



# OHIO

## CRIMINAL SENTENCING COMMISSION

65 SOUTH FRONT STREET • 5TH FLOOR • COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215-3431 • TELEPHONE: 614.387.9305 • FAX: 614.387.9309

### Juvenile Justice Committee

**August 1, 2019**

#### Agenda

- I. **Call to Order & Approval of Meeting Notes of May 2019 meeting**
- II. **Old Business**
  - A. **CWRU Probation study update**  
*Brief update on the **upcoming** juvenile probation study being conducted by researchers at Case Western Reserve University*
- III. **New Business**
  - A. **Department of Youth Services Update**  
*Representatives from DYS will discuss the recent passage of HB166 (Budget Bill) as well as DYS initiatives moving forward*
- IV. **Legislative Update**  
*Update on pending and recently enacted legislation.*

---

#### Upcoming Meetings

Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission	September 19, 2019 Riffe Center, South B&C Conference Rooms 31st Floor
Juvenile Justice Committee	October 17, 2019 Ohio Judicial Center, Room 281

**Juvenile Justice Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**May 16, 2019**

**CALL TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2019 MEETING NOTES**

This meeting took place via conference call. The chair called the meeting to order and the minutes of the February meeting were approved.

**Old Business**

**Juvenile Probation Recommendations:**

Members of the Committee began their discussion with a review of the probations recommendations of the Center for State Government's Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI). While these recommendations were not specifically directed at the juvenile justice system, Commission staff felt they merited review of the committee to determine what if any impact they could have on the juvenile system.

The first recommendation are centered on length of supervision terms. JRI recommended basing the maximum length of community control terms on felony level. More serious felonies would be subject to a 5 year term, felonies of the third degree a 3 year term, and fourth and fifth degree felonies as well as misdemeanors would be subject to a 2 year maximum term. Currently, juvenile probation terms can last 7-8 years.

Judge DeLamatre led the discussion by noting that while there is an understandable desire to move away from indefinite supervision terms, the move would best be towards statewide guidelines rather than hard and fast limits, at least with regard to juvenile supervision practices. Numerous circumstances can exist that merit continued involvement with probation to provide services aimed at assisting the youth. He advocates for a framework of expected time frames with discretion to deviate when necessary. He noted that restitution can make things problematic – there is a desire not to extend a term of community control solely due to financial sanctions. Concerns about the rights of victims need to be balanced against the reality of a youth's ability to pay. He also suggested that any discussions distinguish restitution from fines and court costs that are imposed.

Members then discussed JRI's concept of "recovery sentencing" which relies on professional assessments to identify and develop treatment plans for individuals with substance abuse or mental health disorders. The goal is to tailor treatment and probation sanctions to an individual's specific needs and risk level. Judge DeLamatre felt that this is a relatively common practice in the juvenile system, with screenings in place to determine when a formal assessment is needed. Paul Dobson echoed that sentiment, stating that most courts are already doing the assessments. He suggested making probation length a consideration in plea negotiations. Judge DeLamatre also had concerns about "recovery sentencing" programs conflicting with specialized dockets already in existence.

**New Business**

**JJPA Reauthorization:**

Cayla Burton of the Juvenile Justice Coalition then discussed the reauthorization of the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. It was reauthorized in December of 2018 and the Juvenile Justice Coalition is hoping to come up with some recommendations and proposed legislation that would bring Ohio into compliance with the provisions of the Act. They feel there's a need to update several provisions in Revised Code Title 21 dealing with jail removal and sight/sound separation for youth in adult facilities, as well as a need to have racial and ethnic disparity data collected and reported on, with plans to address those disparities. States are required to submit plans to an advisory group and are subject to data collection and reporting requirements. Justin Stanek of the Department of Youth Services reported that DYS has been looking into changes made during JJDPa reauthorization but that Ohio is currently doing many of the things recommended already. DYS staff work with local governments to implement these policies. DYS is willing to help if necessary. There is a state JJDPa advisory group that meets quarterly, and DYS has a staffer who attends those meetings and they work with the Governor's office to make appointments to the group. They have an upcoming meeting where this will be discussed further and DYS is happy to report on discussion at that meeting.

**Legislative Update:**

Members were then updated on several pieces of recently introduced legislation affecting the juvenile justice system, including Senate Bill's 99 and 100 both introduced by Senator Thomas, which represent the bindover changes and extended juvenile sentence review provisions that were part of the last GA's omnibus juvenile bill.

**Adjourn:**

With no further business for the good of the order, a motion to adjourn was then passed.

## Investing in Ohio's Most In-Need Children

As the father of eight and grandfather of 24, family is central to Governor Mike DeWine's beliefs and values. Tragically, too many Ohio families have been separated because they are unable to access the care their children need to be healthy. As a result, parents must make the unfathomable decision to relinquish the custody of their child.

During his first days in office, Governor Mike DeWine directed the Ohio Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services to provide a one-time, \$3 million investment to address the unmet needs of multi-system youth who were at risk of criminal justice involvement and/or custody relinquishment. The flexible funds help locals meet the needs of families and are currently available to communities.

The Ohio operating budget supports Governor DeWine's goal of keeping families together by:

**Investing \$20 million in crisis stabilization services.** The state operating budget invests \$11.5 million over the biennium to provide flexible funding for crisis stabilization services that help meet the needs of individuals and families, as they arise. Local communities can use these funds to provide supports and services not covered by Medicaid. In addition, the budget invests in crisis infrastructure development by directing \$9.2 million to Ohio's county mental health and recovery boards. These funds will be used to develop standardized and quality crisis access. These funds can be used to create mobile response teams and address gaps in Ohio's crisis service network.

**Investing \$4 million to improve care coordination and provide support for families with children in crisis through the Strong Families, Safe Communities program.**

The Strong Families, Safe Communities program is designed specifically for children who present a risk to themselves, their families, or others because of a mental illness or developmental delay. Many children who are at risk are not engaged in treatment programs and may not be known to the community until a crisis unfolds. Care coordination and crisis intervention services can quickly stabilize a child's health. Support for these families will reduce the risk of harm and help the family remain together.

**Investing \$4.4 million through the Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities** to provide tele-psychiatry, respite services, and increase provider capacity to support the families of youth with complex needs. These investments are designed to prevent or reduce out-of-home placements for youth, prepare families for a successful return home after out-of-home placements, and improve overall outcomes.

**Investing \$28 million in additional services for individuals with autism spectrum disorder.** The newly-funded services will work to keep children with their families and prevent the need for out-of-home care.

**Investing \$4 million to provide individualized services and supports to children with multi-system needs and their families.** The Cabinet's Family-Centered Services and Supports project provides non-clinical assistance for children, up to age 21, who are challenged with multiple needs and their families. These funds are appropriated to local Family and Children First Councils to coordinate care for children who may not have access to Medicaid. Since its inception, approximately 96 percent of children served by Family-Centered Services and Supports have been able to remain in their homes, rather than enter institutional care or custody of a public agency.

**Investing \$18 million in multi-system youth innovation,** to serve children with complex needs who may be at risk of custody relinquishment. These funds will provide families and children with the services they need to get healthy and remain in their own homes and communities.

Ohio's operating budget also makes targeted investments in services to support multi-system youth who have been separated from their families:

**Investing \$25 million to provide services to multi-system youth in Ohio's public children services agencies or who are at risk of entering children services.** For too many Ohio children, child welfare has become the place of last resort when they can't access needed services within their own communities. The care that multi-system youth require is often expensive, and room and board are not covered by insurance. Ohio's operating budget supports Governor DeWine's goal to allocate additional funding to ensure multi-system youth within public children services agencies and youth who are at risk of entering them can receive the care they need.

The operating budget also supports Governor DeWine's commitment to providing additional support to young people as they transition out of foster care by:

**Investing an additional \$11.4 million over the biennium to support transition-aged youth exiting foster care.** Ohio's Bridges program is available to young adults who are transitioning from foster care to adulthood, who are ages 18 to 20. The program provides guidance, support, and services tailored to children's unique needs. Through regular meetings with Bridges representatives, participants develop goals, learn skills, and access services from employment and education to health care and household maintenance. All services are designed to help former foster youth become successful, self-sufficient adults.

Governor Mike DeWine has tasked the Ohio Family and Children First Cabinet Council – which is comprised of his Directors of Aging, Developmental Disabilities, Education, Health, Job and Family Services, Medicaid, Mental Health and Addiction Services, Opportunities for Ohioans with Disabilities, Rehabilitation and Correction, Youth Services, and Budget and Management – with coordinating the investments above to provide a safety net for Ohio's most at-risk children and families and ensure they receive the supports they need.



**Research Proposal for the Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission Juvenile Justice  
Committee**

**Begun Center for Violence Prevention Research and Education  
Jack, Joseph and Morton Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences  
Case Western Reserve University**

Fredrick Butcher, Ph.D. (Principal Investigator)  
Research Assistant Professor  
Begun Center for Violence Prevention Research and Education  
Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences  
Case Western Reserve University  
11402 Bellflower Rd.  
Cleveland, OH 44106  
fredrick.w.butcher@case.edu  
(216)368-0370

Krystel Tossone, Ph.D. (Co-Principal Investigator)  
Senior Research Associate  
Begun Center for Violence Prevention Research and Education  
Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences  
Case Western Reserve University  
11402 Bellflower Rd.  
Cleveland, OH 44106  
krystel.tossone@case.edu  
(216)368-4834

## Abstract

Recent juvenile justice policy changes have resulted in an increased variety of detention alternatives to reduce the incarcerated population. These detention alternatives include a wide range of probation services as well as diversion programming. As part of this shift, many states have moved towards providing assessment services to identify risk and need to target the appropriate evidence-based treatment. There is a need in Ohio to examine multiple perspectives of supervision services, assessment, as well as recidivism in the juvenile justice system. This project seeks to examine supervision, diversion, and probation programming through its processes, prevalence of characteristics, behavioral health assessments, and recidivism. Data collected for the project will encompass youth under supervision in state run facilities, youth in a statewide behavioral health diversion program, and juvenile justice involved youth across four urban and rural counties. By leveraging existing relationships with counties and existing datasets, the proposed project will provide a picture of the juvenile justice system from several perspectives. Further, it will also result in recommendations on data collection across the state to better identify the risk and needs of youth entering the juvenile justice system.



## **Background and Problem Statement**

Nationally, juvenile justice systems across many states have implemented a number of policy changes to reduce the incarcerated population (Howell, Wilson, Sickmund, Hodges, & Howell, 2017). These policy shifts have dramatically increased the use of detention alternatives that focus on addressing the underlying issues associated with juvenile delinquency (Mendel, 2014). These detention alternatives have reduced the detention population while also increasing public safety. As part of this policy shift, many states have moved towards providing assessment services to identify risk and need to target the appropriate evidence-based treatment for those most in need (Howell et al., 2017).

One way in which states have chosen to reduce the incarcerated population is through juvenile diversion programs. Often, juvenile justice systems are ill-equipped to deal with the issues that face many of the youth they serve (Kretschmar, Butcher, Flannery, & Singer, 2016). Diversion to community based treatment and other services can help to alleviate the issues faced by the systems. Diversion can take place at different parts of the juvenile justice system, including, for example, from formal juvenile court processing. Generally studies have shown that youth diverted from formal processing have lower rates of recidivism than those who are formally processed (Petrosino, Turpin-Petrosino, & Guckenburg, 2010; Schwalbe, Gearing, MacKenzie, Brewer, & Ibrahim, 2012; Wilson & Hoge, 2012).

Consistent with this increased emphasis on evidence-based treatment for juvenile justice involved youth, the overall aim of probation has evolved from enforcing the law to addressing the needs of probationers. The role of probation officers has similarly evolved from that of a law enforcement officer to a social worker (Miller, 2015). Probation officers are often asked to implement risk assessment and to provide case planning (Guy, Vincent, Grisso, & Perrault, 2015). The use of risk assessments, however, can be a complex process and is effective in identifying risk and need only when properly implemented (Vincent, Guy, Perrault, & Gershenson, 2016).

While Ohio has not seen a meaningful reduction in the incarcerated population in the adult system, the juvenile justice system has seen a large decrease in the number of incarcerated youth. In 1997, the average daily population incarcerated in state facilities was 2,096 (Ohio Department of Youth Services, 1997). In the two decades since, the average daily population decreased by 79 percent to 429 in 2017 (Ohio Department of Youth Services, 2017). This large

decrease in the incarcerated population during this time period coincided with RECLAIM Ohio, which expanded the availability of services for juvenile justice involved youth at the local level. Through several programs funded through the Ohio Department of Youth Services (ODYS), counties were incentivized against placing youth in residential services, including in local and state detention and incarceration facilities (Panzino, 2017). The state placed a heavy emphasis on investing in evidence-based assessment, treatment, and programming to identify the needs of youth being served and to monitor programmatic outcomes.

The Behavioral Health Juvenile Justice (BHJJ) initiative has provided community based behavioral health treatment for juvenile justice involved youth across the state of Ohio for over a decade. Data from this initiative has exhibited that youth participating in the program have histories of exposure to violence, high levels of trauma symptomatology, substance use, and other behavioral health issues that can be difficult to treat in the justice system (Butcher, Galanek, Kretschmar, & Flannery, 2015; Tossone, Wheeler, Butcher, & Kretschmar, 2017). However, outcome data from BHJJ have shown that youth receiving community based treatment have improved mental health symptomatology, substance use, and lower rates of recidivism (Kretschmar et al., 2016).

While the state has been fairly successful in reducing the incarcerated population through programs like RECLAIM and BHJJ, several problems remain throughout the system. Generally, there is a lack of accessible data throughout. At the state level, the ODYS warehouses readily accessible data on youth who are sent to ODYS facilities. However, there is no consistent method of gathering data at the county level in juvenile courts. Courts utilize varying methods of data collection, with some large urban counties having large accessible electronic databases, while several smaller rural counties have paper based files. These paper based files must be manually entered into a database for analysis. This basic data problem, coupled with the reality that rural youth account for a much lower percentage of juvenile justice involved youth across the state has resulted in policy decisions at the state level that may not reflect circumstances of rural counties.

Another important data need for Ohio is a consistent source of data on recidivism. The state tracks the number of youth that return to ODYS facilities. However, much of reoffending occurs prior to a youth's return to an ODYS facility. Further, this definition of recidivism does not track youth under probation or in diversion programs. ODYS recognizes this issue and has

begun to mandate recidivism tracking at the charge level for diversion programs funded by the state.

Further, as risk assessment has become a large part of decision making across the state, the focus has been on criminogenic risk. While criminogenic risk is an important factor in predicting recidivism, intake assessments should also account for behavioral health need. Osher and colleagues (2012) argued for a nine group typology of adult offenders based on their criminogenic risk and behavioral health need. While these data were based on adult offenders, the same argument applies for youthful offenders. Criminogenic risk provides one important factor in assessing a youth's risk for recidivism, however, consistent information on behavioral health must be collected to understand a youth's need for and responsiveness to treatment.

The proposed project is to examine the juvenile justice system in Ohio from a variety of perspectives. The project will explore the juvenile justice population in ODYS facilities, diversion, and probation across the state and four target counties. These target counties will include both urban (Montgomery and Lucas) and rural (Ashtabula and Marion) counties. Available data will be leveraged and supplemented to provide a fairly comprehensive examination of the system across Ohio. The project is designed to address the following aims and research questions.

### **Specific Aims and Questions**

1. To estimate the prevalence of youth in probation, diversion, and supervision in Ohio and the target counties.
  - a. How many probation, diversion, and formal/informal supervision youth are there in Ohio/target counties?
  - b. What is the average probation caseload size for juvenile probation officers in the target counties?
  - c. How many youth are currently on active probation status in the target counties (overall and by recidivism risk level)?
2. To gather data regarding offender and case characteristics and history in Ohio and the target counties.
  - a. What are the demographic characteristics of youth in probation, diversion, and formal/informal supervision?

- b. What are the offense characteristics of cases in probation, diversion, and formal/informal supervision?
  - c. What are the referral sources for youth in probation, diversion, and supervision?
  - d. What is the history of abuse/neglect among youth in probation, diversion, and supervision?
3. To evaluate the processes of probation cases in the target counties.
- a. How long do key case processing stages (such as arrest to referral, petition to adjudication, etc.) take for the probation population in the target counties?
  - b. What are the court histories of the probation population in the target counties?
  - c. How many judges and attorneys have been involved in a probation case, on average, in the target counties?
  - d. Among youth detained who go on probation, what was the length of time for detention in the target counties?
  - e. What percentage of cases are experiencing adjudication and disposition during the same hearing in the target counties?
  - f. How many pre-dispositional reports are being compiled in the target counties?
  - g. How many probation officers/court workers have been assigned to handle probation cases in each target county?
  - h. What percentage of probation cases are experiencing timely re-assessments in target counties?
  - i. What are the current probation levels of the probation population in target counties?
4. To understand the type of prior services and placement that probation youth received in target counties.
- a. What types of services did the probation population receive before, during, and after system entry in the target counties?
  - b. What are the placement histories of the probation and diversion populations in Ohio and in the target counties?
5. To determine the behavioral health needs of youth referred to juvenile courts in target counties.

- a. What is the prevalence of behavioral health problems in juvenile justice involved youth in target counties?
  - b. What is the prevalence of exposure to traumatic events in juvenile justice involved youth in target counties?
  - c. What should youth be screened for as they enter the justice system?
6. To evaluate the capacity and occurrence of risk screening, assessments, and tracking of outcomes in the target counties.
  - a. Is there a routine reporting system or data system for housing data elements related to screening, assessment and tracking of probation cases in the target counties?
  - b. What type of risk screens or assessments are conducted for youth in probation in the target counties?
  - c. If there are programs to address process and outcomes within in probation services in the target counties (such as JDAI), has there been improvement in outcomes since adoption?
7. To measure the occurrences of delinquency during project involvement, at case closure, and after program exit among probation and behavioral health diversion in Ohio and target counties.
  - a. What types of delinquency (recidivism) are these youth experiencing during project involvement, at case closure, and after program exit?
  - b. Are there differences in recidivism, detention length of stay, or pro-social improvements such as family placement or behavioral health functioning between the target counties?

## **Research Design**

This study will employ a retrospective secondary data analysis. A total of five sources will be used for data to answer the research questions detailed above. These data sources encompass youth involved in different parts of the juvenile justice system including intake, diversion, and incarceration. Taking this approach will provide for a more comprehensive look at the juvenile justice population across Ohio. Four of these data sources leverage existing data that have been collected for previous projects. These data will be supplemented with additional data collection or analyzed in a way that has not been reported prior to this current proposed project.

## ODYS

For a previous project the Ohio Department of Youth Services provided Case Western Reserve University (CWRU) with data for all commitments to DYS facilities during the period between 2011-2016. These data included the offense history for all ODYS youths, risk for recidivism as measured by the Ohio Youth Assessment System (OYAS), length of supervision, and recidivism.

## BHJJ

The Behavioral Health/Juvenile Justice initiative is a diversion program for juvenile justice involved youths with mental health and/or substance use issues. To participate in the program, youths must have a history of juvenile justice involvement, at least one *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM) diagnosis, and be between the ages of 10 and 18. The state identified optional eligibility criteria including substantial behavioral status impairment, co-occurring substance abuse, a pattern of criminal behavior, exposure to trauma or domestic violence, a pattern of criminal behavior, and a history of multi-system involvement. To date, over 4,300 youths in 17 urban and rural counties across Ohio have been diverted into community based behavioral health treatment as part of this initiative. Many youth participating in BHJJ are on probation or intensive supervision while receiving programming.

Case Western Reserve University has been involved in the evaluation of this program for over a decade. Evaluation activities have involved data collection on juvenile court history and recidivism, treatment success, history of violence exposure and abuse, and behavioral health information including diagnostic information, trauma symptomatology, substance use, and behavioral health problem severity and functioning. These surveys are completed by the youth, worker, and caregiver at least at intake and termination from the program with some measures repeated at three and six months.

## Montgomery County

The Montgomery County Intervention Center (IC) is a 7-day a week 24 hours a day intake center that provides assessment services for all youth referred to juvenile court. There are around 2,000 youths who are provided with assessment services annually. While the type of assessments completed can vary for each youth based on the type of placement and whether the

case is processed officially or unofficially, all youth receive the Risk Assessment Instrument that measures whether the youth is at risk for being placed in detention. Additionally, the OYAS is completed for youth who are processed officially. For all youths going through the IC, their juvenile court history, probation/supervision status, and recidivism will be tracked.

#### Lucas County

The Lucas County Assessment Center provides assessment services for youths referred to the court for approximately 1,000 youths annually. Data on public health, a measure of mental health symptomology, probation/supervision, OYAS, and recidivism are collected as part of the current evaluation.

#### Ashtabula County

The Resource Center in Ashtabula County provide assessment and placement services for approximately 200 youth diverted from the juvenile justice system annually. For these youth, CWRU will collect data on their behavioral health symptomatology, traumatic exposure, OYAS, juvenile court records, and recidivism. For youth who do not complete diversion programming successfully, data on their placement including probation and supervision will be available.

#### Marion County

All intakes into the Marion County Juvenile Court receive a trauma screening as part of their assessment services. For these youth, CWRU will collect data on trauma, placement, juvenile court history, OYAS, and recidivism.

#### Analysis Plan

Specific Aim 1: We will compile frequencies and cross-tabulations of youth in each target county, supervision, and diversion. We will estimate the average caseload per probation officer in the target counties. Percent and number of youth on active probation will be tabulated for each target county as well as cross-tabulated by OYAS risk level.

Specific Aim 2: We will compile demographic data, including frequencies and central tendencies, of each variable for the target counties and the data for youth under supervision, and diversion. This includes variables such as gender, race, age, and any other demographic variables available depending on the data source. We will calculate frequencies of offense characteristics,

including current offenses, previous offenses (depending on the data), and level of offenses. This may also include charge data, which sometimes differs from what the actual offense was adjudicated as. We will cross-tabulate offense data with demographics and by target county, supervision, or diversion. Additionally for those with multiple OYAS scores (such as in supervision), we will cross-tabulate OYAS scores depending on the type of OYAS assessment. Referral sources will be tabulated for those in the target counties and supervision. Abuse and neglect history will be tabulated for those in the target counties (where available) and diversion. Both referral source and abuse/neglect history will be cross-tabulated with demographics.

Specific Aim 3: We will calculate length of time in key processing stages within each target county. This will give us a picture of the average processing time for youth in each target county. We will then compare the length of time in key processing stages by target county by employing a comparison of central tendency test (i.e. Analysis of Variance if parametric or Kruskal-Wallis test if non-parametric). This will allow us to compare the counties for differences in length of time in each stage. We will compile the prevalence of court history for youth on probation in key target counties as well as diversion. We will be able to then cross-tabulate these prevalences by target counties and compare them. This includes past court involvement and past probation. We will also calculate the average number of probation officers, judges, and attorneys involved in a probation case in the target counties. We will calculate the length of time in detention for youth who go onto probation in the target counties. We can compare the length of time for probation according to offense level and OYAS risk score, as well as any other key variables that are identified. Percentage of cases in adjudication and disposition during the same hearing will be tabulated in target counties and compared between the counties using a Chi-squared ( $\chi^2$ ) test or Fisher's exact test (if sample sizes are low). Key variables that may explain the percentage of those cases such as offense level or type of offense can be included as possible confounders in a regression model if there is a statistically significant relationship. We will calculate the amount of time that probation cases receive re-assessments, and what percentage are timely in each target county. Probation levels will also be tabulated into percentages for each target county, and will be cross-tabulated with key variables and statistical difference testing conducted as in similar analyses.



Specific Aim 4: We will calculate the types of services that probation youth received before, during and after probation in the target counties (where data are available). We can cross-tabulate these frequencies with related variables of interest, such as offense and court involvement history. We will also tabulate the prevalence of placement types in each target county as well as in diversion. We can also cross-tabulate these prevalence categories by relevant variables such as offense history, types of services received, and court involvement.

Specific Aim 5: We will determine the prevalence of behavioral health needs of youth in target counties through the calculation of variables that reflect behavioral health needs. This includes psychiatric and trauma data and self-report scales from questionnaires. These can be cross-tabulated with relevant variables of interest as well as demographic variables and statistical testing to determine key differences in these samples will be conducted.

Specific Aim 6: We will gather data on tracking and housing of data related to tracking, screening, and assessment for each target county. This will include conducting a gap analysis of what each county collects and their capacity for data collection as well. We can conduct short telephone interviews with each target county in order to understand their data collection and tracking process. We will also gather data on what risk screens and assessments are conducted with youth on probation and during which stage of the probation process. This will aid in identifying where increased screening and assessment needs to be targeted. In the target counties that recently changed their system due to implementation of increased programming (such as JDAI implementation), we can analyze whether recidivism has decreased following the programming where data are available.

Specific Aim 7: We will examine the prevalence of recidivism for youth in probation (target counties), supervision (whether they returned to DYS), and diversion (if they offended during and after BHJJ). We can cross-tabulate this prevalence by demographic variables, as well as variables of interest (such as offense level, court history, OYAS level, and probation services received where relevant). Statistical testing can determine whether any of the differences in the prevalence of recidivism is significantly related to OYAS level or other relevant variables through regression analysis. Outcome testing, including recidivism, placement, and behavioral health functioning, will be conducted among the target counties using the appropriate statistical test such as a regression analysis, in order to control for possible confounders.

## Project Personnel

Fredrick Butcher, PhD is a Research Assistant Professor with the Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences and the Begun Center for Violence Prevention Research and Education at Case Western Reserve University and will serve as the Principal Investigator for this project. Dr. Butcher's research has focused on behavioral health assessment and intervention for youth involved in the justice system. He has been a principal investigator on several projects including Competitive RECLAIM, a county led juvenile diversion program in many counties across Ohio. Further, Dr. Butcher has worked on the evaluation of Behavioral Health/Juvenile Justice initiative since 2009. The results of these evaluations have been disseminated to practitioner and academic audiences through reports, journal articles, and presentations. He also has extensive experience collaborating with the agencies and juvenile courts providing data for this proposed project. For example, Dr. Butcher has worked with the Montgomery County Juvenile Court on a number of different projects for nearly a decade. This history of collaboration will help to ensure that the project and data collection will be completed according to the project design.

Krystel Tossone, Ph.D., is the Center-Based Statistician and a Senior Research Associate at the Begun Center for Violence Prevention Research and Education at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio and will serve as the Co-Principal Investigator for this project. Dr. Tossone's expertise is in quantitative methodology and statistics, particularly in advancing methodological and analytical techniques in the fields of juvenile justice, trauma, and victimization. She currently works on several research projects at the Begun Center, including: Ohio's Behavioral Health/Juvenile Justice (BHJJ) Initiative, evaluation of decarceration legislation for Ohio's Supreme Court Sentencing Commission, many adult drug treatment court evaluation programs including being part of the team awarded a 5-year Bureau of Justice Assistance Smart Supervision grant; and conducting statistical analyses on cohorts of youth who are suicidal and seeking psychiatric treatment. Her main areas of expertise are secondary data analysis of existing datasets, latent variable modeling; including mixture modeling, latent class analysis, and structural equation modeling. In addition to her evaluation and statistical activities at the Center and elsewhere, Dr. Tossone is an author on a number of peer-reviewed articles at high-tiered journals, including *Child Abuse and Neglect* and *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, and co-investigator on grant applications. She is also an invited reviewer for a number of peer-reviewed journals.

## Potential Impact

The proposed project will provide a picture of the juvenile justice system from several perspectives. Data available statewide will be able to shed some light on the characteristics of youths in ODYS facilities. Further, data from the BHJJ initiative can help to provide exploratory data on juvenile justice involved youth at different points in the system. While Ohio has a centralized database for youth in the ODYS system, there is no consistent database for youths who are involved in the juvenile justice system at the county level. Research has shown that early intervention for at risk youth before they become officially involved in the juvenile justice system is a critical piece for ensuring that these youth do not become further involved in the system and for public safety (Ford, Kerig, Desai, Feierman, 2016). The proposed project will collect data for youths at the front end of the system in target counties to describe the risk and needs of these youth.

As part of the activities proposed in this project, we will examine the processing of probation cases. Understanding this process can help to improve and streamline the time between intake and court processing and help to reduce the time that youth may spend in detention awaiting trial. Detention places youth at risk for further delinquency and crime, and it is important that we examine and address processes that may result in detention use (Mendel, 2014). The

Further, the proposed project can help to identify the data needs, in the target counties and possibly across the state. The proposed project will result in recommendations on data collection across the state to better identify the risk and needs of youth entering the juvenile justice system. The proposed project may also help counties to streamline their data collection efforts by identifying critical pieces of information as youth enter the system. While the study may not be generalizable to the entire state, the project is designed to be an exploratory study of data needs in Ohio and can help to continue the conversation around data needs around the state. Target counties include both urban and rural counties, the latter being an underrepresented population in similar studies.

## References

- Butcher, F., Galanek, J. D., Kretschmar, J. M., & Flannery, D. J. (2015). The impact of neighborhood disorganization on neighborhood exposure to violence and social relationships among at-risk youth. *Social Science & Medicine*, *146*, 300-306. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.10.013
- Ford, J. D., Kerig, P. K., Desai, N., Feierman, J. (2016). Psychosocial interventions for traumatized youth in the juvenile justice system: Research, evidence base, and clinical/legal challenges. *Journal of Juvenile Justice*, *5*, 31-49.
- Guy, L. S., Vincent, G. M., Grisso, T., & Perrault, R. (2015). Advancing use of risk assessment in juvenile probation. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Howell, J. C., Wilson, J. J., Sickmund, M. H., Hodges, N. J., & Howell, M. Q. (2017). Caught in the act: States doing some things right in juvenile justice. *Juvenile & Family Court Journal*, *68*, 25-42. doi: 10.1111/jfcj.12101
- Kretschmar, J. M., Butcher, F., Flannery, D. J., & Singer, M. I. (2016). Diverting juvenile justice-involved youth with behavioral health issues from detention. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *27*, 302-325. doi: 10.1177/0887403414560885
- Mendel, R. (2014). Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative: Progress report 2014. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Miller, J. (2015). Contemporary modes of probation officer supervision: The triumph of the “synthetic” officer? *Justice Quarterly*, *32*, 314-336. doi: 10.1080/07418825.2013.770546
- Ohio Department of Youth Services. (1997). *Annual Report Fiscal Year 1997*. Retrieved from <http://www.dys.ohio.gov/Portals/0/PDFs/Home/NewsAndFacts/AnnualReports/FY1997AnnualReport.pdf>
- Ohio Department of Youth Services. (2017). *Annual Report Fiscal Year 2017*. Retrieved from <http://www.dys.ohio.gov/Portals/0/PDFs/Home/NewsAndFacts/AnnualReports/FY2017AnnualReport.ppd>
- Osher, F., D’Amora, D. A., Plotkin, M., Jarrett, N., & Eggleston, A. (2012). Adults with behavioral health needs under correctional supervision: A shared framework for reducing recidivism and promoting recovery. New York, NY: Council of State Governments.
- Panzino, A. (2017). The Future of State Grant Funded Activities [Powerpoint slides].
- Petrosino, A., Turpin-Petrosino, C., Guckenburg, S. (2010). Formal system processing of juveniles: Effects on delinquency. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, *1*, 1-88.

- Schwalbe, C. S., Gearing, R. E., MacKenzie, M. J., Brewer, K. B., Ibrahim, R. (2012). A meta-analysis of experimental studies of diversion programs for juvenile offenders. *Clinical Psychology Review, 32*, 26-33. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2011.10.002
- Tossone, K., Wheeler, M., Butcher, F., & Kretschmar, J. M. (2017). The role of sexual abuse in trauma symptoms, delinquent and suicidal behaviors, and criminal justice outcomes among females in a juvenile justice diversion program. *Violence Against Women*, advanced online publication. doi: 10.1177/1077801217724921
- Vincent, G. M., Guy, L. S., Perrault, R. T., & Gershenson, B. (2016). Risk assessment matters, but only when implemented well: A multisite study in juvenile probation. *Law and Human Behavior, 40*, 683-696. doi: 10.1037/lhb0000214
- Wilson, H. A., Hoge, R. D. (2012). The effect of youth diversion programs on recidivism: A meta-analytic review. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 40*, 497-518. doi:10.1177/0093854812451089

## Appendix A. Budget and Budget Narrative

Juvenile Justice Commission Evaluation

Begun Center for Violence Prevention Research &  
Education

Case Western Reserve University

Ohio Criminal Sentencing  
Commission

---

Budget Period: July 1, 2018 - June 30, 2019

<b>Salaries</b>		<b>base</b>	<b>effort</b>	<b>project total</b>
Fred Butcher, Principal Investigator	513700	\$79,968.00	15.00%	\$11,995.20
Krystal Tossone, Co-PI	513100	\$74,000.00	15.00%	\$11,100.00
Master's Student		\$7,280.00	100.0%	\$7,280.00
Local UND Students county specific		\$2,000.00	100.0%	\$2,000.00
Wendy Boerger, Grants Administrator		\$56,871.45	1.00%	\$568.71
 Fringe @ 33%				 \$7,099.17
 Supplies				 
*research needs such as training and presentation materials, software, etc.				\$ -
 Contractual				 \$ -
 Travel				 
*local mileage at federal rate, parking, etc.				\$1,249.76
*in-state travel to 3 Ohio counties				\$707.80
*conference travel				\$2,400.00
			<b>Total Direct Cost</b>	<b>\$43,692.85</b>
 IDC				 
*calculated at a reduced rate of 20%				\$8,738.57

**Total Project Cost**                      \$52,431.42

---

---

The budget is reflective of Dr. Butcher's and Dr. Tossone's time at 15% FTE for a 12 month period. Additionally, there will be a Master's level student working on data management for the duration of the project. Ashtabula and Marion counties will require a student to enter data on a contract basis. These students will be paid \$1,000 for work related to entering data for the project. Travel for the project will be required for regular meetings with the Ohio Criminal Sentencing Commission and the Juvenile Justice Committee throughout the year. Additionally, one meeting with Ashtabula, Marion, and Montgomery counties are required to begin the data collection phase. Travel funding for dissemination is also figured into the budget.

**1. Some members of the committee were concerned about how the research remains objective in its evaluation. What precautions would be in place to avoid an assumption that the program's being evaluated are actually effective?**

For the proposed project, it is not possible to evaluate program effectiveness. This is mainly due to the lack of experimental design in these existing studies. To our knowledge, there has been no random assignment in any evaluation of programming in the juvenile justice system in Ohio. Given that there is no random assignment, we do have data to be able to examine whether youth who do receive programming improve across a variety of behavioral health and criminal justice measures. Further, we have data to be able to examine the conditions with which a youth coming into behavioral health programming would see the most benefits. For example, under good conditions, we would be able to match youth violent vs. nonviolent offenders on a variety of behavioral health measures at intake to compare their programmatic outcomes. At the very least, we can control for possible confounders in any analysis that examines programmatic outcomes.

The evaluation of the programs will be objective, in the sense that the data analysis and methods will be both transparent and replicable. However, there are always limitations to any study and the data collection process occurs beyond our reach. Because we receive data from the courts, any bias in collecting the information cannot be controlled for. We will list all data limitations in any final report. Further, we do not have a financial or any other interest in the programs being offered by the counties.

**2. Will your research and reporting be able to capture complaints handled both formally and informally? The Committee is very interested in the project being able to report on informal complaints, understanding how those are handled can vary by jurisdiction.**

**a. Will misdemeanor and unruly dispositions be captured in the study?**

Yes, the proposed project examines data from three assessment centers that handle cases both formally and informally. For example, some preliminary data we examined from Lucas county showed that around 55% of cases are processed unofficially. Montgomery county and Ashtabula county also collect data on all cases being processed through their assessment centers including those that are processed informally. We felt that these assessment centers are an important source of data collection because they allow us to examine how these jurisdictions handle both official and unofficial cases. Additionally, we aim to examine all cases through Marion county which will provide a contrasting look at how official and unofficial cases are processed in a smaller county with no assessment center.



We have a few ways in which misdemeanor and unruly dispositions can be captured. Since we are collecting data for all cases that are coming through the assessment centers in Montgomery, Lucas, and Ashtabula counties, we will be able to examine data for misdemeanor and unruly cases there. Additionally, we are examining juvenile court data for all youth who participate in the BHJJ program. Many of these youth come into the program with misdemeanor and unruly offenses.

**3. The Committee also wanted to know how you came to choose the four counties you selected for the study. Was it solely due to existing, available data and established relationships, or were other factors involved?**

**a. Relatedly, the Committee also asked whether it would be possible to consider alternate/additional sites. Is this possible? The four counties in the proposal are all JDAI participants, and interest was expressed in examining other non-JDAI sites as well as varying sizes of sites to better represent the whole picture in Ohio.**

**b. If so, which counties would CWRU recommend? What would the cost impact on the proposal be if CWRU collected and analyzed data from one or more alternate sites.**

The four counties were chosen for a number of reasons. Established relationships is an important factor in ensuring that researchers and courts can work together to collect data. In addition to established relationships being a factor, these four counties include two counties from the Big 6 and two rural counties. Further, three of the counties (Montgomery, Lucas, and Ashtabula) have assessment centers which have formalized data collection processes in place for youth who are screened and processed officially and unofficially.

If we were to add two or three counties that are currently non-JDAI sites, we would suggest Hamilton or Lorain county, Clark county and Richland county. Hamilton and Lorain counties both participate in BHJJ and have had several grants through RECLAIM funding. Clark county has its own detention center but is not a participant in either BHJJ or RECLAIM. Richland county would be a rural non-JDAI site that would be able to add to the overall characteristic of the data. While we are not entirely sure how adding these sites will affect the budget, we do not anticipate that this would add more than \$5,000 to hire a graduate student, travel, and a small percentage of the PI and the Co-PI's time and effort. The scope of work will be more apparent once we have a chance to speak with the court administrator at each site to understand what their capacity for data would be.