



Oregon Commission on Children and Families

**Juvenile Crime Prevention Advisory Committee
(JCPAC)**

2009-2011

**Juvenile Crime Prevention (JCP)
Final Guidelines for Updating
Local High-Risk Juvenile Crime Prevention Plans and
Connecting them to Local Coordinated Comprehensive Plans**

Approved by JCPAC, May 28 2009

Questions or technical assistance: Contact either Barbara Carranza or Jessie Dudley:
Barbara Carranza, OCCF Juvenile Crime Prevention Manager
barbara.j.carranza@or.state.us
503-378-5119.

Jessie Dudley, OCCF Regional Juvenile Crime Prevention Coordinator
jessie.dudley@state.or.us
503-378-5175

**JUVENILE CRIME PREVENTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Guidelines for Juvenile Crime Prevention (JCP)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Oregon Revised Statutes - Related to JCP Planning and Local Coordinated Comprehensive Planning	3-5
Overview - Roles and responsibilities, outcomes, expectations and other details: County JCP Lead Agencies; JCPAC Responsibilities; High-Risk Juvenile Crime Prevention (JCP) Plans including: JCP Prevention funds; Basic Services funds; Diversion funds; Research in Oregon on Risk Indicators in Multiple Domains; Improved Outcomes	6-7
Process of Developing Guidelines JCP Planning Template; and Process for Submitting Plans	8
Context for 2009-2011 JCP Planning 2010 Local Coordinated Comprehensive Planning Updates	8
Outline for the JCP Plan Summary	9
Planning Process Details	
Step 1) Planning	10
Step 2) Participation and Collaboration	11
Step 3) Analysis	
Step 4) Gaps and Barriers	12
Step 5) JCP Community Issues	13
Step 6) JCP Target Population	
Step 7) Strategic Approaches and Strategies	
Step 8) Measurement	15
Step 9) Continuum of Services	
Step 10) Budget Information	16
APPENDICES	
A. High-Risk JCP Prevention Population Policy	17
B. High-Risk JCP Performance Measures Policy	19
C. Evidence Based Practice Policy	21
D. Importance of Effective Juvenile Crime Prevention	25
E. Oregon Revised Statutes	
Local High-Risk Juvenile Crime Prevention Plan	27
JCPAC Committee and Duties	28
Template 1. Sample OYA Basic Services and Diversion Funding Plan	Attachment

Oregon Revised Statutes
Related to JCP Planning and Local Coordinated Comprehensive Planning

Updating Local High Risk Juvenile Crime Prevention Plans and incorporating them into Local Coordinated Comprehensive Plans: Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) provide a foundation for developing and implementing the High-Risk Juvenile Crime Prevention Plans, and High-Risk JCP plans as a section of the Local Coordinated Comprehensive Plans. Provided below are several most relevant statutes to these guidelines:

417.705 Definitions for ORS 417.705 to 417.801.

(6) “*Local coordinated comprehensive plan*” or “*local plan*” means a local coordinated comprehensive plan for children and families that is developed pursuant to ORS 417.775 through a process coordinated and led by a local commission and that consists of:

- (a) A community plan that identifies the community’s needs, strengths, goals, priorities and strategies for:
 - (A) Creating positive outcomes for children and families;
 - (B) Community mobilization;
 - (C) Coordinating programs, strategies and services for children who are 0 through 18 years of age and their families among community groups, government agencies, private providers and other parties; and
 - (D) Addressing the needs of target populations; and
- (b) *The service plans listed in ORS 417.775 (6) that designate specific services for the target populations identified in the community plan. [Such as JCP plans]*

417.715 Policy; service system values and goals.

(4) The service system must begin at the local level, through cooperation and integration of all local and state providers, treat the whole person and be built on the strengths and natural supports of neighborhoods and communities.

417.735 Duties of state commission; rules.

- (3) The state commission shall:
 - (a) Set guidelines for the planning, coordination and delivery of services by local commissions in partnership with other planning bodies and agencies providing services for children and families. The guidelines shall be consistent with the key elements of the service system developed and implemented under ORS 417.705 to 417.801. In conjunction with other planning bodies and agencies providing social supports, the state commission shall use the local coordinated comprehensive plans to advise agencies, the Legislative Assembly and the Governor;
 - (b) Advise the Legislative Assembly and the Governor concerning possible solutions to problems facing children and families;
 - (f) Compile, analyze and distribute information that informs and supports statewide coordinated planning;
 - (h) Provide a process whereby the Department of Human Services, Juvenile Crime Prevention Advisory Committee, Oregon Youth Authority, Department of Education, Department of Community Colleges and Workforce Development, Employment Department, Housing and Community Services Department and Economic and Community Development Department review all findings from data collected by the local commissions through the local coordinated comprehensive plans. *The information gathered in this review shall be considered by those agencies in designing future economic resources and services and in the coordination of services; [use of data collected]*

417.775 Purpose and duties of local commission; local coordinated comprehensive plan; community plan.

- (4) ... the local commission shall coordinate the development of a single local plan for coordinating community programs, strategies and services for children who are 0 through 18 years of age and their families among community groups, government agencies, private providers and other parties. *The local plan shall be a comprehensive area-wide service delivery plan for all services to be provided for children and their families in the county...*
- (5) The local commission shall prepare the local coordinated comprehensive plan and applications for funds to implement ORS 417.705 to 417.801 and 419A.170. *The local plan, policies and proposed service delivery systems shall be submitted to the board or boards of county commissioners for approval prior to submission to the state commission. [Approvals]* The local plan shall be based on identifying the most effective service delivery system allowing for the continuation of current public and private programs where appropriate. *The local plan shall address needs, strengths and assets of all children, their families and communities, including those children and their families at highest risk.*
- (6) Subject to the availability of funds:
 - (a) The local coordinated comprehensive plan shall include:

(A) Identification of ways to connect all state and local planning processes related to services for children and their families into the local coordinated comprehensive plan to create positive outcomes for children and their families; **[Outcomes]** and

(B) Provisions for a continuum of social supports at the community level for children from the prenatal stage through 18 years of age, and their families, that takes into account areas of need, service overlap, asset building and community strengths as outlined in ORS 417.305 (2).

(b) *The local coordinated comprehensive plan shall reference:*

(A) A voluntary local early childhood system plan created pursuant to ORS 417.777;

(B) Local alcohol and other drug prevention and treatment plans developed pursuant to ORS 430.258;

(C) Local service plans, developed pursuant to ORS 430.630, for the delivery of mental health services for children and their families;

(D) Local public health plans, developed pursuant to ORS 431.385, that include public health issues such as prenatal care, immunizations, well-child checkups, tobacco use, nutrition, teen pregnancy, maternal and child health care and suicide prevention; and

(E) *The local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plan developed pursuant to ORS 417.855. [JCP plans]...*

417.845 Juvenile Crime Prevention Advisory Committee; membership; chairperson, staffing. (1) The Juvenile Crime Prevention Advisory Committee is created within the State Commission on Children and Families.

(2) The committee shall have the following members:

(a) The Director of the Oregon Youth Authority or a designee of the director;

(b) The staff director of the State Commission on Children and Families or a designee of the staff director;

(c) The Director of Human Services or one or more designees of the director, one of whom has expertise in treatment and prevention of substance abuse;

(d) The executive director of the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission or a designee of the executive director;

(e) The Superintendent of Public Instruction or a designee of the superintendent;

(f) The Superintendent of State Police or a designee of the superintendent;

(g) The Director of the Department of Corrections or a designee of the director;

(h) One designee of the Governor;

(i) One member appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be a member of the Senate and who shall be a nonvoting, advisory member;

(j) One member appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall be a member of the House of Representatives and who shall be a nonvoting, advisory member; and

(k) One designee of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court from the Judicial Department who serves as a nonvoting member to provide information and support the partnership role of the courts in an effective comprehensive statewide approach to high-risk youth and their families.

(3) In addition to the members listed in subsection (2) of this section, the Governor shall appoint the following members who shall be representative of the geographic and cultural diversity of the state:

(a) To represent local public and private entities:

(A) A county commissioner;

(B) A local juvenile director;

(C) A director of a local commission on children and families;

(D) Two law enforcement officials;

(E) A county mental health director;

(F) An alcohol and drug abuse professional;

(G) A school superintendent;

(H) A private youth service provider; and

(I) An elected city official;

(b) A researcher;

(c) A citizen member; and

(d) Other members as determined by the Governor.

(4) Each member of the committee appointed by the Governor under subsection (3) of this section shall serve a term of four years. Members appointed by the Governor shall serve at the pleasure of the Governor. A vacancy in the office of any member appointed by the Governor under subsection (3) of this section shall be filled by the Governor by appointment for the unexpired term.

(5) The Governor shall select one of the members of the committee as chairperson and one of its members as vice chairperson.

(6) The committee shall meet at times, places and intervals deemed advisable by a majority of the members.

(7) *The State Commission on Children and Families shall provide staff support to the committee. [JCPAC staffing]*

417.850 Duties of committee. The Juvenile Crime Prevention Advisory Committee shall:

(1) Review the budget and allocation formula for appropriations for the purpose of juvenile crime prevention;

(2) *Review the components of the local coordinated comprehensive plans for children and families created pursuant to ORS 417.775 that address local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans developed under ORS 417.855 and make recommendations to the Governor about the local plans; [Review plans]*

(3) *Ensure that high-risk juvenile crime prevention planning criteria are met by state and local public and private entities; [Planning criteria]*

(4) Recommend high-risk juvenile justice and juvenile crime prevention policies to the Governor and the Legislative Assembly; ...

(6) *Review data and outcome information; [Outcomes]*

(7) *Establish and publish review and assessment criteria for the local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans. The criteria shall include, but not be limited to, measuring changes in juvenile crime and juvenile recidivism; [Assessment criteria]*

(8) *Review and coordinate county youth diversion plans and basic services grants with the local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans. [Diversion plans and basic services grants] Basic services grants may be used for detention and other juvenile department services including:*

(a) Shelter care;

(b) Treatment services;

(c) Graduated sanctions; and

(d) Aftercare for youth offenders.

417.855 Local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plan. (1) *Each board of county commissioners shall designate an agency or organization to serve as the lead planning organization to facilitate the creation of a partnership among state and local public and private entities in each county. [Lead planning organization and JCP partnership]* The partnership shall include, but is not limited to, local commissions on children and families, education representatives, public health representatives, local alcohol and drug planning committees, representatives of the court system, local mental health planning committees, city or municipal representatives and local public safety coordinating councils. *The partnership shall develop a local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plan that shall be incorporated into the local coordinated comprehensive plans created pursuant to ORS 417.775. [High Risk JCP plan incorporated into Local Plan]*

(2) The local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans shall use services and activities to meet the needs of a targeted population of youths who:

(a) Have more than one of the following risk factors:

(A) Antisocial behavior;

(B) Poor family functioning or poor family support;

(C) Failure in school;

(D) Substance abuse problems; or

(E) Negative peer association; and

(b) Are clearly demonstrating at-risk behaviors that have come to the attention of government or community agencies, schools or law enforcement and will lead to imminent or increased involvement in the juvenile justice system.

(3)(a) The State Commission on Children and Families shall allocate funds available to support the local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans to counties based on the youth population age 18 or younger in those counties.

(b) The state commission shall award a minimum grant to small counties. The minimum grant level shall be determined by the Juvenile Crime Prevention Advisory Committee through a public process and reviewed by the committee biennially.

GUIDELINES

Updating Local High-Risk Juvenile Crime Prevention Plans as section of the Local Coordinated Comprehensive Plans

Overview

Roles and responsibilities, outcomes, expectations and other details: A short summary of these key topics is provided below.

County JCP Lead Agencies: Each County Board of Commissioners appoints a county agency to serve as the lead agency responsible for convening a “JCP partnership” to perform a number of activities related to preventing juvenile crime, as outlined in statutes.

JCPAC Responsibilities: JCPAC is issuing these guidelines to provide guidance as required in statute for juvenile crime prevention planning and incorporating JCP plans into the local coordinated comprehensive plans.

Preventing and reducing juvenile crime is critical in Oregon: Juvenile crime prevention is an integral part of the juvenile justice system. Effective prevention strategies reduce the number of youth and cost of serving youth who enter the juvenile justice system, or move further into the system because of re-offending. Effective prevention and intervention along the continuum reduces victimization.

High-Risk Juvenile Crime Prevention (JCP) Plans:

Three sources of state general fund are included in the JCP Plan. These funds are described in more detail on page 15.

JCP Prevention funds focus on efforts in the community and in the juvenile department to reduce the number of youth who enter the juvenile justice system, or who move further into the system because of re-offending.

Community Juvenile Crime Prevention Efforts

*Schools, community agencies,
advocates and other partners*

County Juvenile Justice System

*Juvenile departments and
other community partners*

Oregon Youth Authority

Youth Correctional Facilities
Parole / Probation Services
Residential Resources

Adult Criminal Justice System

Department of Corrections
County Parole / Probation
Adult Correctional Facilities

Reducing victims and numbers of youth involved in the juvenile justice system and potentially in adult corrections

◀◀ **Prevention Funds**
*Prevent/reduce youth entering
county juvenile justice system*

◀◀ **Basic Services Funds**
Prevent/reduce youth further offending

◀◀ **Diversion Funds**

Prevent/reduce youth moving into OYA

◀◀ **OYA Services**

Prevent/reduce youth moving into adult system

Reducing the number of youth who become involved in the juvenile justice system allows juvenile departments and juvenile courts to focus efforts and limited resources (**Basic Services Funds**) on youth who are at moderate to high risk for reoffending (recidivism).

The combination of effective juvenile crime prevention and effective management of high-risk youth by county juvenile departments reduces the number of youth who need to be placed in the more costly care and custody of the Oregon Youth Authority (**Diversion Funds**). This allows the Oregon Youth Authority to focus efforts and limited resources on community protection and reforming youth offenders.

“**JCP Prevention**” seems redundant, but is used in the guidelines to be clear about instructions regarding the prevention funded portion of the planning. JCPAC approves the JCP Prevention funded plans, and reviews them within the context of Basic and Diversion funded plans (High-Risk JCP Plans).

Oregon Youth Authority (OYA): The high level outcomes established for JCP Basic and Diversion Funds are reduced recidivism and compliance with the Discretionary Bed Allocation (DBA). OYA tracks services in the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) to identify and report progress. OYA is providing Guidelines for Service Plans for 2009-11 JCP Basic Service and Diversion funds. OYA has developed a “JCP Basic & Diversion Provider Program Template” and “List of Program Types” for counties to use in categorizing services in their service plan. (See Template 1)

Research in Oregon on Risk Indicators in Multiple Domains: A risk assessment tool has been developed and validated for use in Oregon. Use of the JCP Risk Assessment tool is required for initial assessments, re-assessments and program assessments. Experience with using the tool has documented that for those youth with:

- 4 risk indicators, there is an approximate 25% chance that they will re-offend;
- 9 risk indicators, there is an approximate 50% chance they will re-offend; and
- 14 risk indicators, there is an approximate 75% chance they will re-offend.

JCPAC Commitment to Counties: In carrying out its role and function JCPAC has agreed to provide:

- streamlined planning process that is attentive to individual needs of counties, and
- training and technical assistance plan for meeting planning and outcome expectations.

Improved Outcomes: JCPAC understands that clear guidance about planning has not been provided over recent years. JCPAC anticipates these guidelines and policies will facilitate gathering reliable data and documenting improved outcomes related to investments in juvenile crime prevention.

JCPAC determined that it was critical to provide clarification in:

- Expectations for targeting locally defined populations,
- Use of evidence based interventions, and
- Data collection and continuous improvement.

Policies: These guidelines are based on three policies adopted by JCPAC on May 28, 2009. The policies are a major section of these guidelines (*See Appendices A, B and C*). JCP partnerships will need to be familiar with these policies prior to beginning planning discussions and making decisions:

High-Risk JCP Prevention Population Policy	(Appendix A)
High-Risk JCP Performance Measures Policy	(Appendix B)
Evidence Based Practice Policy	(Appendix C)

Process of Developing Guidelines

These guidelines reflect input from local communities through forums in 2008 and telephone surveys in early 2009. Stakeholder review and comment sessions were held on April 22 in Salem and on April 28 in Pendleton.

JCP Planning Template: During telephone surveys counties provided much of the information needed to update the 2007-09 plans. Staff has incorporated information already collected from counties into a JCP Plan Summary template (including information such as issues, strategies and services) for each county. Draft templates will be sent to counties late May and early June for confirmation of accuracy and completeness, and for counties to use in developing 2009-11 JCP plans.

Process for Submitting Plans: These guidelines provide specific details for submitting JCP plans to local commissions for incorporation in the local coordinated comprehensive plans and for JCPAC review.

Context for 2009-2011 Juvenile Crime Prevention (JCP) Planning: Local commissions on children and families (local commissions) maintain the local coordinated comprehensive plans (comprehensive plans) for each county. These are county plans and not “commission” plans. Many details of the comprehensive plans are captured in a database to allow OCCF and other state and local partners to analyze local or statewide issues, gaps and barriers; share strategies and efforts with others; inform the legislature, etc. Local commissions also provide narrative information in a “County Comprehensive Plan Summary”.

This is the first time JCP plan updates have been requested in a format similar to local plans. JCP plans will become one section of the local comprehensive plan updates that are due to OCCF on January 29, 2010. These guidelines describe JCP plan information that will be captured in the OCCF comprehensive planning database, this information will be provided by the lead agency to the local commission. Commissions will enter information into the comprehensive plan database. The Lead agency will provide narrative information in a “JCP Plan Summary” that will also be provided to the local commission.

The local JCP plan is one of several local “service” plans that will be aligned with the county’s comprehensive plan. These are the first guidelines to describe a process for aligning a service plan with the comprehensive plan. Other local service plans that are expected to be aligned over time are the early childhood plans, and alcohol and drug prevention plans, among others. Local commissions will provide the Lead Agency or the JCP partnership with information from the current comprehensive local plan. The JCP partnership plans will build upon current plans and will further inform the local comprehensive plan.

JCP partnerships are expected to review information already gathered in the comprehensive plan regarding community issues, gaps and barriers. JCP groups will determine if there are common issues, gaps and barriers and whether additional issues, gaps and barriers need to be added specific to preventing juvenile crime.

One way that JCP plans will be aligned with the comprehensive plans is by gathering information about the approaches and strategies included in preventing juvenile crime. Each local JCP effort will be categorized primarily as one of these four approaches:

- 1) system improvements;
- 2) service delivery improvements;
- 3) policy changes; and
- 4) community mobilization activities or projects.

Each JCP Partnership with assistance from local commissions will identify key strategies, initiatives and projects that are not necessarily funded by government. Some community efforts may be initiatives of local organizations or volunteers. The JCP Partnership will include those strategies funded by three specific sources: JCP Prevention funds allocated by OCCF; and Basic Services and Diversion Funds allocated by Oregon Youth Authority (OYA).

2010 Local Coordinated Comprehensive Planning Updates: Local commissions are required to provide community updates to the six-year plans in January of each even year. The initial six-year plans were submitted January 2008. January 2010 County Plan updates are expected to include information from the JCP planning groups that has been either developed or updated during 2009. Local commissions are asked to assure the section of the database called “Connect the Plans: JCP Partnership Plan” includes all key community strategies in place among local partners working to reduce juvenile crime through funded services, local initiatives and volunteer efforts.

Counties will update newly identified juvenile crime related issues, gaps and/or barriers. Just as in other planning years, the OCCF data base will provide important information to use at the state level and that is based on information from all 36 counties. Some counties described the juvenile crime prevention efforts as a “Focus Issue” in their 2008 six-year plans and will need to update that information. Some counties may be ready to add juvenile crime prevention as a focus issue. Updates can be made at anytime in the comprehensive plan data base. JCP plan information is captured in the “Connect the Plans” section and may also be included in a Focus Issue. Reports of the JCP plan information can be generated from the data provided.

Outline for the JCP Plan Summary

The JCPAC will need the following kinds of information (A through I) provided in a concise Executive Summary for their review of JCP Plans submitted by counties (ORS 417.797). These are the specific areas that need to be included in the Executive Summary:

1. Planning - Summary of the Update Process
2. Participation and Collaboration
3. Analysis
4. Gaps and Barriers
5. JCP Community Issues
6. Target Population
7. Strategic Approaches and Strategies
8. Performance Measures
9. Continuum of Services
10. Budget

More specific details are included in the Guideline Steps 1 through 10 about each of the areas listed above.

PLANNING PROCESS DETAILS

Step 1) PLANNING: Determine a juvenile justice planning process for the service delivery continuum to include prevention, basic services and diversion.

Purpose of the JCP Initiative

The Juvenile Crime Prevention Initiative (JCP) was designed to (a) reduce the number of youth who are at imminent risk of entering the juvenile justice system (first criminal referral), and (b) to prevent youth with one or more criminal referrals from re-offending and moving further into the juvenile justice system through early intervention services.

Purpose of the Basic Services Grants Program

The Basic Services Grants Program was designed to help juvenile departments provide supervision, detention, shelter care, treatment services, graduated sanctions, and aftercare for youth involved in the juvenile justice system.

Waiver Provision to Combine JCP Prevention and Basic Services Funds

In counties where JCP Prevention and Basic Services funds are both limited, there is a provision for requesting a waiver to combine these two grant programs to allow county juvenile departments to provide adequate funding for both JCP prevention and basic services. Waivers must be requested at the beginning of each biennium.

Documents and Tasks – Planning

Comprehensive Planning Module of OCCF Database Entry: *none*

Executive Summary: *Describe the local JCP planning process. Include information such as: Which agencies and individuals led the planning? How was the JCP planning update process conducted? Were meetings or forums held to develop the plan? Were community stakeholders involved or surveyed? Was the plan approved by the local Juvenile Crime Prevention Partnership Committee, Local Public Safety Coordinating Council (LPSCC, and the Board of County Commission (BOCC)? Local Commission on Children and Families will review the plan as a part of the local comprehensive plan. Were youth involved in the planning process?*

Step 2) PARTICIPATION AND COLLABORATION: Assure the local planning process involves inclusive participation of agencies and individuals reflecting system stakeholders and the diversity of both the community and the youth served through the JCP Plan.

Documents and Tasks – Participation and Collaboration

Comprehensive Planning Module of OCCF Database Entry:

- a) Enter each participant name not already in the participant section of the database, affiliation, and planning committee member. (Entry of participation level is not required.)
- b) Type “JCP” in the comments section.

Executive Summary:

List agencies, organizations, and committees involved in the development of the plan (for example: Local Public Safety Coordinating Council, Juvenile Crime Prevention Partnership Committee, etc.) Was the process inclusive? Did the participants reflect the social, cultural and economic diversity of the community and specifically of the youth served by the JCP Plan? Were consumer families or youth involved?

Step 3) ANALYSIS: Where are we? What are the JCP issues?

What do we know so far?

OCC staff will provide each county with a template of 2007-09 information that has been provided previously by counties in the Comprehensive Planning Module of the database or through the JCP survey conducted in February 2009. This template will include:

- JCP issues identified
- Service gaps
- Barriers and solutions
- Along with many other specific details of the 207-09 JCP plan.

What does data tell us?

OCCF staff will assist in providing data available in the JCP Data Manager, from NPC evaluations, and others sources.

County staff will review data available locally from Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) and other sources such as law enforcement, district attorney, juvenile court judges, etc. Data such as:

- referrals to the county juvenile department, types of crimes, gender
- changes in where and when juveniles are committing crimes
- juvenile offender profiles

Documents and Tasks – Analysis

Comprehensive Planning Module of OCCF Database Entry: *none*

Executive Summary:

What is the risk profile of youth (and their families) most likely to enter or move further into the juvenile justice system? This should be based on available demographic information, JCP risk assessment data, and profiles of youth currently in the juvenile justice system.

Step 4) GAPS and BARRIERS

What's missing?

Are there gaps in service?

Is anything getting in the way of having an effective system at the local level?

Are there barriers to delivering the services? (Federal, state, local, other)

Do there need to be changes in policy, protocol, statute or rule? Does a practice or procedure need to be changed?

What solutions would the county suggest to address the barriers?

Documents and Tasks – Gaps and Barriers

Comprehensive Planning Module OCCF Database Entry:

a) *Record gaps in services. A drop down menu is available. Additional items may be added to the list.*

b) *Record barriers and possible solutions. Identify if the barrier is federal, state, local, or other.*

Executive Summary:

a) *Are there gaps in service?*

b) *Is anything getting in the way of having an effective JCP system at the local level?*

c) *Are there barriers to delivering the services? (Federal, state, local, other)*

d) *Does there need to be a change in policy? Does there need to be a change in protocol, statute or rule? Does a practice or procedure need to be changed?*

d) *What solutions would the county suggest to address the identified barriers at the federal, state, or local level?*

Step 5) JCP COMMUNITY ISSUES: Identify Juvenile Crime “issues” in the community.

Documents and Tasks – JCP Community Issues
Comprehensive Planning Module OCCF Database Entry: <i>a) Enter community issues related to juvenile crime and juvenile recidivism. b) Identify key data in the comments section that supports this as an “issue.”</i>
Executive Summary: <i>a) Explain the juvenile crime related issues identified during the analysis and support the findings with data, identifying data trends and data sources. b) Describe community issues related to juvenile crime and juvenile recidivism.</i>

Step 6) TARGET POPULATION: Determine the population that will be served including ages; demographic data; legal status, such as: offenders, non-offenders, both; and risk level or profile.

Documents and Tasks – Target Population
Comprehensive Planning Module OCCF Database Entry: none.
Executive Summary: <i>a) Describe the population that services will be directed to, including age; demographic data; legal status, such as: offenders, non-offenders, both; and risk level or profile of youth. b) Identify the number of risk domains the county will use in screening youth for services. Statute requires more than one. The county may determine a threshold of more risk factors and or identify additional screening methods or criteria in combination with the number of risks. If there are additional screening criteria, please describe it.</i>

Step 7: STRATEGIC APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES

How will youth who are demonstrating at-risk behavior be identified for JCP Risk Screening? What is the process for determining specific service and support needs for youth and families, especially with multiple service needs? What is the process for connecting youth and families to other community agencies for different or additional services?

Describe actions planned to address each juvenile crime issue, using the 4 strategic approaches:

- 1) system improvements;
- 2) service delivery improvements;
- 3) policy changes; and
- 4) community mobilization activities or projects.

What will community partners do to address the identified focus issues? What actions will partners take? Describe the strategic approaches and strategies to improve conditions and outcomes that ultimately reduce juvenile crime?

Refer to the JCPAC Policy on Evidence-Based Practice when developing interventions.

What is in the JCP planning strategies related to use of evidence-based practice and approaches: addressing gender, ethnic or racial disproportionalities; and current level of outcomes?

Documents and Tasks – Strategic Approaches and Strategies

Comprehensive Planning Module OCCF Database Entry:

- a) Enter strategic approaches, strategy categories and describe the strategies the community will use to address the identified juvenile crime issues, including program, initiative or activity names and descriptions.*
- b) Document evidence-based practice sources for each funded activity in the Local Resources Module of the OCCF data base.*

Executive Summary:

- a) Describe the partners who will participate and strategies they will use to address identified county juvenile crime issues? Include community efforts beyond what is funded by JCP.*
- b) How are youth identified for JCP Risk Screening?*
- c) What is the process for determining specific service and support needs for youth and families, especially with multiple service needs?*
- d) What is the process for connecting youth and families to other community agencies for different or additional services?*

Step 8) MEASUREMENT: What measures will demonstrate results?

Use of the JCP Risk Assessment, Reassessment and Program Evaluation tools is required and will provide the required measurement data. Counties may choose to measure changes in other specific data.

Documents and Tasks – Measurement
Comprehensive Planning Module OCCF Database Entry: None
<i>a) Counties using JCP Data Manager will not need to enter monitoring, output and outcome information. The local commission resources module will extract output and outcome information from JCP Data Manager.</i> <i>b) Those counties who gather JCP information in JJIS will need to obtain the JJIS quarterly summary report from the Juvenile Department and enter output and outcome information into the Local Resources Module each quarter.</i>
Executive Summary: <i>Describe additional performance measurements, if your county will be using additional measures. (One example might be truancy in the specific service area.)</i>

Step 9) CONTINUUM OF SERVICES: Coordination of JCP Prevention, Basic Services and County Diversion Grants

Consider these questions in preparing a narrative summary of the JCP plan:

How is planning for diversion and basic services coordinated with planning for the use of JCP prevention funds? (ORS417.850 (8))

Given the strategies and objectives of your JCP Plan, what are the best investments for JCP grant funds? How will each of the programs recommended for funding complement and improve the current system of strategies, services, and community supports that are currently in place to address the risk profiles and service needs of the JCP target population?

How will the JCP planning strategies and the funded programs complement and support the planning and targeting of OYA Basic and Diversion Services?

Have there been any reductions, or will there be any future reductions in services and community supports that have been in place to address the risk factors and service needs of youth and their families in your JCP target population? If this has occurred, or if any reductions in services are anticipated, what will be the likely effect of these reductions in services for youth and their families in your JCP target population?

Does your county currently have a waiver or plan to seek a waiver in its use of JCP prevention funds? If so, please include a waiver request with your JCP Executive Summary.

Documents and Tasks – Continuum of Services; Prevention, Basic and Diversion Grants

Comprehensive Planning Module OCCF Database Entry:

In “Connect the Plans” portion of the database enter strategies for the Prevention plan, Basic Service Plan and the Diversion Plan. Obtain the Basic Service Plan and the Diversion Plan from the Lead JCP Agency.

Executive Summary: Consider these questions in preparing the written narrative.

- a) Describe how JCP Basic Services, Diversion, and other funds are used as part of the continuum of services in addressing juvenile crime.*
- b) Describe the specific use of the Prevention funds.*
- c) How do the JCP Prevention funds fit into the continuum of services provided through Prevention, Basic Services and Diversion grants?*
- d) How are OYA Basic Services funds used in your county? What specific services are funded with Basic Services funds?*
- e) How are OYA Diversion Funds used to divert youth offenders from placement in OYA? What specific programs and services are funded as part of your county’s OYA Diversion Plan?*
- f) Does your county currently have a waiver or plan to seek a waiver in its use of JCP prevention funds? If so, please include a waiver request with your JCP Executive Summary.*

Step 10: BUDGET INFORMATION: What will JCP funds buy?

Documents and Tasks – Budget

Local Resources Module OCCF Database entry:

- a) Local Commissions enter JCP Prevention fund budget (not Basic or Diversion), activities, and activity descriptions.*
- b) Enter leverage if applicable each quarter.*
- c) Those counties who gather JCP information in the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) will need to obtain the prevention fund budget, activities and activity descriptions from the Juvenile Department.*

Executive Summary:

- a) What are the JCP funding recommendations for prevention, basic and diversion services in the 2009-2011 biennia?*
- b) Provide specific JCP funding budget information as detailed as possible including activity, activity description along with the funding of each activity.*

JUVENILE CRIME PREVENTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (JCPAC)

POLICY: High-Risk Juvenile Crime Prevention Population

Purpose: To establish clear policy on the population to be served with Juvenile Crime Prevention (JCP) Prevention funds.

Definition of JCP Population: Youth ages 10 to 17 clearly demonstrating at-risk behaviors that have come to the attention of government or community agencies, schools or law enforcement and will lead to imminent or increased involvement in the juvenile justice system, as measured by the risk screening tool.

Identifying Local JCP Population: Each community will define the high-risk population it plans to serve with JCP Prevention funds. The population is described in the county JCP plan. The decision and justification for the identified population is based on local data and on local circumstances in the context of the service continuum existing within the community.

Local High-Risk Juvenile Crime Prevention Plan: The county plan that is the result of following the 2009-2011 Juvenile Crime Prevention Guidelines. Identifying and describing the target population is a fundamental purpose of the local juvenile crime prevention plan that will be reviewed for approval by the JCPAC each biennium.

Exceptions: Younger siblings of youth meeting the criteria are an exception to the age range. Other risk factors associated with criminal behavior include early onset of antisocial behavior and antisocial attitudes, values, and beliefs. If a county plans to focus resources on youth younger than 10 years of age, the details must be included in the county JCP plan. JCPAC approval of a plan to serve younger youth will require appropriate methods of screening and measurement. (The JCP Risk Assessment Tool is not validated for youth younger than 10 years of age.)

JCP Screening: The JCP Screening tool identifies risk factors (domains including antisocial behavior; poor family functioning; or poor family support; failure in school; substance abuse problems; or negative peer association) and protective factors. The JCP Screening information should be used to develop the county plan, and to design the services and activities that will be used to build on protective factors and mitigate risk factors (domains). A list of the risk and protective factors included in the JCP risk assessment tool is available at:
http://www.npcresearch.com/Files/JCP_screen_2006.1%20_Revised_9-2008.pdf

POLICY: High-Risk Juvenile Crime Prevention Population

Policy Background, Context and References

By statute, JCP funds may be used to serve any youth with two or more risk factors, as scored on the JCP Risk Assessment tool. In thinking about how to maximize the success of JCP programs, JCPAC briefly considered mandating that JCP funds could only be used for youth with a higher number of risk factors. However, JCPAC later decided that the target population should be locally determined, within certain parameters. This policy establishes the parameters. By narrowing the scope of eligible youth, the policy alleviates JCPAC's concerns about "net-widening," ensures that the target population will be selected using a thoughtful, data-driven process, and increases the likelihood that JCP funds will be used for services that reduce the rate of juvenile crime and recidivism in each county.

Some youth have protective factors that balance the risk for criminal behavior leading to a low risk for committing crime. Youth with high needs and who score at low risk for committing crime may be identified and screened in communities. Youth who are high need and who do not demonstrate criminal behaviors and risk factors associated with criminal behavior should be served in appropriate manners and with other funding. Youth screened with higher risks are more likely to offend as demonstrated in data collected by JCP evaluation.

The context for defining the prevention population is provided in ORS 417.855; in definitions developed by JCPAC in 2000; research validating the risk screening tool; and policy adopted by JCPAC during its January 2009 meeting (included below).

JCP Prevention Services and JCP Basic Services defined in early agreements of the High Risk JCP Planning.

Prevention Services: Services delivered to youth who fit the juvenile crime prevention target population, regardless of legal status, and demonstrating effectiveness in reducing risk factors and preventing initial or continuing delinquent behavior among high risk youth.

Basic Services: Juvenile department services delivered to any youth for an offense – basic services consist of a continuum of graduated sanctions: shelter care, detention, treatment, and other juvenile department services.

ORS 417.855 Local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plan.

(2) The local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans shall use services and activities to meet the needs of a targeted population of youths who:

(a) Have more than one of the following risk factors [domains]:

(A) Antisocial behavior;

(B) Poor family functioning or poor family support;

(C) Failure in school;

(D) Substance abuse problems; or

(E) Negative peer association; and

(b) Are clearly demonstrating at-risk behaviors that have come to the attention of government or community agencies, schools or law enforcement and will lead to imminent or increased involvement in the juvenile justice system.

JCPAC Meeting Minutes, January 22, 2009

Action: JCP Prevention funds will be targeted on interventions with the highest risk populations in each county, based on the data and evaluation that is provided. Local commission comprehensive county plan amendments will include the JCP plan and will be due January, 2010. Technical assistance will be a critical component of the planning process and will be based on the data reported in the current JCP survey of counties. The plan will be communicated to all.

JUVENILE CRIME PREVENTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (JCPAC)

POLICY: High Risk Juvenile Crime Prevention Performance Measures

Purpose: To establish consistent statewide and local measures of performance of High-Risk Juvenile Crime Prevention in Oregon.

Definition of Performance Measures: Local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans serve youth who are at risk of imminent involvement in the juvenile justice system or increased involvement in the juvenile justice system. Therefore, the performance measures for county and program level outcomes are linked to preventing crime and reducing recidivism. For each youth receiving JCP Prevention services the following measurements will be tracked:

- comparison of number and percent of first referrals for youth not previously referred to the juvenile justice system; and
- comparison of the number and percent of youth who have a subsequent referral to the juvenile justice system (recidivism).

Additional client level and program level outcome measures are collected by programs through initial JCP risk screening and follow-up JCP risk assessments of youth. Measurement includes:

- Changes in risk factors, and
- Changes in protective factors

Process: Programs enter data into either the Juvenile Crime Prevention Data Manager System (Data Manager) or the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS). Youth who have not entered the juvenile system are tracked in Data Manager. Youth who have entered the juvenile system are tracked in JJIS. Juvenile departments and Oregon Youth Authority (OYA) have access to JJIS. Juvenile Departments that serve both populations use both systems. Training for Data Manager is provided by Oregon Commission on Children and Families (OCCF) and training for JJIS is provided by the OYA. Requirements and capacity for data reporting are described later in this policy.

Reports are generated from data entered into Data Manager or JJIS at the county level by program. In order for JCPAC to determine effectiveness of efforts to prevent juvenile crime the following performance measurement data is required and gathered in the JCP Data Manager or in JJIS: output measures, demographic data, risk profiles and outcome measures. Counties agree to track and report specific data regarding youth who are screened and youth who are served with JCP Prevention funds.

Required Data Collection and Reporting

Output Reports include:

- number of active cases carried over from the previous reporting period (quarter),
- number of new youth enrolled during the reporting period (quarter),
- number of youth ending service during the reporting period (quarter),

- total number of youth served in the reporting period (number carried over from the previous period combined with the number of youth enrolled), and
- number of active cases at the end of the reporting period.

Descriptive information:

Risk profiles of youth enrolled during the reporting period.

Demographic reporting information for each youth includes:

- age ranges,
- gender, and
- race/ethnicity,

Demographic information of youth is aggregated by age, gender and race/ethnicity.

At least once a year, reports are disaggregated by race, ethnicity and gender for presentation to the JCPAC.

Evaluation reports are provided both statewide and by local jurisdiction. Reports are made available to participating local jurisdictions.

Data Base Capacity: JCPAC is responsible for providing appropriate databases to support the capacity to collect and report the required information. Database systems track service or program utilization and outcomes for all clients, families, and communities. This responsibility includes the following critical supports: maintaining databases, producing reports, interpreting data, and training users in accurate data entry and report production. JCPAC assures confidentiality and system security.

County Requirements: County JCP Prevention lead agencies through biennial intergovernmental agreements with OCCF commit to specific notification and training requirements to assure quality data collection and reporting, confidentiality and system security. These commitments include items such as: notifying OCCF JCP staff when data base users leave their positions; assuring new users are trained prior to making data entries; assuring new program staff are trained to administer the risk screening tool and evaluation tool prior to screening or assessing youth for JCP services; etc. County JCP lead agencies participate in required statewide training at the beginning of each biennium. This training includes specific requirements of the state and county regarding the JCP Prevention Program, including minimum standards for risk screening, reassessments, program assessments, etc.

References or Context: The context for measurements is provided in ORS 417.855(2).

ORS 417.855 Local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plan

(2) The local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans shall use services and activities to meet the needs of a targeted population of youths who:

(a) Have more than one of the following risk factors [domains]:

- (A) Antisocial behavior;
- (B) Poor family functioning or poor family support;
- (C) Failure in school;
- (D) Substance abuse problems; or
- (E) Negative peer association; *and*

(b) Are clearly demonstrating at-risk behaviors that have come to the attention of government or community agencies, schools or law enforcement *and* will lead to imminent or increased involvement in the juvenile justice system.

JCPAC discussed this Policy in its meetings held November 2008, and January and March 2009.

JUVENILE CRIME PREVENTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (JCPAC)**POLICY: EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE**

Purpose: To define and clarify acceptable evidence-based practice criteria within Juvenile Crime Prevention (JCP). The JCP fund is subject to SB 267 and is included in mandatory biennial reports to the Legislature regarding percent of funds expended for evidence-based practice. In 2009-2011 biennium, 75% of the JCP fund must be expended for evidence-based practices.

Background: JCP funds were included in ORS 182.515 (2003 legislation SB 267) requiring specific percentages of agency funds to be used in evidence-based practice.

Process: Five state agencies are included in ORS 182.515. These agencies formed a SB 267 Implementation Committee to steer agency decisions and actions related to interpreting SB 267 requirements. Each of the five agencies adopted a definition for acceptable practices and a process for determining the rate at which acceptable practices were being used within the agency. ORS 182.515 also requires an evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of evidence-based programming.

Clarification: The term “program” is used in ORS 182.515. JCPAC and OCCF have each determined that meeting the evidence-based requirement does not necessarily imply using a *specific* evidence-based program, but rather active presence of the approaches or principles listed in the attached references.

References or Context: JCPAC documents describe Principle Components in Evidence-Based Practice in Preventing Juvenile Crime. OCCF State Commission documents reveal four approaches to evidence-based practice. The four approaches are evidence-based programming, evidence-based practice, evidence-based management, and practice-based evidence. These approaches are described in the reference document. The approaches emphasize Cultural Adaptation.

Cultural Adaptation has the following components:

- A culturally-equivalent form of a model program.
- While cultural adaptation has to be scientifically justified, data/research and the community assessment will show what program elements need to be adapted.
- Target community input is vital to identify the program elements in need of adaptation and how to do so. Indicators should be relevant to the community’s values, for example, “family” as defined by the culture.
- Fidelity to the model program is imperative. Effective cultural adaptation means implementing the principles of the model program in accordance with the values of the target community.

Reference Documents for Evidence-Based Practice Policy

JCPAC discussed this Policy during its March 26, 2009 meeting. Due to limited time for review and discussion they did not adopt the policy, but stated they would like receive review and comment on the framework for the policy document.

JCPAC Definition for Evidence-Based Practice: A practice that incorporates the principles that research shows to be effective in reducing juvenile crime and recidivism. JCPAC developed a set of program assessment criteria to use in recording the program's adherence to the following principles:

EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE PRINCIPLES:

Research and Theory - Programs and approaches must be research-based.

- Services based on empirically validated theory and research including meta-analysis and evaluation;
- Measures of results and independent research are components of programs and services;
- Levels of evidence: Exemplary/Model, Effective, or Promising Program

Nationally, different governmental, academic, and non-profit organizations provide ratings of specific programs according to the quality of the evidence for their efficacy. Evaluations that show program effectiveness in achieving targeted outcomes may be classified according to the scientific strength of their designs and their findings.

Level 1: Supported by scientifically sound randomized controlled studies that have shown consistently positive outcomes. Outcomes have been achieved in scientifically controlled and in routine care settings.

Level 2: Supported by scientifically sound experimental studies that have demonstrated consistently positive outcomes. Outcomes have been achieved in scientifically controlled settings or routine care settings, not both.

Level 3: Program, practice or service based on elements derived from level 1 or 2 practices and applied in a setting or for a population that differs from the original practice.

Level 4: Supported through sound research, documentation of service procedures, and consistently measured outcomes, but not yet sufficiently documented and/or replicated through scientifically sound research.

- Fidelity to program design in implementation.

Risk principle – Services are most effective when delivered proportionally to the level of client risk. Higher-risk cases should receive intensive services, whereas lower risk cases should receive minimal services.

- Significant risk factors include:
 - Antisocial attitudes, values beliefs
 - Antisocial peers
 - Substance abuse
 - History of antisocial behavior from a young age
 - Family factors: low levels of affection, caring support; poor supervision and discipline practices; abuse and neglect
 - Low levels of educational, vocational, financial achievement
- Risk is assessed using the JCP Risk Assessment tool;
- Duration, level, and intensity of service is based on risk level and addresses multiple risk factors in a range of social settings (family, school, peer group);

Need (Criminogenic) principle – Intervention is geared to those factors closely linked to criminal offending rather than an array of needs that are less related to criminal conduct.

- Services target dynamic factors and needs associated with criminal behavior: antisocial attitudes, values, beliefs; antisocial peer association; family problems with supervision, communication, engagement; difficulties with self-control and problem solving; substance abuse;
- Intervention is comprehensive and across systems, and addresses many aspects of youths' lives – health, education, employment, cognitive and social skills.

Responsivity principle – Intervention is matched to client learning styles.

- Services are intensive and involve frequent contact with youth and families;
- Services build on strengths or “protective factors;”
- Services are developmentally appropriate and address critical transitions;
- Services address youth in relationships with family, peers, school, and community;
- Services are culturally appropriate and gender specific.

Quality service principle – Addresses the infrastructure providing the services.

- Infrastructure and leadership – service provider professional and personal qualities; education, training, experience, and supervision; ongoing training; engagement with clients; modeling of pro-social values and behavior; capacity to recognize antisocial thinking and behavior, demonstrate and reinforce alternative, offer problem solving, skill building, and connection to appropriate community resources;
- Goals and methods are detailed in program and training materials;
- Activities focus on results,

Collaboration principle - Collaboration and integration of services is demonstrated and is authentic.

- Genuine collaboration engages youth and families, generates appropriate organization change, and integrates services across agencies

Cognitive-behavioral approaches – Fundamental aspects of delinquency reduction/ prevention effective principles.

- Services provide clear, consistent responses to negative behavior;
- Services focus on behavior and skills that can be observed, modeled, practiced, and reinforced;
- Methods include modeling, practice, and reinforcement of concrete skills of self-control, decision making, and relationship building;
- Youth learn to monitor their own behavior and parents learn to provide support and supervision,

IMPLEMENTING AN EVIDENCE-BASED PROGRAM

Program integrity – Conducting a treatment in a structured manner so as not to alter effective principles. Implementing a research-based program requires sufficient staff to ensure program fidelity.

- Adherence to program design, with all core components being delivered to the appropriate population;
- Exposure to the required number of sessions at the appropriate duration and frequency required by the program model;
- The manner in which staff deliver the program, e.g., skill in using techniques and methods;
- Participant responsiveness – the extent to which participants are engaged and involved in the content of the program.

Fidelity and Adaptation – step-by-step process

- Identify and understand the theory behind the program. Published literature on the program should provide a description of its theoretical underpinnings; if not, an inquiry to the program developer may yield this information.
- Obtain or conduct a core components analysis of the program (a bridge between developer and implementer, and between fidelity and adaptation).
- Assess fidelity/adaptation concerns for the particular implementation site to determine what adaptations may be necessary, given the target population, community environment, cultural and gender specifics, etc. Determine what core components are especially critical to address fidelity, given those circumstances.
- Consult as needed with the program developer[s] to review the above steps and how they have shaped a plan for implementing the program in a particular setting.
- Consult with the organization and/or community in which the implementation will take place.
- Develop an overall implementation plan based on these inputs. Include a strategy for achieving and measuring fidelity/adaptation balance for the program to be implemented, both at the initial implementation and over time.

The Importance of Effective Juvenile Crime Prevention

Juvenile crime prevention is an integral part of the juvenile justice system. Effective prevention strategies reduce the number of youth who enter the juvenile justice system, or move further into the system because of re-offending.

Effective prevention and intervention along the system continuum reduce the number of crime victims in communities.

Community Juvenile Crime Prevention Efforts	County Juvenile Justice System	Oregon Youth Authority	Adult Criminal Justice System
<i>Schools, community agencies, advocates and other partners</i>	<i>Juvenile departments and other community partners</i>	Youth Correctional Facilities Parole / Probation Services Residential Resources	Department of Corrections County Parole / Probation Adult Correctional Facilities

Reducing the number of youth who become involved in the juvenile justice system allows juvenile departments and juvenile courts to focus efforts and limited resources on youth who are at moderate to high risk for reoffending (recidivism).

The combination of effective juvenile crime prevention and effective management of high-risk youth by county juvenile departments reduces the number of youth who need to be placed in the care and custody of the Oregon Youth Authority. This allows the Oregon Youth Authority to focus efforts and limited resources on community protection and reforming youth offenders.

Targeting Youth with Criminogenic Risk Factors

Most youth referred to county juvenile departments for criminal offenses do not re-offend. Their behavior is related to situational factors and poor judgment rather than risk factors associated with continued involvement in criminal behavior. They may also have protective factors that balance risk factors they have.

Being held accountable for offenses to their victims may provide a "wake-up call" and an opportunity to re-evaluate their choices in friends or their decision-making. Some youth receive informal counseling and supervision from the juvenile department. Some youth and families are referred to community agencies for follow-up services, such as family counseling, substance abuse treatment, or mental health services.

A proportion of youth referred to juvenile departments have moderate to medium levels of risk to re-offend. Depending on the nature of their offenses and risk level, some may be adjudicated and placed on formal probation. The remaining 10%-15% are high risk youth who have significant risk factors for recidivism and will be involved in the formal juvenile justice system. These high-risk youth are usually committing most of the serious juvenile crime in the county.

Targeting Children and Youth with Patterns of Multiple Early Onset Risk Factors

One-fifth of juveniles 16 years of age who had been arrested were first arrested before age 12. Juveniles known to the justice system before age 13 are responsible for a disproportionate share of serious crimes and violence*.

*SUBCHAPTER I—GENERALLY [Title I] Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002 *42 U.S.C. 5601*
[Sec. 101.] Findings

ONSET TYPES: Children and Youth Referred to the Juvenile Justice System

- **Early Onset** (*4th, 5th and 6th grades*) Clear early predictors and risk factors for future problems which include early school behavior/academic problems, truancy, thefts, lying, early substance use, early patterns of criminal thinking, association with antisocial peers, and early referrals to juvenile department. ;
- **Adolescent Onset** (*middle school years*) Limited or no early predictors – later predictors include delinquent friends, substance use, risky behavior, school and family problems;
- **Late Onset** (*High School and After Graduation*) Limited or no early predictors – later predictors include difficulty entering adulthood, substance abuse, friends who participate in risky behaviors;

Research shows that many children and youth with multiple early onset risk factors become deeply involved in the juvenile justice system if they don't receive intensive early intervention, including intensive family services. JCP planning activities should look closely at the prevalence of these youth in your local juvenile justice system.

OREGON REVISED STATUTES
Local High-Risk Juvenile Crime Prevention Plan

417.855 Local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plan. (1) Each board of county commissioners shall designate an agency or organization to serve as the lead planning organization to facilitate the creation of a partnership among state and local public and private entities in each county. The partnership shall include, but is not limited to, local commissions on children and families, education representatives, public health representatives, local alcohol and drug planning committees, representatives of the court system, local mental health planning committees, city or municipal representatives and local public safety coordinating councils. The partnership shall develop a local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plan that shall be incorporated into the local coordinated comprehensive plans created pursuant to ORS 417.775.

(2) The local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans shall use services and activities to meet the needs of a targeted population of youths who:

(a) Have more than one of the following risk factors:

(A) Antisocial behavior;

(B) Poor family functioning or poor family support;

(C) Failure in school;

(D) Substance abuse problems; or

(E) Negative peer association; and

(b) Are clearly demonstrating at-risk behaviors that have come to the attention of government or community agencies, schools or law enforcement and will lead to imminent or increased involvement in the juvenile justice system.

(3)(a) The State Commission on Children and Families shall allocate funds available to support the local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans to counties based on the youth population age 18 or younger in those counties.

(b) The state commission shall award a minimum grant to small counties. The minimum grant level shall be determined by the Juvenile Crime Prevention Advisory Committee through a public process and reviewed by the committee biennially. [1999 c.1053 §39; 2005 c.503 §10]

OREGON REVISED STATUTES

Juvenile Crime Prevention Advisory Committee (JCPAC)

417.845 Juvenile Crime Prevention Advisory Committee; membership; chairperson, staffing.

- (1) The Juvenile Crime Prevention Advisory Committee is created within the State Commission on Children and Families.
- (2) The committee shall have the following members:
- (a) The Director of the Oregon Youth Authority or a designee of the director;
 - (b) The staff director of the State Commission on Children and Families or a designee of the staff director;
 - (c) The Director of Human Services or one or more designees of the director, one of whom has expertise in treatment and prevention of substance abuse;
 - (d) The executive director of the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission or a designee of the executive director;
 - (e) The Superintendent of Public Instruction or a designee of the superintendent;
 - (f) The Superintendent of State Police or a designee of the superintendent;
 - (g) The Director of the Department of Corrections or a designee of the director;
 - (h) One designee of the Governor;
 - (i) One member appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be a member of the Senate and who shall be a nonvoting, advisory member;
 - (j) One member appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall be a member of the House of Representatives and who shall be a nonvoting, advisory member; and
 - (k) One designee of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court from the Judicial Department who serves as a nonvoting member to provide information and support the partnership role of the courts in an effective comprehensive statewide approach to high-risk youth and their families.
- (3) In addition to the members listed in subsection (2) of this section, the Governor shall appoint the following members who shall be representative of the geographic and cultural diversity of the state:
- (a) To represent local public and private entities:
 - (A) A county commissioner;
 - (B) A local juvenile director;
 - (C) A director of a local commission on children and families;
 - (D) Two law enforcement officials;
 - (E) A county mental health director;
 - (F) An alcohol and drug abuse professional;
 - (G) A school superintendent;
 - (H) A private youth service provider; and
 - (I) An elected city official;
 - (b) A researcher;
 - (c) A citizen member; and
 - (d) Other members as determined by the Governor.
- (4) Each member of the committee appointed by the Governor under subsection (3) of this section shall serve a term of four years. Members appointed by the Governor shall serve at the pleasure of the Governor. A vacancy in the office of any member appointed by the Governor under subsection (3) of this section shall be filled by the Governor by appointment for the unexpired term.
- (5) The Governor shall select one of the members of the committee as chairperson and one of its members as vice chairperson.

(6) The committee shall meet at times, places and intervals deemed advisable by a majority of the members.

(7) The State Commission on Children and Families shall provide staff support to the committee. [1999 c.1053 §36; 2001 c.900 §111; 2001 c.904 §8; 2001 c.905 §9; 2005 c.503 §8]

417.850 Duties of committee. The Juvenile Crime Prevention Advisory Committee shall:

(1) Review the budget and allocation formula for appropriations for the purpose of juvenile crime prevention;

(2) Review the components of the local coordinated comprehensive plans for children and families created pursuant to ORS 417.775 that address local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans developed under ORS 417.855 and make recommendations to the Governor about the local plans;

(3) Ensure that high-risk juvenile crime prevention planning criteria are met by state and local public and private entities;

(4) Recommend high-risk juvenile justice and juvenile crime prevention policies to the Governor and the Legislative Assembly;

(5) Ensure initiation of contracts based on approved local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans and oversee contract changes;

(6) Review data and outcome information;

(7) Establish and publish review and assessment criteria for the local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans. The criteria shall include, but not be limited to, measuring changes in juvenile crime and juvenile recidivism;

(8) Review and coordinate county youth diversion plans and basic services grants with the local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans. Basic services grants may be used for detention and other juvenile department services including:

(a) Shelter care;

(b) Treatment services;

(c) Graduated sanctions; and

(d) Aftercare for youth offenders;

(9) Work to ensure broad-based citizen involvement in the planning and execution of high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans at both the state and local levels;

(10) Develop a funding policy that provides incentives for flexible programming and promotes strategies that stress reinvestment in youth;

(11) Periodically report to the Governor and the Legislative Assembly on the progress of the committee;

(12) Oversee and approve funding and policy recommendations of the state advisory group as required by the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, 42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.; and

(13) Work with tribal governments to develop tribal high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans. [1999 c.1053 §38]