 2, 2025.

- » The ADP in FY 2025 was 317 youth.
- » In FY 2025, 54.3% of the direct care ADP was in the JCC, 18.2% was in a CPP, and 27.5% was in another alternative placement.

Admissions with Prior Successful Diversion Plans, Probation Placements, or Direct Care Admissions, FY 2023-2025*

	2023	2024	2025
Prior Successful Diversion Plans	17.4%	24.0%	14.5%
Prior Probation Placements	67.4%	66.7%	63.6%
Prior Direct Care Admissions	10.1%	5.9%	3.5%
<i>Total Admissions</i>	<i>178</i>	<i>204</i>	<i>173</i>

* 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.

- » 14.5% of admissions in FY 2025 had at least one prior successful diversion plan.
- » 63.6% of admissions in FY 2025 had at least one prior probation placement.
- » 3.5% of admissions in FY 2025 had at least one prior direct care admission, a substantial decrease since FY 2023.

In FY 2025, 54.3% of the direct care ADP was in the JCC, 18.2% was in a CPP, and 27.5% was in another alternative placement.

Admission Demographics, FY 2023-2025

Demographics	2023	2024	2025
Race			
Asian	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
Black	64.6%	72.1%	65.3%
White	24.2%	22.1%	23.1%
Other/Unknown	11.2%	5.9%	11.0%
Ethnicity			
Hispanic	13.5%	11.8%	11.6%
Non-Hispanic	79.2%	81.4%	78.0%
Unknown/Missing	7.3%	6.9%	10.4%
Sex			
Female	7.9%	6.9%	5.8%
Male	92.1%	93.1%	94.2%
Age			
Under 14	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
14	5.6%	2.9%	3.5%
15	15.2%	16.7%	8.1%
16	24.2%	30.4%	22.5%
17	38.8%	35.8%	39.9%
18	14.6%	11.3%	17.3%
19-20	1.7%	2.9%	6.9%
<i>Total Admissions</i>	<i>178</i>	<i>204</i>	<i>173</i>

- » 65.3% of admissions in FY 2025 were Black, and 23.1% were White.
- » 78.0% of admissions in FY 2025 were non-Hispanic, and 11.6% were Hispanic. 10.4% had unknown or missing ethnicity information.
- » 94.2% of admissions in FY 2025 were male, and 5.8% were female.
- » Approximately two-thirds (62.4-66.2%) of admissions since FY 2023 were 16 or 17 years of age.
- » The average age of youth admitted in FY 2025 was 17.3 years.



Admission Demographics by Commitment Type and Committing Court Type, FY 2025*

Demographics	Commitment Type		Committing Court Type	
	Determinate/ Blended	Indeterminate	J&DR District Court	Circuit Court
Race				
Asian	0.0%	0.9%	0.8%	0.0%
Black	71.9%	62.1%	65.3%	65.4%
White	21.1%	24.1%	21.5%	26.9%
Other/Unknown	7.0%	12.9%	12.4%	7.7%
Ethnicity				
Hispanic	12.3%	11.2%	13.2%	7.7%
Non-Hispanic	75.4%	79.3%	75.2%	84.6%
Unknown/Missing	12.3%	9.5%	11.6%	7.7%
Sex				
Female	1.8%	7.8%	5.8%	5.8%
Male	98.2%	92.2%	94.2%	94.2%
Age				
Under 14	N/A	2.6%	2.5%	N/A
14	0.0%	5.2%	5.0%	0.0%
15	1.8%	11.2%	9.9%	3.8%
16	17.5%	25.0%	28.1%	9.6%
17	38.6%	40.5%	38.8%	42.3%
18	28.1%	12.1%	10.7%	32.7%
19-20	14.0%	3.4%	5.0%	11.5%
<i>Total Admissions</i>	<i>57</i>	<i>116</i>	<i>121</i>	<i>52</i>

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

* Youth committed by a J&DR district court with the commitment upheld in circuit court on appeal are included in "J&DR District Court." There were two youth committed by a J&DR district court with the commitment upheld in circuit court on appeal in FY 2025.

- » 32.9% of admissions were for determinate commitments or blended sentences, and 67.1% were for indeterminate commitments.
- » 69.9% of admissions were committed by a J&DR district court and 30.1% by a circuit court.
- » The average ages at admission by commitment type were as follows:
 - › Determinate/Blended – 17.9 years
 - › Indeterminate – 17.0 years
- » The average ages at admission by committing court type were as follows:
 - › J&DR district court – 17.0 years
 - › Circuit court – 17.9 years



Admissions by Committing MSO Category, FY 2025*

MSO Category	Det./Blend.	Indeterminate			Overall		
	Felony	Felony	Misd.	Total	Felony	Misd.	Total
Arson	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%	0.0%	0.6%
Assault	29.8%	14.4%	80.0%	17.2%	19.6%	80.0%	21.4%
Burglary	5.3%	8.1%	N/A	7.8%	7.1%	N/A	6.9%
Extortion	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%	0.0%	0.6%
Fraud	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	6.0%	4.2%	0.0%	4.0%
Kidnapping	1.8%	2.7%	0.0%	2.6%	2.4%	0.0%	2.3%
Larceny	1.8%	18.9%	0.0%	18.1%	13.1%	0.0%	12.7%
Murder	21.1%	1.8%	N/A	1.7%	8.3%	N/A	8.1%
Narcotics	1.8%	1.8%	0.0%	1.7%	1.8%	0.0%	1.7%
Obscenity	1.8%	1.8%	0.0%	1.7%	1.8%	0.0%	1.7%
Obstruction of Justice	0.0%	2.7%	20.0%	3.4%	1.8%	20.0%	2.3%
Robbery	22.8%	21.6%	N/A	20.7%	22.0%	N/A	21.4%
Sexual Abuse	8.8%	9.0%	0.0%	8.6%	8.9%	0.0%	8.7%
Sexual Offense	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.6%
Traffic	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	1.7%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%
Vandalism	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	2.6%	1.8%	0.0%	1.7%
Weapons	3.5%	2.7%	0.0%	2.6%	3.0%	0.0%	2.9%
Other	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	1.7%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%
Total Admissions	57	111	5	116	168	5	173

* 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.

- » The majority of total admissions (97.1%) were for felonies; 2.9% were for misdemeanors.
- » The highest percentage of total admissions were for assault (21.4%) and robbery (21.4%).
- » 67.1% of admissions were for indeterminate commitments.
 - › The majority of admissions for indeterminate commitments were for felonies (95.7%); 4.3% were for misdemeanors.
 - › The highest percentage of admissions for indeterminate commitments were for robbery (20.7%), larceny (18.1%), and assault (17.2%).
- » 32.9% of total admissions were for determinate commitments or blended sentences.
 - › The highest percentage of admissions for determinate commitments or blended sentences were for assault (29.8%), robbery (22.8%), and murder (21.1%).



Admissions by Committing MSO, FY 2025*

MSO Severity	Determinate/ Blended	Indeterminate	Total
DAI Ranking			
Felony			
Against Persons	91.2%	70.7%	77.5%
Weapons/Narcotics Dist.	5.3%	4.3%	4.6%
Other	3.5%	20.7%	15.0%
Class 1 Misdemeanor			
Against Persons	0.0%	3.4%	2.3%
Other	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
VCSC Ranking			
Person	86.0%	61.2%	69.4%
Property	1.8%	26.7%	18.5%
Narcotics	1.8%	1.7%	1.7%
Other/Unspecified	10.5%	10.3%	10.4%
Total Admissions	57	116	173

* 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."

* "Other/ Unspecified" includes offenses ranked as "Other" and those that were missing a VCSC ranking.

» MSO by DAI ranking:


› The highest percentage of determinate or blended and indeterminate admissions were for felonies against persons (91.2% and 70.7%, respectively).

» MSO by VCSC ranking:

› The highest percentage of determinate or blended and indeterminate admissions were for person offenses (86.0% and 61.2%, respectively).

The majority of admissions over the last five FYs (75.7-87.1%) were high risk based on YASI scores.

Admissions by Risk Levels, FY 2021-2025*



* Percentages may not add to 100% due to missing YASIs. For example, in FY 2025, six direct care admissions were missing YASIs.

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

» In FY 2025, 96.5% of admissions had a YASI completed within 90 days.

» Between FY 2021 and FY 2025, the percentage of high-risk admissions decreased from 87.1% to 75.7%.



Admissions by Commitment Type, FY 2025*

Commitment Type	Total	%
Blended	13	7.5%
Determinate	44	25.4%
Indeterminate	116	67.1%
Total Admissions	173	100.0%

* 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.

- » In FY 2025, 67.1% of admissions were for indeterminate commitments.

Indeterminate Admissions by Assigned LOS, FY 2025*

Assigned LOS	Total	%
6-9 months	0	0.0%
7-10 months	1	0.9%
8-11 months	4	3.4%
9-12 months	2	1.7%
9-15 months	0	0.0%
10-13 months	9	7.8%
11-14 months	8	6.9%
11-17 months	1	0.9%
12-15 months	5	4.3%
12-18 months	14	12.1%
13-19 months	5	4.3%
15-21 months	19	16.4%
18-24 months	23	19.8%
21-27 months	2	1.7%
21-30 months	10	8.6%
24-30 months	1	0.9%
27-36 months	0	0.0%
Treatment Override	12	10.3%
Total Admissions	116	100.0%

* Youth with multiple commitments for a single admission are counted once; the longest assigned LOS was selected.

- » An assigned LOS of 18-24 months was the most common for youth with indeterminate commitments, with 23 admissions (19.8%). In comparison, assigned LOSs for youth with determinate commitments or blended sentences ranged from 6.0 to 62.6 months, averaging 36.1 months.

See Appendix D for an explanation of the LOS Guidelines.

Releases by LOS, FY 2025*

Commitment Type/ Assigned LOS	% of All Releases	Average Actual LOS (Months)	
		2015 LOS Guidelines	2023 LOS Guidelines
Blended	5.2%	34.5	
Determinate	22.6%	28.6	
Indeterminate	72.3%	31.4	16.4
5-8 months	1.9%	34.4	N/A
6-9 months	3.2%	27.5	N/A
7-10 months	8.4%	31.6	17.0
8-11 months	1.3%	N/A	10.6
9-12 months	3.9%	34.4	14.8
10-13 months	4.5%	N/A	11.5
11-14 months	9.7%	N/A	14.7
11-17 months	1.3%	N/A	15.7
12-15 months	6.5%	N/A	14.0
12-18 months	5.8%	N/A	17.5
13-19 months	1.9%	N/A	17.6
15-21 months	9.0%	N/A	17.6
18-24 months	8.4%	N/A	19.9
Treatment Override	5.2%	32.3	21.0
Total Releases	155	22.5	

* Assigned LOSs for indeterminate commitments with fewer than two releases are not shown. These releases are included in the totals.


* 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 assigned LOS was selected.

* Subsequent commitments are included because of their impact on actual LOS. There were four subsequent indeterminate commitments.

- » The average actual LOS for all youth released in FY 2025 was 22.5 months.
- » Youth with indeterminate commitments comprised 72.3% of releases, and their average actual LOS was 19.8 months.
 - » 25 youth (22.3%) were released under the 2015 LOS Guidelines, and 87 youth (77.7%) were released under the 2023 Guidelines.
 - » Youth with treatment overrides have inpatient 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 2025, their average actual LOS was 26.7 months.
- » Youth with determinate commitments or blended sentences comprised 27.7% of releases. Their average actual LOS was 29.7 months.
- » The average age of youth released was 18.9 years.




Admissions by Treatment Need, FY 2025



- » 98.3% of admissions were identified as having an aggression management treatment need.
 - › Intensive is more rigorous compared to prescriptive, which is delivered individually as needed.
- » 94.2% of admissions were identified as having a substance use 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.
- » 13.3% 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 2025, 11.0% of admissions had an inpatient and 1.2% 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 2025, 1.2% of admissions had a prescriptive sex offender treatment need.


Admissions by Symptoms of Select Mental Health Disorders, FY 2025*



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

- » 86.7% of admissions appeared to have significant symptoms of at least one of the following: ADHD, CD, ODD, or substance use disorder.

Admissions by Prescribed Psychotropic Medication and Symptoms of Other Mental Health Disorders, FY 2025*



* 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 (65.3%) of admissions were prescribed psychotropic medication at some point in their lives.
- » 38.2% of admissions had current or newly prescribed psychotropic medication at the time of admission.
- » The majority (71.7%) of youth appeared to have significant symptoms of at least one mental health disorder at the time of admission, excluding those disorders listed in the second caveat.



Education

The DJJ SY starts in July and ends in June of the following year. Education data include data from Yvonne B. Miller High School and Post-Secondary Programs in Bon Air JCC. Data from other programs at the JCC and non-JCC placements are excluded. CTE courses are exclusively for youth enrolled in high school or a GED program. HVACR I and Plumbing I courses are offered for both CTE credit and post-secondary student certification; these data are reported separately.

SOL Pass Rates, SY 2024-2025*



* 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, either at their current school or previous school. The WorkKeys exams allow students to earn verified credits for graduation.

* Youth are counted multiple times if they fail the initial test and pass the retest or WorkKeys exam. Multiple failed tests within the same testing window are only counted once.

» The highest pass rates were in Algebra I (56.8%) and EOC Reading (50.8%).

Virginia High School Diplomas and GED® Certificates Earned, SY 2023-2024 and SY 2024-2025

Type	2023-2024	2024-2025
Standard Diploma	25	26
Applied Studies Diploma	1	0
GED® Certificate	16	16
Total	42	42

» During SY 2024-2025, 26 youth earned Virginia high school diplomas, and 16 youth earned GED® certificates.

» During SY 2024-2025, 94.4% of eligible high school seniors graduated.

CTE Credentials, SY 2024-2025*

Course	Assessment	Pass Rate
HVACR I	NCCER	100.0%
Plumbing I		100.0%
Economics and Personal Finance	W!SE	56.3%

* Some courses may have low enrollment numbers; therefore, rates may be strongly influenced by only a few students.

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

» During SY 2024-2025, 14 youth took the NCCER HVACR I assessment, six took the NCCER Plumbing I assessment, and 48 took the W!SE Financial Literacy Certification Test.

Post-Secondary Certification Programs, SY 2024-2025*

Course	Enrolled	Certification
Barbering	10	5
CPR/First Aid	25	25
Forklifting	35	7
HVACR I	19	18
NCCER: Core	31	17
Plumbing I	11	5
Total Courses	131	77

* Youth may be released from direct care or change classes, preventing them from completing a course. Some certifications require off-campus testing, which may also prevent certification.

» 58.8% of post-secondary certification program enrollments resulted in an earned certification in SY 2024-2025.

Post-Secondary Programs at Reynolds Community College, SY 2024-2025*

Course	Enrolled	Completed
Customer Service Management	13	8
Entrepreneurship	7	5
Introduction to Business	20	16
Orientation to Business	20	3
Sales & Marketing Management	9	5
Small Business Management	11	7
Total Courses	80	44

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

» 55.0% of course enrollments at Reynolds Community College were completed in SY 2024-2025.



Direct Care Population on June 30, 2025

Demographics

Demographics	Bon Air	Non-JCC	Total
Race			
Asian	0.0%	0.7%	0.3%
Black	72.1%	69.5%	70.9%
White	21.8%	20.5%	21.2%
Other/Unknown	6.1%	9.3%	7.6%
Ethnicity			
Hispanic	8.4%	11.9%	10.0%
Non-Hispanic	81.0%	82.8%	81.8%
Unknown/Missing	10.6%	5.3%	8.2%
Sex			
Female	6.7%	3.3%	5.2%
Male	93.3%	96.7%	94.8%
Age			
Under 14	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
14	0.6%	4.0%	2.1%
15	2.2%	4.6%	3.3%
16	11.2%	11.9%	11.5%
17	21.8%	37.7%	29.1%
18	29.1%	31.1%	30.0%
19-20	35.2%	10.6%	23.9%
Total Youth	179	151	330

- » 70.9% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2025, were Black, and 21.2% were White.
- » 81.8% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2025, were non-Hispanic, and 10.0% were Hispanic. 8.2% had unknown or missing ethnicity information.
- » 94.8% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2025, were male, and 5.2% were female.
- » 59.1% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2025, were 17 or 18 years old.
- » The average age of youth in direct care on June 30, 2025, was 18.1 years.

YASI Risk Levels

YASI Risk Level	Bon Air	Non-JCC	Total
Low	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%
Moderate	14.0%	16.6%	15.2%
High	84.9%	82.8%	83.9%
Missing	0.6%	0.0%	0.3%
Total Youth	179	151	330

- » 83.9% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2025, were high risk.

Committing MSO Category

MSO Category	Bon Air	Non-JCC	Total
Arson	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%
Assault	19.0%	22.5%	20.6%
Burglary	6.7%	7.9%	7.3%
Extortion	0.6%	0.0%	0.3%
Fraud	2.2%	5.3%	3.6%
Gangs	0.0%	0.7%	0.3%
Kidnapping	2.8%	2.6%	2.7%
Larceny	14.5%	16.6%	15.5%
Murder	14.5%	3.3%	9.4%
Narcotics	1.7%	1.3%	1.5%
Obscenity	1.7%	0.0%	0.9%
Obstruction of Justice	0.0%	2.0%	0.9%
Parole Violation	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%
Robbery	20.7%	22.5%	21.5%
Sexual Abuse	11.2%	4.0%	7.9%
Sexual Offense	0.0%	0.7%	0.3%
Traffic	0.6%	1.3%	0.9%
Vandalism	1.1%	2.6%	1.8%
Weapons	1.1%	4.6%	2.7%
Other	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%
Total Youth	179	151	330

- » Of the youth in direct care on June 30, 2025, the most common committing MSOs were robbery (21.5%) and assault (20.6%).

Committing MSO Severity*

MSO Severity	Bon Air	Non-JCC	Total
DAI Ranking			
Felony			
Against Persons	78.2%	68.9%	73.9%
Weapons/Narcotics Dist.	2.8%	7.3%	4.8%
Other	15.6%	20.5%	17.9%
Class 1 Misdemeanor			
Against Persons	2.8%	2.0%	2.4%
Other	0.0%	0.7%	0.3%
Parole Violation	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%
VCSC Ranking			
Person	77.1%	60.9%	69.7%
Property	17.3%	25.8%	21.2%
Narcotics	1.7%	1.3%	1.5%
Other/Unspecified	3.9%	11.9%	7.6%
Total Youth	179	151	330

* "Other/Unspecified" includes offenses ranked as "Other" and those that were missing a VCSC ranking.

- » 73.9% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2025, had a felony against persons as the committing MSO according to the DAI ranking.
- » 69.7% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2025, 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	65.9%	78.8%	71.8%
Appeal to Circuit Court	0.0%	1.3%	0.6%
Circuit Court	34.1%	19.9%	27.6%
<i>Total Youth</i>	<i>179</i>	<i>151</i>	<i>330</i>

* Youth with multiple commitments for a single admission are counted once.

- » Of the youth in direct care on June 30, 2025, 71.8% were committed by a J&DR district court, 27.6% by a circuit court, and 0.6% 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	14.5%	1.3%	8.5%
Determinate	30.2%	23.2%	27.0%
Indeterminate	55.3%	75.5%	64.5%
<i>Total Youth</i>	<i>179</i>	<i>151</i>	<i>330</i>

* 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."

- » 64.5% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2025, had an indeterminate commitment.
- » 35.5% of youth in direct care on June 30, 2025, had a determinate commitment or blended sentence.


Placement Type*

Placement Type	Count	%
Bon Air JCC	179	54.2%
Adm./Eval. in JDCs	57	17.3%
CPPs	56	17.0%
Contracted Alternatives	7	2.1%
Detention Reentry	0	0.0%
Individual JDC Beds	31	9.4%
<i>Total Youth</i>	<i>330</i>	<i>100.0%</i>

* IBPs and individually purchased JDC beds are included in "Individual JDC Beds."

- » Of the youth in direct care on June 30, 2025, 54.2% were at Bon Air JCC, 17.0% were in a CPP, and 28.8% 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, 2025. The graph displays up to 365 days.

- » There were 117 youth in direct care with a determinate commitment or blended sentence and 213 youth with an indeterminate commitment on June 30, 2025.
- » Among youth with a determinate commitment or blended sentence, 82.1% had been in direct care for at least 90 days, and 53.0% had been in direct care for at least one year. The average time in direct care was 431 days.
- » Among youth with an indeterminate commitment, 82.2% had been in direct care for at least 90 days, and 48.8% had been in direct care for at least one year. The average time in direct care was 380 days.



3 Special Topics

DJJ's Research Unit analyzes data to evaluate programs, initiatives, and trends to provide meaningful information to decision-makers and improve services and outcomes. The following studies represent a selection of projects from FY 2025.

DRT Evaluation

On January 1, 2025, DJJ began implementing the DRT: a standardized tool developed to guide POs in recommending a disposition to the court when a pre-D social history report is ordered. The tool is designed to encourage recommendations that decrease the likelihood of bias (e.g., racial disparity, justice by geography) and enhance public safety by consistently promoting appropriate levels of supervision. This section describes the DRT scoring process, presents preliminary data from the first six months of DRT implementation, and describes the Research Unit's plan for further evaluation of the tool.

DRT Scoring and Recommendations

A youth's DRT score is calculated based on seven scoring factors: (i) the most serious present adjudicated offense, (ii) other present adjudicated offenses, (iii) supervision status at the time of the present offense(s), (iv) prior adjudications of guilt, (v) prior supervision status, (vi) gang involvement, and (vii) YASI dynamic risk level. Each scoring factor includes a range of possible scores based on the specific characteristics of the case, and these factors are summed to calculate the youth's total DRT score. Based on early implementation feedback from staff, the DRT was revised on May 14, 2025, to improve recommendations and promote public safety. The revision increased the points assigned for present offenses of murder and other serious offenses (e.g., voluntary manslaughter, aggravated involuntary manslaughter, rape).

After applying the scoring factors to adjudicated cases, the case will fall within one of five scoring ranges, which guide staff toward two possible disposition recommendations. The final decision of the most appropriate recommendation is left to the staff's discretion. A completed DRT includes an actual disposition recommenda-

tion; only completed DRTs are included in the data for this section. An exceptions process exists for rare cases when the tool's disposition recommendations may not be appropriate. All exceptions must receive supervisor approval before being presented as the official recommendation to the court. During the first six months of implementation, there were 39 approved exceptions (5.7% of all completed DRTs), which are excluded from all data presented in this section.


DRT Disposition Options by Scoring Range*

Range	Disposition Options
1-4	Referral(s) and Reporting of Outcomes to the Court
	Post-D Case Management
5-10	Post-D Case Management
	Court-Ordered Probation Supervision
11-20	Court-Ordered Probation Supervision
	Court-Ordered Out of Home Placement with Case Management or Probation
21-25	Suspended Commitment with Probation
	Indeterminate Commitment
26+	Indeterminate Commitment
	Serious Offender Commitment

* Some disposition recommendations are dependent on eligibility.

* Disposition options are ordered from least to most restrictive.


Completed DRTs by Scoring Range



» 646 DRTs were completed between January 1, 2025, and June 30, 2025.




Recommended Dispositions from DRTs, January-June 2025



» In the first six months of DRT implementation, the majority of completed DRTs (59.3%) included a recommendation for a disposition of court-ordered probation supervision.

Restrictiveness of Recommended Dispositions by Scoring Range, January-June 2025



» Within each scoring range, there is a more restrictive and a less restrictive disposition recommendation option. In the first six months of DRT implementation, POs tended to recommend the more restrictive disposition option for DRTs with lower scores (i.e., scores in the 1-4 and 5-10 scoring ranges) and the less restrictive disposition option for DRTs with higher scores (i.e., scores in the 11-20, 21-25, and 26+ scoring ranges).

DRT Evaluation

To assist with the continued improvement of the DRT, the Research Unit will conduct two evaluations: an implementation evaluation and an outcome evaluation. The implementation evaluation will be completed at the end of the first year of implementation and include the number of DRTs completed, the distribution of scores, the types of disposition recommendations from POs, and insights into approved exceptions. Results from the implementation evaluation will be shared with staff in

Community Programs and the Training Unit to ensure the tool is being used as intended and inform additional guidance as needed. The outcome evaluation will assess whether recommendations generated from the DRT align with actual court dispositions and whether the level of alignment is consistent across CSUs. Together, these two evaluations can be used to inform stakeholders about potential adjustments to the tool and ensure POs are able to make consistent recommendations that best address youth needs and prioritize public safety.



FOCUS Model Evaluation


DJJ's new community supervision model, FOCUS, was implemented on March 3, 2025. The FOCUS model contributes to DJJ's mission of preparing court-involved youth to be productive citizens and enhances public safety by providing youth on community supervision with structured and effective programming. The model encourages youth to build the necessary cognitive-behavioral, social, and life skills to lead a successful life. FOCUS was developed in partnership with researchers from the Wilder School's Center for Public Policy at Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) with Virginia's specific needs in mind, promoting research-based practices with practical, consistent, and flexible guidance to staff supervising youth. The Community Programs division oversees the implementation of the FOCUS model with support from the Training Unit, QA Unit, and Records & Data Integrity Unit, who assist with staff training, ongoing coaching, and job aids.

The FOCUS Model

Youth success during and after community supervision is based on an individualized approach to the following four components:

- » Engagement: rapport between the youth, their family, and PO; buy-in and goal setting; active programmatic participation
- » Case planning: risk assessment; alignment of service referrals, goals, and priorities
- » Behavior change: cognitive-behavioral learning
- » Skill building: social skills and life skills (including education and employment)

The FOCUS model provides a framework for POs to determine the focus of each contact with a youth to address these components and achieve success over the course of supervision. Supervision contacts are implemented based on three tenets: fidelity to the case plan, flexibility, and balance.



Fidelity refers to alignment between the action steps of a youth's case plan and their short- and long-term goals while concentrating on a youth's criminogenic needs and targeted risk items. Flexibility refers to the need for POs to adjust focuses based on youth's changing needs during each contact as well as across the supervision period. Balance refers to providing an appropriate mix of contact focuses over the course of supervision. The six contact focuses allow POs to plan and conduct contacts according to the three tenets.



Implementation Evaluation


The FOCUS model is evidence-informed and will be continuously evaluated by the Research Unit to ensure future adaptations and improvements are data-driven, reflect the values of the agency, and are based on the needs of DJJ staff and youth. Implementation evaluation efforts are completed through a collaboration between the Research Unit and VCU. The implementation evaluation places an emphasis on the importance of staff feedback and communicating findings to agency stakeholders involved in implementation and support functions to improve the model. Following the initial FOCUS training, a staff survey found that the e-learning course improved both staff knowledge about the model as well as confidence in implementing the model. It also indicated several areas where staff wanted more support and training. Focus groups with POs and an in-depth survey of Community Programs staff were completed in Fall 2025.

Implementation is also being monitored using an interactive dashboard, which is updated quarterly. The dashboard reports the number of FOCUS contacts by focus, topic, and method. It can also be filtered by region or CSU.




Data in the dashboard and this section only include FOCUS contacts for youth on probation or parole. During the first three months of FOCUS implementation, 7,452 FOCUS contacts were made with 2,226 youth. Over half of those contacts (55.1%) included at least one family member, an important indicator of engagement.

FOCUS Contacts by Contact Focus, March-May 2025



- » The FOCUS model encourages staff to use a balance of different contact focuses, remaining flexible to the individual needs and circumstances of youth. The most frequently used contact focuses for each youth will depend on their individual needs and case plan. In the first three months of implementation, cognitive-behavioral skill building (29.3%), life skill building (22.9%), and case management (22.5%) contact focuses were the most common statewide.
- » Crisis support, a contact focus designed to only be used in instances where a youth needs immediate assistance to address an ongoing crisis, was the least common contact focus (2.5%).

FOCUS Contact Method and Location, March-May 2025*



* "Other (In Person)" includes FOCUS contacts in secure facilities, residential placements, court, and other locations not shown.

- » Over half of all FOCUS contacts took place in a CSU office (56.5%), and approximately one-third took place in the youth's home, school, or community (29.1%).
- » Video contacts require supervisor approval and were used 64 times.



Future Evaluation Efforts

The Research Unit will continue to evaluate the implementation of the FOCUS model in order to inform potential adjustments to the model, related policies, and resources needed to improve delivery of the model. Future efforts will include further updates to the FOCUS dashboard, continued sharing of implementation evaluation results with staff, and an outcome evaluation. The outcome evaluation is designed to determine the effects of the FOCUS model on youth outcomes, such as service completion, changes in YASI risk and protective scores, and recidivism. Consistent communications and updates from the Research Unit to stakeholders will allow DJJ to adjust and optimize efforts in the continuous improvement of the model for youth and staff and promote long-term sustainability.






4 Trends and Forecast

10-Year Trends

Juvenile Intake Complaints by Offense Severity, FY 2016-2025*




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

- » There were 39,882 juvenile intake complaints in FY 2025, a decrease of 29.8% from FY 2016.
- » There were 7,837 felony juvenile intake complaints in FY 2025, a decrease of 31.3% from FY 2016.
- » There were 14,966 Class 1 misdemeanor juvenile intake complaints in FY 2025, a decrease of 29.9% from FY 2016.
- » Following the substantial decrease in intake complaints from FY 2020 to FY 2021, there was an increase each year through FY 2024 (59.3% overall). In FY 2025, the trend reversed with a 5.1% decrease from FY 2024.



DR/CW Complaints, FY 2016-2025




- » There were 111,035 DR/CW complaints in FY 2025, a decrease of 21.9% from FY 2016.
- » There were 49,054 custody complaints in FY 2025, a decrease of 25.6% from FY 2016.
- » There were 12,238 support/desertion complaints in FY 2025, a decrease of 39.6% from FY 2016.
- » There were 19,775 protective order/ECO complaints in FY 2025, an increase of 23.0% from FY 2016.
- » There were 29,968 visitation complaints in FY 2025, a decrease of 25.1% from FY 2016.

There were 111,035
DR/CW complaints in
FY 2025, a decrease of
21.9% from FY 2016.




Juvenile Intake, Petitioned, and Diversion Plan Complaints, FY 2016-2025*



* 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 from FY 2020 to FY 2021, there was an increase of 51.2% in juvenile intake complaints from FY 2021 to FY 2025. During the same time period, complaints with a petition increased by 77.8%, and complaints with a diversion plan increased by 11.7%.
- » There were 39,882 juvenile intake complaints in FY 2025, a decrease of 29.8% from FY 2016.
- » There were 30,244 petitioned juvenile intake complaints in FY 2025, a decrease of 22.3% from FY 2016.
- » There were 4,466 juvenile intake complaints with a diversion plan in FY 2025, a decrease of 41.6% from FY 2016.

Juvenile Intake, Petitioned, and Diversion Plan Cases, FY 2016-2025*



* 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 from FY 2020 to FY 2021, there was an increase of 55.1% in juvenile intake cases from FY 2021 to FY 2025. During the same time period, cases with a petition increased by 83.7%, and cases with a diversion plan increased by 24.5%.
- » There were 27,743 juvenile intake cases in FY 2025, a decrease of 33.1% from FY 2016.
- » There were 19,970 juvenile intake cases with at least one petitioned intake complaint in FY 2025, a decrease of 25.6% from FY 2016.
- » There were 3,912 juvenile intake cases with a diversion plan in FY 2025, a decrease of 41.1% from FY 2016.




Probation Placements and Probation ADP, FY 2016-2025*



* "Probation Placements" data values are above the trendlines, and "Probation ADP" data values are below.


- » There were 2,241 probation placements in FY 2025, a decrease of 36.5% from FY 2016.
- » The probation ADP was 2,065 youth in FY 2025, a decrease of 46.2% from FY 2016.

Detainments and JDC ADP, FY 2016-2025



- » There were 6,354 detainments in FY 2025, a decrease of 24.3% from FY 2016. From FY 2016 to FY 2021, detainments decreased by 56.8% before increasing by 75.1% from FY 2021 to FY 2025.
- » The JDC ADP was 499 youth in FY 2025, a decrease of 22.3% from FY 2016.


Direct Care Admissions and Direct Care ADP, FY 2016-2025



- » There were 173 direct care admissions in FY 2025, a decrease of 45.8% from FY 2016.
- » The direct care ADP was 317 youth in FY 2025, a decrease of 21.7% from FY 2016.




Parole Placements and Parole ADP, FY 2016-2025*



* In FY 2023, the "Parole ADP" data value is above the trendline (113), and the "Parole Placements" value is below (112).


- » There were 134 parole placements in FY 2025, a decrease of 59.3% from FY 2016.
- » The parole ADP was 100 youth in FY 2025, a decrease of 61.0% from FY 2016.

Average LOS for Direct Care Releases (Months), FY 2016-2025



- » The average LOS for direct care releases was 22.5 months in FY 2025.
- » From FY 2016 to FY 2018, the average LOS decreased by 26.1% before increasing by 42.9% from FY 2018 to FY 2021. From FY 2021 to FY 2023, there was a decrease of 8.7%, followed by an increase of 35.5% from FY 2023 to FY 2025.

Average LOS for Probation and Parole Releases (Months), FY 2016-2025



- » The average LOS for probation releases was 11.0 months in FY 2025, a decrease of 15.8% from FY 2016.
- » The average LOS for parole releases was 12.2 months in FY 2025, an increase of 21.7% from FY 2016.




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 377 of Chapter 2 of the 2025 Acts of Assembly, 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. In FY 2025, DJJ added a new forecast for detainments.

A number of historical factors, including statutory or policy changes, COVID-19, and trends in the number of juvenile intake cases, may influence the population forecasts. Policy and procedure changes (e.g., LOS Guidelines) also may impact future trends and are accounted for to the extent possible in the forecasts.

For the full forecast report by the SPSHS, view the “Report on the Offender Population Forecasts (FY 2026 to FY 2031)” on the Virginia Legislative Information System’s website (lis.virginia.gov).

Detainments and Forecast, FY 2016-2031*




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

- » Detainments are projected to decrease to 6,165 in FY 2026.
- » Detainments are projected to increase from 6,165 in FY 2026 to 6,287 by FY 2031.




JDC ADP and Forecast, FY 2016-2031*



* 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 decrease slightly to 486 in FY 2026.
- » The average JDC ADP is projected to increase to 503 by FY 2031.

Direct Care Admissions and Forecast, FY 2016-2031*




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

- » Direct care admissions are projected to increase slightly to 176 in FY 2026 and continue an upward trend to 192 by FY 2031.



Direct Care ADP and Forecast, FY 2016-2031*



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

- » The direct care ADP is projected to increase to 347 in FY 2026.
- » The direct care ADP is projected to increase to 361 by FY 2031.



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 2020 through FY 2024 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.

Each year, the reoffense data are updated for all of the groups reported. Rates may change 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 2024 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, detainments, 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. DJJ reviews the offense information from VSP to determine if it meets DJJ's recidivism definitions. 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 offenses 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. Less than 4% of any 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.

Rearrest and reconviction definitions require a new delinquent act or a new criminal offense. Therefore, non-criminal DR/CW complaints, non-criminal traffic violations, status offenses, and technical violations (e.g., violation of probation or parole, contempt of court) are excluded. Felony and misdemeanor failure to appear offenses with the VCC prefix of FTA are considered a new criminal offense (see § 19.2-128 of the *Code of Virginia*), but all other failure to appear offenses are considered technical violations.

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.

With the drastic decrease in juvenile intake cases due to COVID-19 during FY 2020-2021, rearrest rates during that timeframe may be lower than previous or future years. Recidivism rates for FY 2022 through FY 2024 may be more comparable to pre-pandemic years.

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 intake cases with diversion plans, intake cases with first-time diversion plans, probation placements, parole placements, and VJCCCA placements, the follow-up period may extend beyond the end date.

* 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 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 2020-2024, Tracked through FY 2025



- » 12-month rearrest rates for diversion plans and probation placements remained steady from FY 2023 to FY 2024.
- » 12-month rearrest rates for direct care releases and parole placements decreased from FY 2023 to FY 2024.



12-Month Recidivism Rates for Probation Placements, Direct Care Releases, and Parole Placements in FY 2020-2023, Tracked through FY 2025



- » 12-month recidivism rates for probation placements decreased from 20.6% to 16.7% from FY 2022 to FY 2023.
- » 12-month recidivism rates for direct care releases and parole placements remained steady from FY 2022 to FY 2023.

12-Month Recidivism Rates for Intake Cases with Diversion Plans, Probation Placements and Releases, Direct Care Releases, and Parole Placements and Releases in FY 2020-2024, Tracked through FY 2025

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Diversion Plans					
Rearrest	10.5%	12.0%	11.9%	10.7%	11.3%
Total	6,309	2,795	4,702	5,379	4,487
Probation Placements					
Rearrest	29.9%	28.0%	33.2%	31.4%	30.0%
Reconviction	17.5%	17.0%	20.6%	16.7%	N/A
Total	1,877	1,480	1,524	2,153	2,405
Probation Releases					
Rearrest	26.8%	25.8%	31.6%	27.9%	25.8%
Reconviction	17.7%	18.0%	22.7%	17.0%	N/A
Total	2,481	1,898	1,488	1,622	2,158
Direct Care Releases					
Rearrest	50.6%	41.4%	51.0%	50.4%	45.6%
Reconviction	39.9%	36.1%	40.0%	42.5%	N/A
Reincarceration	13.3%	16.2%	16.1%	18.1%	N/A
Total	308	191	155	127	114
Parole Placements					
Rearrest	55.5%	41.9%	53.2%	51.5%	45.3%
Reconviction	44.5%	37.4%	42.1%	45.6%	N/A
Reincarceration	14.8%	18.7%	18.3%	19.4%	N/A
Total	256	155	126	103	95
Parole Releases					
Rearrest	52.7%	43.5%	46.1%	50.7%	49.5%
Reconviction	43.1%	37.1%	37.2%	43.8%	N/A
Reincarceration	14.6%	16.4%	17.3%	15.1%	N/A
Total	239	232	191	146	107



Diversion Plans

Rearrest Rates for Intake Cases with Diversion Plans, Intake Cases with First-Time Diversion Plans, and Successful Diversion Plans in FY 2020-2024, Tracked through FY 2025*

Time to Reoffense	Diversion Plans					First-Time Diversion Plans					Successful Diversion Plans				
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
3 months	3.6%	2.5%	2.8%	2.5%	2.4%	2.9%	1.5%	2.4%	2.1%	1.9%	3.2%	2.7%	3.3%	3.2%	3.5%
6 months	6.5%	6.1%	6.2%	5.5%	5.9%	5.3%	4.7%	5.4%	4.6%	5.0%	5.6%	5.3%	6.5%	6.4%	6.2%
12 months	10.5%	12.0%	11.9%	10.7%	11.3%	8.8%	9.7%	10.5%	9.4%	10.0%	8.9%	10.0%	12.4%	11.0%	10.6%
24 months	17.5%	20.4%	21.2%	17.8%	N/A	15.0%	17.4%	19.4%	16.0%	N/A	15.2%	19.1%	20.9%	17.9%	N/A
36 months	24.1%	28.6%	27.0%	N/A	N/A	21.2%	24.9%	25.0%	N/A	N/A	21.9%	27.2%	27.4%	N/A	N/A
Total	6,309	2,795	4,702	5,379	4,487	5,300	2,364	4,028	4,748	3,960	7,286	2,465	3,484	4,994	4,304

* Counts are based on intake cases. A youth with multiple diverted cases in a FY can be counted multiple times in each group.

* 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.

* FYs for successful diversion plans are determined by the estimated completion date.

» 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 2020-2024, Tracked through FY 2025

Time to Reoffense	Probation Placements					Probation Releases				
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
3 months	13.5%	11.2%	12.5%	11.8%	10.9%	10.0%	8.4%	9.7%	10.7%	9.8%
6 months	20.8%	18.0%	21.5%	20.9%	19.5%	17.1%	15.1%	18.0%	17.0%	16.9%
12 months	29.9%	28.0%	33.2%	31.4%	30.0%	26.8%	25.8%	31.6%	27.9%	25.8%
24 months	42.5%	44.7%	46.8%	44.1%	N/A	41.4%	40.8%	48.1%	42.5%	N/A
36 months	51.6%	54.7%	56.0%	N/A	N/A	50.5%	50.8%	57.1%	N/A	N/A
Total	1,877	1,480	1,524	2,153	2,405	2,481	1,898	1,488	1,622	2,158

» From FY 2020 to FY 2024, rearrest rates for probation placements and releases were lower than rearrest rates for direct care releases, parole placements, and parole releases for the majority of follow-up time periods. (See pages 78-89 for rearrest rates for direct care releases, parole placements, and parole releases.)

Reconviction Rates for Probation Placements and Probation Releases in FY 2020-2023, Tracked through FY 2025

Time to Reoffense	Probation Placements				Probation Releases			
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020	2021	2022	2023
3 months	7.6%	6.2%	6.3%	5.7%	6.0%	5.0%	7.2%	6.0%
6 months	11.2%	10.3%	11.7%	10.8%	10.3%	9.4%	13.1%	9.6%
12 months	17.5%	17.0%	20.6%	16.7%	17.7%	18.0%	22.7%	17.0%
24 months	28.4%	30.7%	31.2%	N/A	31.2%	30.1%	36.3%	N/A
36 months	37.4%	40.3%	N/A	N/A	40.6%	39.4%	N/A	N/A
Total	1,877	1,480	1,524	2,153	2,481	1,898	1,488	1,622

» 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 2023-2024, Tracked through FY 2025*

CSU	Probation Placements				Probation Releases			
	2024		2023		2024		2023	
	Total	Rearrest	Total	Reconviction	Total	Rearrest	Total	Reconviction
1	57	35.1%	54	22.2%	68	33.8%	36	16.7%
2	110	28.2%	111	21.6%	91	36.3%	83	22.9%
2A	19	26.3%	9	22.2%	14	28.6%	6	50.0%
3	36	41.7%	32	18.8%	35	20.0%	16	31.3%
4	97	35.1%	112	22.3%	101	26.7%	64	25.0%
5	48	27.1%	41	26.8%	43	25.6%	33	27.3%
6	30	43.3%	39	25.6%	31	51.6%	31	22.6%
7	77	28.6%	76	13.2%	77	22.1%	59	22.0%
8	28	42.9%	28	28.6%	22	18.2%	31	22.6%
9	22	27.3%	30	13.3%	26	19.2%	30	10.0%
10	56	35.7%	43	11.6%	53	24.5%	42	7.1%
11	27	18.5%	21	28.6%	24	16.7%	14	21.4%
12	82	37.8%	59	18.6%	71	40.8%	43	18.6%
13	81	40.7%	79	27.8%	92	41.3%	72	27.8%
14	139	33.1%	124	19.4%	99	29.3%	76	14.5%
15	51	33.3%	36	22.2%	39	35.9%	37	27.0%
16	83	28.9%	91	12.1%	86	22.1%	53	15.1%
17	106	19.8%	79	7.6%	84	17.9%	50	12.0%
18	77	24.7%	65	10.8%	64	32.8%	45	8.9%
19	191	39.3%	179	20.1%	178	30.3%	114	19.3%
20	91	29.7%	68	11.8%	67	22.4%	51	9.8%
21	55	23.6%	67	7.5%	63	15.9%	43	14.0%
22	78	24.4%	91	15.4%	78	21.8%	74	16.2%
23	85	25.9%	44	15.9%	51	21.6%	31	12.9%
24	80	22.5%	82	24.4%	77	18.2%	79	16.5%
25	84	23.8%	79	5.1%	77	18.2%	70	10.0%
26	97	24.7%	74	2.7%	87	23.0%	67	16.4%
27	85	24.7%	75	16.0%	87	18.4%	57	10.5%
28	64	12.5%	49	14.3%	60	6.7%	10	20.0%
29	23	26.1%	25	8.0%	21	9.5%	18	16.7%
30	94	23.4%	77	14.3%	78	12.8%	85	8.2%
31	152	38.8%	114	17.5%	114	36.0%	102	16.7%
Total	2,405	30.0%	2,153	16.7%	2,158	25.8%	1,622	17.0%

* 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.

See pages 83-84 for recidivism rates for probation placements and releases by risk level.



Direct Care

Rearrest and Reconviction Rates for Direct Care Releases in FY 2020-2024, Tracked through FY 2025

Time to Reoffense	Rearrest					Reconviction			
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2020	2021	2022	2023
3 months	14.0%	15.2%	13.5%	15.0%	7.0%	10.1%	13.1%	9.7%	12.6%
6 months	30.2%	26.2%	29.7%	29.9%	22.8%	24.0%	24.1%	22.6%	22.8%
12 months	50.6%	41.4%	51.0%	50.4%	45.6%	39.9%	36.1%	40.0%	42.5%
24 months	66.9%	56.5%	72.9%	66.9%	N/A	57.1%	49.7%	61.3%	N/A
36 months	78.9%	66.0%	78.1%	N/A	N/A	70.8%	61.8%	N/A	N/A
Total	308	191	155	127	114	308	191	155	127

- » 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 80 for reconviction rates for parole placements.)
- » 12-month rearrest rates for direct care releases decreased from 50.4% to 45.6% from FY 2023 to FY 2024.
- » 12-month reconviction rates for direct care releases remained steady from FY 2022 to 2023.

Reincarceration Rates for Direct Care Releases in FY 2020-2023, Tracked through FY 2025

Time to Reoffense	Direct Care Releases			
	2020	2021	2022	2023
3 months	0.3%	2.1%	0.6%	2.4%
6 months	5.8%	6.3%	3.2%	8.7%
12 months	13.3%	16.2%	16.1%	18.1%
24 months	27.6%	33.5%	32.3%	N/A
36 months	43.2%	44.0%	N/A	N/A
Total	308	191	155	127

- » 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 3- and 6-month reincarceration rates in 2022). (See page 80 for reincarceration rates for parole placements.)
- » Of the 23 direct care releases in FY 2023 reincarcerated within 12 months of release, 52.2% were reincarcerated in direct care, 30.4% in a local jail, 17.4% in a VADOC facility, and none in a JDC.

See pages 83-84 for
recidivism rates for direct care
releases by risk level.



12-Month Recidivism Rates for Direct Care Releases by Treatment Need in FY 2022-2024, Tracked through FY 2025*

Treatment Need	Total Youth			Rearrest			Reconviction		Reincarceration	
	2022	2023	2024	2022	2023	2024	2022	2023	2022	2023
Aggression Management	151	125	112	51.7%	51.2%	46.4%	40.4%	43.2%	16.6%	18.4%
Sex Offender	19	13	9	31.6%	30.8%	11.1%	26.3%	23.1%	15.8%	7.7%
Substance Use	134	109	105	53.0%	52.3%	45.7%	41.0%	45.0%	16.4%	17.4%

* 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.

* Recidivism by treatment need includes any type of reoffense, not only offenses specifically related to the treatment need.

* 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 use treatment need.

Parole

Rearrest Rates for Parole Placements and Parole Releases in FY 2020-2024, Tracked through FY 2025

Time to Reoffense	Parole Placements					Parole Releases				
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
3 months	15.6%	16.8%	13.5%	14.6%	6.3%	19.7%	16.8%	16.2%	19.2%	22.4%
6 months	33.2%	26.5%	31.7%	32.0%	22.1%	35.6%	27.6%	27.2%	36.3%	32.7%
12 months	55.5%	41.9%	53.2%	51.5%	45.3%	52.7%	43.5%	46.1%	50.7%	49.5%
24 months	71.9%	60.0%	75.4%	68.0%	N/A	72.0%	60.8%	61.3%	64.4%	N/A
36 months	84.0%	67.7%	81.0%	N/A	N/A	79.1%	70.3%	69.1%	N/A	N/A
Total	256	155	126	103	95	239	232	191	146	107

» 12-month rearrest rates for parole placements decreased from 51.5% to 45.3% from FY 2023 to FY 2024.

» 12-month rearrest rates for parole releases remained steady from FY 2023 to FY 2024.



Reconviction Rates for Parole Placements and Parole Releases in FY 2020-2023, Tracked through FY 2025

Time to Reoffense	Parole Placements				Parole Releases			
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020	2021	2022	2023
3 months	11.3%	14.8%	10.3%	13.6%	13.8%	14.7%	12.6%	15.1%
6 months	27.0%	24.5%	25.4%	25.2%	27.2%	25.0%	21.5%	30.1%
12 months	44.5%	37.4%	42.1%	45.6%	43.1%	37.1%	37.2%	43.8%
24 months	61.7%	53.5%	64.3%	N/A	63.2%	54.3%	54.5%	N/A
36 months	74.6%	63.2%	N/A	N/A	71.5%	63.8%	N/A	N/A
Total	256	155	126	103	239	232	191	146

- » 12-month reconviction rates for parole placements remained steady from FY 2022 to FY 2023.
- » 12-month reconviction rates for parole releases increased from 37.2% to 43.8% from FY 2022 to FY 2023.

Reincarceration Rates for Parole Placements and Parole Releases in FY 2020-2023, Tracked through FY 2025

Time to Reoffense	Parole Placements				Parole Releases			
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020	2021	2022	2023
3 months	0.4%	2.6%	0.0%	2.9%	1.7%	1.7%	3.7%	4.8%
6 months	7.0%	7.7%	3.2%	10.7%	5.9%	7.3%	8.4%	7.5%
12 months	14.8%	18.7%	18.3%	19.4%	14.6%	16.4%	17.3%	15.1%
24 months	30.9%	34.8%	34.1%	N/A	30.1%	30.2%	27.7%	N/A
36 months	46.5%	44.5%	N/A	N/A	42.7%	40.5%	N/A	N/A
Total	256	155	126	103	239	232	191	146

- » From FY 2020 to FY 2023, parole releases had lower reincarceration rates than parole placements for the majority of follow-up time periods.
- » 12-month reincarceration rates for parole placements and parole releases remained steady from FY 2022 to FY 2023.

See pages 83-84 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 2023-2024, Tracked through FY 2025*

CSU	2024		2023		
	Total	Rearrest	Total	Reconviction	Reincarceration
1	1	0.0%	7	0.0%	0.0%
2	3	33.3%	4	50.0%	50.0%
2A	2	50.0%	1	100.0%	100.0%
3	3	66.7%	5	80.0%	20.0%
4	17	52.9%	14	64.3%	35.7%
5	5	60.0%	7	42.9%	14.3%
6	3	33.3%	2	100.0%	50.0%
7	4	25.0%	9	55.6%	33.3%
8	4	75.0%	4	0.0%	0.0%
9	1	0.0%	2	50.0%	50.0%
10	0	N/A	1	0.0%	0.0%
11	2	50.0%	1	0.0%	0.0%
12	2	100.0%	4	25.0%	25.0%
13	8	25.0%	9	55.6%	11.1%
14	6	33.3%	2	100.0%	50.0%
15	3	33.3%	2	50.0%	0.0%
16	7	14.3%	3	33.3%	0.0%
17	1	0.0%	0	N/A	N/A
18	0	N/A	1	0.0%	0.0%
19	5	80.0%	6	50.0%	0.0%
20	1	0.0%	0	N/A	N/A
21	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	0.0%
22	3	33.3%	2	50.0%	50.0%
23	4	50.0%	1	0.0%	0.0%
24	4	75.0%	4	25.0%	0.0%
25	2	50.0%	1	0.0%	0.0%
26	0	N/A	3	66.7%	0.0%
27	0	N/A	3	0.0%	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	3	66.7%	4	75.0%	25.0%
Total	95	45.3%	103	45.6%	19.4%

* 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.



12-Month Rearrest, Reconviction, and Reincarceration Rates by CSU for Parole Releases in FY 2023-2024, Tracked through FY 2025*

CSU	2024		2023		
	Total	Rearrest	Total	Reconviction	Reincarceration
1	3	0.0%	3	33.3%	0.0%
2	4	50.0%	10	30.0%	10.0%
2A	0	N/A	2	50.0%	50.0%
3	4	50.0%	5	80.0%	40.0%
4	19	36.8%	12	50.0%	25.0%
5	4	75.0%	7	42.9%	14.3%
6	5	80.0%	2	100.0%	50.0%
7	8	37.5%	13	30.8%	7.7%
8	5	40.0%	9	0.0%	0.0%
9	1	0.0%	4	25.0%	25.0%
10	1	0.0%	0	N/A	N/A
11	0	N/A	3	33.3%	0.0%
12	9	66.7%	5	80.0%	40.0%
13	11	54.5%	16	50.0%	31.3%
14	1	0.0%	5	60.0%	0.0%
15	4	25.0%	4	50.0%	0.0%
16	5	0.0%	7	14.3%	14.3%
17	0	N/A	0	N/A	N/A
18	0	N/A	2	50.0%	0.0%
19	4	100.0%	8	62.5%	0.0%
20	2	50.0%	1	0.0%	0.0%
21	0	N/A	2	50.0%	0.0%
22	1	100.0%	3	33.3%	0.0%
23	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	50.0%
24	3	33.3%	4	75.0%	0.0%
25	3	66.7%	2	50.0%	0.0%
26	3	66.7%	7	57.1%	14.3%
27	0	N/A	2	50.0%	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	5	100.0%	6	33.3%	16.7%
Total	107	49.5%	146	43.8%	15.1%

* 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.



Risk Levels

YASIs are completed by CSU and direct care staff to determine a youth's relative risk of reoffending. (See Appendix E.) A youth's recidivism risk is classified as low, moderate, or high based on the assessment. 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.

As of FY 2024, all youth under probation or parole supervision or in direct care are reassessed at least every 90 days. However, the closest risk assessment completed within 180 days before or after the measurement date is used in this analysis to reflect practices of the years reported. Youth with no risk assessment completed in that timeframe are excluded.

With the exception of direct care releases and parole placements in FY 2021, high-risk youth had the highest recidivism rates for all groups across all years.

12-Month Rearrest Rates by Risk Levels in FY 2020-2024, Tracked through FY 2025*

	Total Youth					Rearrest				
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Low Risk										
Probation Placement	315	253	256	389	484	11.7%	4.7%	16.0%	8.0%	12.2%
Probation Releases	624	437	290	402	548	12.3%	11.4%	15.5%	12.2%	9.5%
Direct Care Releases	8	2	1	1	1	12.5%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Parole Placements	5	2	1	1	1	20.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Parole Releases	4	6	3	3	2	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%
Moderate Risk										
Probation Placement	991	756	761	1,136	1,304	26.4%	28.8%	30.0%	30.5%	28.5%
Probation Releases	1,193	955	708	710	991	28.2%	24.8%	29.1%	28.0%	26.1%
Direct Care Releases	65	35	20	24	27	33.8%	25.7%	35.0%	25.0%	33.3%
Parole Placements	52	29	16	20	20	36.5%	27.6%	18.8%	25.0%	35.0%
Parole Releases	66	62	43	33	27	42.4%	35.5%	23.3%	45.5%	29.6%
High Risk										
Probation Placement	542	451	489	598	579	48.2%	40.1%	48.1%	48.5%	48.9%
Probation Releases	601	468	454	464	550	40.1%	41.2%	46.0%	41.2%	41.3%
Direct Care Releases	232	151	134	102	85	56.9%	45.0%	53.7%	56.9%	50.6%
Parole Placements	198	124	109	82	74	61.1%	45.2%	58.7%	58.5%	48.6%
Parole Releases	166	160	142	106	74	57.8%	47.5%	53.5%	51.9%	56.8%

* 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 2020-2023, Tracked through FY 2025*

	Total Youth				Reconviction			
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020	2021	2022	2023
Low Risk								
Probation Placement	315	253	256	389	4.8%	3.2%	8.2%	3.6%
Probation Releases	624	437	290	402	6.9%	8.2%	9.3%	5.5%
Direct Care Releases	8	2	1	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Parole Placements	5	2	1	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Parole Releases	4	6	3	3	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Moderate Risk								
Probation Placement	991	756	761	1,136	13.9%	16.8%	17.3%	16.3%
Probation Releases	1,193	955	708	710	18.2%	15.8%	19.9%	16.5%
Direct Care Releases	65	35	20	24	21.5%	20.0%	30.0%	12.5%
Parole Placements	52	29	16	20	21.2%	24.1%	18.8%	15.0%
Parole Releases	66	62	43	33	33.3%	27.4%	18.6%	39.4%
High Risk								
Probation Placement	542	451	489	598	32.3%	25.5%	32.5%	26.3%
Probation Releases	601	468	454	464	28.6%	32.1%	35.7%	28.0%
Direct Care Releases	232	151	134	102	46.6%	40.4%	41.8%	50.0%
Parole Placements	198	124	109	82	51.5%	41.1%	45.9%	53.7%
Parole Releases	166	160	142	106	47.6%	41.3%	43.0%	46.2%

* 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 2020-2023, Tracked through FY 2025*

	Total Youth				Reincarceration			
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2020	2021	2022	2023
Low Risk								
Direct Care Releases	8	2	1	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Parole Placements	5	2	1	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Parole Releases	4	6	3	3	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Moderate Risk								
Direct Care Releases	65	35	20	24	6.2%	2.9%	10.0%	8.3%
Parole Placements	52	29	16	20	5.8%	3.4%	6.3%	10.0%
Parole Releases	66	62	43	33	7.6%	6.5%	7.0%	15.2%
High Risk								
Direct Care Releases	232	151	134	102	15.9%	19.9%	17.2%	20.6%
Parole Placements	198	124	109	82	17.7%	22.6%	20.2%	22.0%
Parole Releases	166	160	142	106	18.1%	20.0%	21.1%	16.0%

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



VJCCCA

Rearrest Rates for Youth Placed in VJCCCA Programs and Youth Released from VJCCCA Programs in FY 2020-2024, Tracked through FY 2025*

Time to Reoffense	Youth Placed in VJCCCA Programs					Youth Released from VJCCCA Programs				
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
3 months	11.4%	10.8%	9.5%	9.4%	9.9%	8.6%	8.8%	8.6%	8.0%	8.2%
6 months	17.7%	17.6%	16.6%	16.4%	16.7%	14.2%	15.5%	14.5%	14.0%	13.9%
12 months	25.6%	27.5%	26.0%	25.9%	25.3%	21.4%	24.9%	24.9%	23.0%	22.3%
Total	5,641	3,554	4,487	6,336	6,472	5,989	3,727	4,804	5,841	6,462

* 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 remained steady from FY 2023 to FY 2024.
- » 12-month rearrest rates for youth released from VJCCCA programs remained steady from FY 2023 to FY 2024.

Post-D Detention with Programs

12-Month Recidivism Rates for Releases from Post-D Detention with Programs in FY 2020-2024, Tracked through FY 2025*

	Post-D Detention with Programs Releases				
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Rearrest	60.1%	47.5%	58.3%	50.4%	51.6%
Reconviction	42.9%	36.7%	42.5%	40.2%	N/A
Reincarceration	12.3%	12.5%	19.2%	21.3%	N/A
Total	163	120	120	127	157

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

- » 12-month rearrest rates for releases from post-D detention with programs remained steady from FY 2023 to FY 2024.
- » 12-month reconviction and reincarceration rates for releases from post-D detention with programs remained steady from FY 2022 to FY 2023.



12-Month Recidivism Rates for Releases from Post-D Detention with Programs in FY 2020-2024 by Risk Levels, Tracked through FY 2025*

	Post-D Detention with Programs Releases				
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Low Risk					
Rearrest	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%
Reconviction	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A
Reincarceration	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A
<i>Total</i>	1	2	1	3	4
Moderate Risk					
Rearrest	50.8%	35.9%	50.0%	50.0%	46.0%
Reconviction	38.1%	33.3%	40.0%	42.5%	N/A
Reincarceration	15.9%	5.1%	16.7%	20.0%	N/A
<i>Total</i>	63	39	30	40	63
High Risk					
Rearrest	67.7%	56.8%	62.4%	51.9%	57.1%
Reconviction	46.9%	40.5%	43.5%	41.8%	N/A
Reincarceration	10.4%	17.6%	21.2%	24.1%	N/A
<i>Total</i>	96	74	85	79	84

* Releases from post-D detention with programs are youth released from a JDC who were in post-D detention with programs at any time during their detention.


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



6 Expenditures and Staffing

Expenditures

DJJ Operating Expenditures, FY 2025*



* Data are not comparable to reports prior to FY 2024 due to methodology changes.

* Prepayments to cover expenses for the following FY may vary from year to year; therefore, caution should be taken when comparing operating expenditures across FYs. In FY 2025, agencies were prohibited from making prepayments.

- » DJJ expended a total of \$248,872,303.
- » 98.4% (\$244,962,794) was General Fund expenditures.
- » Transfer payments to localities for VJCCCA, JDCs, and locally operated CSUs accounted for 23.5% (\$58,602,628) of all expenditures.



Bon Air JCC Expenditures, FY 2025*

Expenditures	
Residential Services	
Administration	\$8,231,838
Food Services	\$1,873,387
Maintenance	\$4,586,277
Medical Services	\$5,961,296
Treatment Services	\$4,185,808
Workforce Development	\$361,560
Youth Supervision	\$13,420,631
<i>Total for Residential Services</i>	<i>\$38,620,797</i>
Education	
Career & Technical Education	\$1,332,016
Instructional Leadership & Support Services	\$1,665,026
Youth Instructional Services	\$8,146,715
<i>Total for Education</i>	<i>\$11,143,758</i>
Total Bon Air JCC Expenditures	\$49,764,555

* Data are not comparable to reports prior to FY 2024 due to methodology changes.

* Expenditures for the CAP Unit, admission and evaluation in JDCs, CPPs, contracted alternatives, detention reentry, IBPs, individually purchased JDC beds, 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 2025*

	Expenditures	ADP	Per Capita
All Direct Care	\$62,159,102	317	\$195,814
JCC: Residential Services	\$38,620,797	172	\$224,071
JCC: Education	\$11,143,758		\$64,654
Alternative Direct Care Placements	\$12,394,547	145	\$85,433

* Data are not comparable to reports prior to FY 2024 due to methodology changes.

* Expenditures for facilities that do not house youth or provide office space for direct care staff (including VPSTC) are excluded.

* 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.

» The per capita cost for youth in a JCC (including Education and Residential Services expenditures) was \$288,724 in FY 2025.



Staffing

Direct Care Staffing (Filled Positions) as of June 30, 2025*

Job Title	Total
Residential Services	
Superintendent	1
Assistant Superintendent	1
Facility Manager	3
ADA Staff	2
Area Supervisor	12
Assistant Watch Commander	4
BSU Staff	17
Casework Supervisor	2
Health Services Staff	24
Housing Unit Coordinator	13
JCS	8
JCS I	121
PREA and ADA Manager	1
PREA Staff	3
Recreation Specialist	4
Reentry Services Staff	8
Rehab Counselor	11
Residential Placement Coordinator	2
Residential Placement Specialist	5
Security Coordinator	1
Security Specialist	1
Violence Intervention Staff	4
Volunteer Services Coordinator	1
Watch Commander	3
<i>Total Filled Residential Services Positions</i>	<i>252</i>
Education	
Principal	1
Program Administrator	1
Assistant Principal	2
School Counselor	2
Instructor/Teacher	37
Instructional Assistant	8
School Safety	20
Other Staff	12
<i>Total Filled Education Positions</i>	<i>83</i>
Total Filled Direct Care Positions	335

* Data are not comparable to reports prior to FY 2024 due to methodology changes in how direct care staff are identified. Data include staff who provide or oversee security, supervision, or services to youth in direct care. In reports prior to FY 2024, support staff were included (e.g., administrative, food operations, maintenance), but these staff are now excluded.

* Executive staff, BAU staff, contracted personnel and staff at contracted placements, human rights coordinators, and JCS trainees are excluded.

* "Facility Manager" under Residential Services includes staff with the following titles: chief of security, compliance manager, and programs manager.

* "Other Staff" under Education includes staff with the following titles: assessment specialist, career and academic coordinator, college facilitator registrar, compliance specialists, curriculum implementation specialist, education transition specialist, instructional technology residential specialist, lead transition specialist, library media specialist, school psychologist, and special education and student support assistant.

» 38.5% of filled direct care positions were JCS or JCS Is.

» 24.8% of filled direct care positions were Education positions.



CSU Staffing (Filled Positions) as of June 30, 2025*

CSU	Director/Deputy Director	Supervisor/Manager	PO/Senior PO	Administrative/Other Staff	Total
1	0	4	14	4	22
2	2	4	22	5	33
2A	1	2	6	3	12
3	1	3	12	2	18
4	1	7	19	9	36
5	1	3	8	3	15
6	1	2	9	4	16
7	1	4	20	6	31
8	1	4	14	6	25
9	1	5	10	6	22
10	1	3	11	7	22
11	1	2	9	5	17
12	1	4	19	6	30
13	1	5	19	6	31
14	1	4	19	6	30
15	1	5	17	7	30
16	1	4	13	7	25
18	1	3	6	5	15
20	1	3	12	3	19
21	1	2	10	5	18
22	1	2	13	4	20
23	1	3	19	2	25
24	1	4	14	4	23
25	1	3	12	6	22
26	1	4	13	5	23
27	0	3	17	5	25
28	1	2	9	4	16
29	1	2	9	5	17
30	1	2	9	4	16
31	1	5	21	4	31
<i>Total Filled Positions</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>103</i>	<i>405</i>	<i>148</i>	<i>685</i>

* CSUs 17 and 19 are not included because they are locally operated. 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, program support technician, and senior program support technician.

» 59.1% 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 15.

Appendix A: CSUs and FIPS

Appendix B: “Other” Categories

Appendix C: DAI

Appendix D: LOS Guidelines

Appendix E: YASI

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: “Other” Categories

The following were combined into “Other” groups:

“Delinquent – Other” Offense Category

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| » Abortion | » Fire Protection/Safety | » Prisoners |
| » Abusive and Insulting Language | » Game, Fish, Wildlife | » Prisoners – Juvenile Facility |
| » Accomplice | » Interstate Compact | » Prisoners, Jails and Prisons |
| » Agriculture, Horticulture, & Food | » Judicial Reviews | » Protective Orders |
| » Aircraft/Aviation | » J&DR Court – Other | » Racketeer/Corrupt Organization |
| » Animals | » Labor | » Riot and Unlawful Assembly |
| » Auto Dealers | » Lottery | » School – Student’s Behavior |
| » Boating | » Mental Health | » School Attendance |
| » Bribery | » Miscellaneous Crime | » Solicitation |
| » Computer Crime | » Money Laundering | » Telephone |
| » Dangerous Conduct | » Ordinance, City or County | » Terrorism |
| » Entice | » Paraphernalia, Controlled | » Violent Activities |
| » Family Offense | » Peace, Conservator of the | » Waters, Ports, & Harbors |
| » Fare, Fail to Pay, etc. | » Perjury | » Wire Communications |

“Status/Other – Other” Offense Category

- | | |
|--|--|
| » Curfew Violation Between 10 PM and 6 AM | » Purchase, Attempted Purchase or Possession of Tobacco by Minor |
| » Motion to Show Cause – Parents Fail to Obey CHINS/Delinquent Order | » Runaway – Out of State |
| » Petition Filed for the Judicial Authorization of an Abortion | » Selling Tobacco to Minor; Minor Purchasing or Possessing |
| » Purchase or Possession of Tobacco by a Minor | |

“Other” Juvenile Intake Decisions

- | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------|
| » Accepted via ICJ | » Returned to Out-of-State |
| » Pending | » Shelter Care Only |

“Other” Detention Dispositional Statuses

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



Appendix C: DAI

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF JUVENILE JUSTICE DETENTION ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

Juvenile Name: _____ DOB: ____/____/____ Juvenile #: _____ ICN#: _____
 Intake Date: ____/____/____ Worker Name: _____ CSU #: _____
 Completed as Follow-Up (On-Call Intake): ☐

	Score
1. Most Serious CURRENT Petitioned 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 CURRENT Petitioned Offenses 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
Post-Disposition Case Management or Probation based on Other Offenses	2
Diversion	1
None	0
6. History of Failure to Appear (within past 12 months)	
Two or more petitions/warrants/detention orders for FTA in past 12 months	3
One petition/warrant/detention order for FTA in past 12 months	1
No petition/warrant/detention order for FTA in past 12 months	0
7. History of Escape/Runaways (within past 12 months)	
One or more escapes from secure confinement or custody	4
One or more instances of absconding from non-secure, court-ordered placements	3
One or more runaways from home	1
No escapes or runaways w/in past 12 months	0
8. TOTAL SCORE	

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

Mandatory Overrides: ☐ 1. Use of firearm in current offense
 (must be detained) ☐ 2. Weapons Offenses Specified in Administrative Directive A-2022-005 and Email Amendment
☐ 3. Escapee/AWOL/Absconder per DJJ Procedure VOL III-9471
☐ 4. 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: 2015 LOS Guidelines for Indeterminately Committed Juveniles, Effective October 15, 2015, Until February 28, 2023

For direct care admissions on or after October 15, 2015, DJJ used guidelines issued by the Board of Juvenile Justice in 2015 to assign the LOS for indeterminately committed youth based on the committing MSO and the risk to reoffend as indicated by the most recently administered YASI at the time of admission to direct care. LOS categories were defined by an anticipated minimum and maximum number of months that the youth would remain with DJJ. The actual LOS was determined through case-specific reviews depending on the youth's behavior, adjustment, and treatment progress. The 2023 LOS Guidelines (see next page) became effective for commitments on or after March 1, 2023.

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	• Misdemeanor Offenses • Violations of Parole	2-4 months*	3-6 months*	5-8 months*	6-9 months*
Tier II	• Non-person Felony Offenses	3-6 months*	5-8 months*	6-9 months*	7-10 months*
Tier III	• Person Felony Offenses	5-8 months*	6-9 months*	7-10 months*	9-12 months*
Tier IV	• Class 1 and 2 Felony Offenses	6-9 months*	7-10 months*	9-12 months*	9-15 months*
Tier V	• 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 D, continued: 2023 LOS Guidelines for Indeterminately Committed Juveniles, Effective March 1, 2023

Using guidelines issued by the Board of Juvenile Justice, effective March 1, 2023, 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, adjustment, treatment progress, and educational requirements.

Committing MSO

Committing offenses are categorized into one of five tiers. For a complete list of offenses associated with each tier, refer to DJJ's website.

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	Class 1 misdemeanors not listed in Tiers II or III	6-9 months	7-10 months	8-11 months	9-15 months
Tier II	Certain other Class 1 misdemeanors; certain non-person felonies	8-11 months	9-12 months	10-13 months	11-17 months
Tier III	Parole violations; certain other Class 1 misdemeanors; certain felonies	10-13 months	11-14 months	12-15 months	13-19 months
Tier IV	Certain felonies	12-18 months	15-21 months	18-24 months	21-30 months
Tier V	Murder, manslaughter, and other serious felony offenses	18-24 months	21-27 months	24-30 months	27-36 months
Other	Treatment Override	Juveniles who have been assessed as needing inpatient sex offender treatment are managed as an exception to the grid.*			

* Treatment Override: Juveniles who have been assessed as needing inpatient sex offender treatment will not be assigned a projected LOS. Instead, they will be handled according to the treatment override process. Treatment override cases will be eligible for release consideration upon completion of the designated treatment program and fulfillment of the additional requirements.



Appendix E: 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 E, 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 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.

Primary Probation Statuses

- » Post-D Residential (Judicially Ordered) with Probation
- » 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 by Another State
- » Inactive Supervision – Courtesy Supervision in Another CSU
- » ICJ Pending
- » 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

Linking Parole Statuses

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



