



OJJDP

RESEARCH

2000

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) was established by the President and Congress through the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, Public Law 93-415, as amended. Located within the Office of Justice Programs of the U.S. Department of Justice, OJJDP's goal is to provide national leadership in addressing the issues of preventing and controlling juvenile delinquency and improving the juvenile justice system.

OJJDP sponsors a broad array of research, demonstration, and training initiatives to improve State and local juvenile programs and to benefit private youth-serving agencies. These initiatives are carried out by seven components within OJJDP, described below.

Research and Program Development Division

develops knowledge on national trends in juvenile delinquency; supports a program for data collection and information sharing that incorporates elements of statistical and systems development; identifies the pathways to delinquency and the best methods to prevent, intervene in, and treat it; and analyzes practices and trends in the juvenile justice system.

Training and Technical Assistance Division provides juvenile justice training and technical assistance to Federal, State, and local governments; law enforcement, judiciary, and corrections personnel; and private agencies, educational institutions, and community organizations.

Special Emphasis Division provides discretionary funds to public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals to develop and support programs and replicate tested approaches to delinquency prevention, treatment, and control in such pertinent areas as mentoring, gangs, chronic juvenile offending, and community-based sanctions.

State and Tribal Assistance Division provides funds for State, local, and tribal governments to help them achieve the system improvement goals of the JJDP Act, address underage drinking, conduct State challenge activities, implement prevention programs, and support initiatives to hold juvenile offenders accountable. This Division also provides training and technical assistance, including support to jurisdictions that are implementing OJJDP's Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders.

Information Dissemination and Planning Unit

produces and distributes information resources on juvenile justice research, statistics, and programs and coordinates the Office's program planning and competitive award activities. Information that meets the needs of juvenile justice professionals and policymakers is provided through print and online publications, videotapes, CD-ROM's, electronic listservs, and the Office's Web site. As part of the program planning and award process, IDPU identifies program priorities, publishes solicitations and application kits, and facilitates peer reviews for discretionary funding awards.

Concentration of Federal Efforts Program promotes interagency cooperation and coordination among Federal agencies with responsibilities in the area of juvenile justice. The Program primarily carries out this responsibility through the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, an independent body within the executive branch that was established by Congress through the JJDP Act.

Child Protection Division administers programs related to crimes against children and children's exposure to violence. The Division provides leadership and funding to promote effective policies and procedures to address the problems of missing and exploited children, abused or neglected children, and children exposed to domestic or community violence. CPD program activities include supporting research; providing information, training, and technical assistance on programs to prevent and respond to child victims, witnesses, and their families; developing and demonstrating effective child protection initiatives; and supporting the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

The mission of OJJDP is to provide national leadership, coordination, and resources to prevent and respond to juvenile offending and child victimization. OJJDP accomplishes its mission by supporting States, local communities, and tribal jurisdictions in their efforts to develop and implement effective, multidisciplinary prevention and intervention programs and improve the capacity of the juvenile justice system to protect public safety, hold offenders accountable, and provide treatment and rehabilitative services tailored to the needs of individual juveniles and their families.

OJJDP Research 2000

Report



Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

May 2001

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
810 Seventh Street NW.
Washington, DC 20531

John Ashcroft
Attorney General

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, and the Office for Victims of Crime.

Foreword

The findings of well-planned and well-executed research are critical to the success of efforts to prevent and reduce juvenile delinquency and victimization. Through its Research and Program Development Division, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) is committed to supporting a comprehensive and coordinated program of research, evaluation, and statistics that is designed to determine the causes and correlates of juvenile delinquency and the ways in which communities can protect at-risk youth and their families from delinquency and victimization.

Space limitations preclude an exhaustive account of the broad array of research activities carried out under OJJDP's auspices. Accordingly, this Report summarizes representative achievements as a way of illustrating the larger picture. New findings, emerging research, and key issues are highlighted, and a wealth of resources in the form of descriptive lists of research-related programs, publications, and Web sites are provided.

The OJJDP initiatives described in these pages—and others like them—inform and enhance the daily, collaborative efforts of researchers, policymakers, and practitioners. The work supported by OJJDP is designed to prevent and reduce juvenile delinquency and victimization. In this way, the seeds planted by sound research will bear productive fruit in the planning and implementation of programs that improve the lives of youth and their families.

Table of Contents

Foreword	iii
Introduction	1
New Findings	3
Research on Very Young Offenders	3
What Have We Learned?	3
What Does This Mean?	4
Selective Bibliography on Research on Very Young Offenders	6
Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency	6
What Have We Learned?	7
What Does This Mean?	7
Selective Bibliography on the Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency ...	8
Juvenile Transfers to Criminal Court	8
Overview of Transfer Research Projects	10
What Have We Learned?	11
What Does This Mean?	12
Selective Bibliography on Juvenile Transfers to Criminal Court	12
Juveniles in Corrections	12
What Have We Learned?	13
What Does This Mean?	14
Selective Bibliography on Juveniles in Corrections	14
Youth Gang Research	14
What Have We Learned?	15
What Does This Mean?	15
Selective Bibliography on Youth Gang Research	16

Diversion From Juvenile Court: Teen/Youth Courts and Restorative Justice Programs	17
What Have We Learned?	18
What Does This Mean?	19
Selective Bibliography on Diversion From Juvenile Court: Teen/Youth Courts and Restorative Justice Programs	20
National Statistics on Juvenile Offenders and Victims	20
What Have We Learned?	22
What Does This Mean?	23
Selective Bibliography on National Statistics on Juvenile Offenders and Victims	23
New and Emerging Research Efforts	25
Girls Program Evaluations and Girls Study Group	25
Research on American Indian and Alaska Native Juveniles	26
Understanding and Monitoring the “Whys” Behind Juvenile Crime Trends	28
Mental Health and Juvenile Justice: Building a Model for Effective Service Delivery	28
Highlights	31
Evaluations of School-Related Projects	31
Evaluations of Substance Abuse Programs	31
Drug-Free Communities Support Program	31
Enforcing the Underage Drinking Laws Program	32
Child Victimization	33
Safe Start Demonstration Project	33
Second Comprehensive Study of Missing Children	33
Crimes against Children Research Center	34
Pathways to Desistance: A Prospective Study of Serious Adolescent Offenders	34
Working With States and Communities To Improve Evaluation and Information Collection Efforts	35
Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center	35
Juvenile Justice Statistics and Systems Development Project	36
Conclusion	37
Appendixes	
Appendix A: Active Projects, September 1999 to Present	A-1
Appendix B: OJJDP Publications and Products From the Research Division, August 1999 to the Present	B-1
Appendix C: Research-Related Online Resources	C-1

Introduction

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), through its Research and Program Development Division (the Research Division), supports and promotes science-based research, rigorous and informative evaluations of demonstration programs, and meaningful collection and analysis of statistics. The Research Division's overall mission is to generate credible and useful information to improve decisionmaking in the juvenile justice system and thereby prevent and reduce juvenile delinquency and victimization. To achieve this goal, OJJDP translates research into action.

This Report summarizes the activities and achievements of OJJDP's Research Division from August 1999 to the present in three areas:

- ◆ **Research.** The Research Division sponsors empirical studies on an array of topics related to juveniles and delinquency, from the roots of violence to the impact of victimization. Studies range from exploratory and descriptive to rigorously analytical.
- ◆ **Evaluation.** One of the Research Division's important functions is to identify what works. Its evaluations measure the impact of programs geared to preventing or reducing the incidence of juvenile delinquency and victimization. Many OJJDP-sponsored projects are community-based initiatives with multiple components. This type of project presents special challenges to the Research Division when measuring the impact of interventions and specific programs.
- ◆ **Statistics.** The Research Division sponsors the Nation's primary efforts to gather data and statistics on juveniles and crime, including information on juvenile detention and corrections populations,

probation caseloads, and court activities. OJJDP's Research Division also has taken the lead in making such statistical data accessible to the field.

Solutions to juvenile crime and delinquency must be based on what has been learned about effective programming. OJJDP strategically sponsors research that has the greatest potential to improve the Nation's understanding of juvenile delinquency and victimization and of ways to develop effective prevention and intervention programs. The Research Division collaborates with a number of Federal agencies to carry out research and evaluation efforts, the findings of which are useful to an interdisciplinary audience. The work produced through OJJDP research, evaluation, and statistics programs is used by:

- ◆ Researchers in the field.
- ◆ Practitioners on the front lines.
- ◆ Policymakers at the Federal, State, and local levels.

In addition, the Research Division works with other OJJDP divisions to use research to enhance training efforts, improve program activities, inform the public, craft effective interventions, and formulate policies that will have a positive impact on individuals, families, and communities.

Programs that promote protective factors and help reduce the risk factors that lead to juvenile crime are among the best investments a community can make to lower its rate of delinquency. Evaluation and testing must be used to identify the programs that are effective in keeping juveniles from being arrested and entering the juvenile justice system in the first place. At the same time, communities need to identify corrections treatment and aftercare programs that will effectively reduce the likelihood of recidivism.

Collaboration With Other Federal Agencies

OJJDP collaborates with other Federal Government agencies to cofund and oversee research related to juveniles. Such collaboration enables OJJDP to use its funds more efficiently and ensure that its efforts do not duplicate those of other agencies. OJJDP is much sought after as a partner by other agencies. The Research Division currently works with the Office of National Drug Control Policy; the U.S. Departments of Commerce (Bureau of the Census), Education, Health and Human Services (Administration for Children and Families, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, National Institute of Mental Health, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and National Institute on Drug Abuse), and Labor; the Federal Trade Commission; and other U.S. Department of Justice offices, including the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the Executive Office for Weed and Seed, the National Institute of Justice, the Office for Victims of Crime, the Office of Community Oriented Policing, and the Violence Against Women Office.

The Research Division is committed to maximizing the impact of OJJDP research by disseminating its findings to practitioners and policymakers who work with juveniles and juvenile offenders. Space constraints make it impossible to cover fully in this document the number and scope of projects undertaken by the Research Division every year. Instead, this Report offers a current overview of the Division's diverse work, with particular focus on important new findings and emerging research areas. The Report includes the following chapters:

- ◆ **New Findings.** This chapter describes important OJJDP research projects, including the Study Group on Very Young Offenders, the Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency, and research on juvenile transfers to criminal court.

- ◆ **New and Emerging Research Efforts.** This chapter highlights new and emerging research efforts being launched by OJJDP, including research programs that examine female delinquency, tribal youth, and mental health issues and a study that examines the “whys” behind juvenile crime trends.

- ◆ **Highlights.** This chapter presents information on some key OJJDP research activities, including research on child victimization, school violence, and substance abuse initiatives.

In addition, three appendixes list active research projects, research-related publications and products, and research-related online resources.

New Findings

Research on Very Young Offenders

A key finding of OJJDP's Study Group on Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders—that most chronic juvenile offenders begin their delinquency careers before age 12 and some as early as age 10¹—led OJJDP in 1998 to establish its Study Group on Very Young Offenders (the Study Group). The Study Group assembled a distinguished panel of 15 researchers to examine collaboratively what is known about the prevalence and frequency of very young offending (i.e., offending by children younger than age 13). The Study Group focused specifically on determining whether young offending is predictive of future delinquent or criminal careers, how juveniles are handled by various systems, and what the best methods are for preventing very young offending and the persistence of offending. The Study Group's findings are complete, and OJJDP will issue a Bulletin on the project in late 2001.

What Have We Learned?

Young offending is serious business. The most recent available national data show that in 1999, police arrested about one-quarter of a million (230,800) youth age 12 and younger. Such very young offenders ("child delinquents") represented about 9 percent of the total number of juvenile arrestees (those up to age 18 in 1999). Although

¹ The full findings of the Study Group on Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders appear in Loeber and Farrington's 1998 publication *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*. The Study Group Report on which this publication is based (Loeber and Farrington, 1997) is available from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse. See the selective bibliography on page 6 for more information on both publications.

most of these child delinquents were boys, nearly one in four was a girl. These numbers may underestimate the number of child delinquents because in many jurisdictions it is unusual for delinquents under age 12 to be arrested or referred to juvenile court.

In 1997,² offenders age 12 and younger made up about 16 percent of those referred to juvenile court. Compared with later onset offenders, child delinquents commit certain types of serious offenses at relatively high rates. For example, they account for 1 in 3 juvenile arrests for arson, 1 in 5 juvenile arrests for sex offenses and vandalism, and 1 in 12 juvenile arrests for violent crime. Child delinquents are also more likely than later onset offenders to engage in minor theft and commit status offenses such as truancy, running away from home, and curfew and liquor law violations.

No evidence of a new and more serious "breed" of child delinquent and young murderer exists.

Although statistics relating to the number of child delinquents are sobering, they do not represent a drastic shift in the trend of juvenile offending. The prevalence of child delinquents does not appear to have increased over the past two decades. For example, the number of recorded arrests of juveniles increased 35 percent between 1988 and 1997, but the number of child delinquents increased by only 6 percent during that time. In addition, examination

² 1997 is the most recent year for which national juvenile court data are available. This is due to the lengthy technical process of creating a national database from dozens of State and local courts. Juvenile and family courts across the Nation voluntarily provide data to the National Juvenile Data Court Archive (available online at www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/njdca/), which collects, stores, and analyzes data on juvenile justice.

Members of the OJJDP Study Group on Very Young Offenders

Chairs

David P. Farrington, Ph.D., University of Cambridge,
England

Rolf Loeber, Ph.D., University of Pittsburgh,
Pittsburgh, PA

Members

Barbara J. Burns, Ph.D., Duke University Medical
Center, Durham, NC

Dante Cicchetti, Ph.D., Mount Hope Family Center,
Rochester, NY

John Coie, Ph.D., Duke University Medical Center,
Durham, NC

Darnell Hawkins, Ph.D., University of Illinois at
Chicago

J. David Hawkins, Ph.D., University of Washington,
Seattle

James C. Howell, Ph.D., Institute for Inter-
governmental Research, Tallahassee, FL

David Huizinga, Ph.D., University of Colorado,
Boulder

Kate Keenan, Ph.D., University of Chicago,
Chicago, IL

Dan Offord, M.D., Chedoke McMasters Hospital,
Ontario, Canada

Howard N. Snyder, Ph.D., National Center for
Juvenile Justice, Pittsburgh, PA

Richard Tremblay, Ph.D., University of Montreal,
Quebec, Canada

Terence P. Thornberry, Ph.D., University at Albany,
State University of New York

Gail A. Wasserman, Ph.D., Columbia University,
New York, NY

of self-reported delinquency data for the past 20 years indicates no increase in delinquency by young offenders in the United States. Moreover, between 1980 and 1997, the number of murders committed by offenders age 12 or younger remained fairly constant, averaging about 30 per year. Increased media coverage and public awareness of very young offenders, however, may affect the public's view of child delinquents.

It is short-sighted for communities to ignore delinquent acts and problem behaviors of child delinquents in the hope that they will “grow out of them.” Child delinquency is a predictor of serious, violent, and chronic offending. Research findings uniformly show that the risk of subsequent violence, serious offenses, and chronic offending is two to three times higher for child delinquents than for later onset offenders. Child delinquents also tend to have longer delinquency careers than later onset delinquents. In addition, child delinquents are more likely than later onset juvenile offenders to become gang members and/or engage in substance abuse.

Incarceration in a detention center or correctional facility is inappropriate for child delinquents in most cases. No evidence shows that incarcerating serious child delinquents substantially reduces recidivism or prevents careers of serious and violent offending. In fact, correctional placement of child delinquents may lead to their exposure to and victimization by older, serious delinquent offenders and increase the child delinquents' likelihood of becoming serious and chronic offenders.

What Does This Mean?

Researchers cannot definitively predict which preschoolers will become child delinquents and serious and violent juvenile offenders, but there are warning signs. A certain level of disruptive behavior is common during the preschool years, especially at ages 2 and 3, when many children of both sexes show high levels of aggression and noncompliance. Although the majority of early-onset delinquents have a history of aggressive, inattentive, or sensation-seeking behavior in the

Definition of Child Delinquency

Child delinquency includes offending between the ages of 7 and 12. The Study Group on Very Young Offenders concentrated on three categories of children:

- ◆ **Serious child delinquents:** Children between the ages of 7 and 12 who have committed one or more of the following acts: homicide, aggravated assault, robbery, rape, or serious arson.
- ◆ **Other child delinquents:** Children who commit delinquent acts, excluding serious offenses.
- ◆ **Nondelinquent children:** Children up to and including age 12 who engage in persistent disruptive behavior but do not commit delinquent acts.

preschool years, the reverse is not true: The majority of aggressive, inattentive, or attention-seeking preschoolers do not go on to become child delinquents. Researchers nonetheless have identified the following important warning signs of later problems:

- ◆ Disruptive behavior that is either more frequent or more severe than that of other children the same age.
- ◆ Disruptive behavior, such as temper tantrums and aggression, that persists beyond ages 2 to 3. For many very young offenders, disruptive behavior becomes apparent during the preschool and certainly the elementary years.

Additional early warning signs for the development of delinquency at a young age include:

- ◆ Physical fighting.
- ◆ Cruelty to people or animals.
- ◆ Covert acts such as frequent lying, theft, and fire setting.
- ◆ Inability to get along with others.
- ◆ Low school motivation during elementary school.

- ◆ Substance use (without parental permission).
- ◆ Repeated victimization (e.g., child abuse or peer bullying).

Steps can be taken to prevent child delinquency and its escalation to chronic criminal behavior.

The best way to prevent any type of delinquency (including child delinquency) is to focus on risk and protective factors. Risk factors for child delinquency, like those for later onset juvenile offending, exist in the individual child, the family, the peer group, and the school. They probably also exist in the neighborhood in which the child lives. For very young offenders, the most important risk factors are likely individual (e.g., birth complications, hyperactivity, and impulsivity) or family related (e.g., parental substance abuse and poor childrearing practices). Protective factors—that is, those that can buffer or offset the impact of risk factors—include prosocial behavior during the preschool years and strong cognitive performance. Ultimately, children with many risk factors and few protective factors are at highest risk of becoming serious, violent, and chronic offenders.

Communities should emphasize primary prevention and early intervention. Several primary prevention programs reviewed by the Study Group are geared to conflict resolution and violence prevention and focus on enhancing children's problem-solving and interaction skills. Programs that teach children about the causes and the destructive consequences of violence (e.g., the Second Step and the Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways curriculums) have been shown to reduce aggressive behavior significantly. Several other effective programs focus on reducing early persistent disruptive behavior among children. Some programs (e.g., Parent Management Training, Functional Family Therapy, and Multi-systemic Therapy) have been shown to reduce the risk of later, more serious offending.

No single agency can reduce child delinquency; rather, partnerships between agencies are likely to be more productive and efficient. Child delinquents often have co-occurring problems, such as early substance abuse, depression, rejection by peers, academic underachievement, and truancy. Because child delinquents frequently have multiple problems at a young age, they tend to require

services from several agencies. Ideally, programs for serious child delinquents should incorporate immediate screening and assessment to identify children's programmatic needs. Interventions for persistently disruptive children and child delinquents should:

- ◆ Be integrated across services.
- ◆ Focus on children younger than age 13.
- ◆ Apply multimodal interventions—that is, those that address more than one risk factor domain (e.g., individual child, family).
- ◆ Address the multiple problems of a child, as necessary.

Selective Bibliography on Research on Very Young Offenders

Loeber, R., and Farrington, D.P. 1997. *Never Too Early, Never Too Late: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions for Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders*. Final Report of the Study Group on Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders (grant number 95-JD-FX-0018). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Available from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse, 800-638-8736.

Loeber, R., and Farrington, D.P., eds. 1998. *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Loeber, R., and Farrington, D. In press. *Child Delinquency: Early Intervention and Prevention*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 186162).

Loeber, R., and Farrington, D., eds. 2001. *Child Delinquents: Development, Interventions, and Service Needs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency

Since 1986, OJJDP has sponsored three longitudinal studies—collectively referred to as the Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of

The Causes and Correlates Studies

- ◆ A Longitudinal Multidisciplinary Study of Developmental Patterns (Denver Youth Survey), directed by David Huizinga, Ph.D., at the University of Colorado.
- ◆ Progressions in Antisocial and Delinquent Child Behavior (Pittsburgh Youth Study), directed by Rolf Loeber, Ph.D., at the University of Pittsburgh.
- ◆ A Panel Study of a Reciprocal Causal Model of Delinquency (Rochester Youth Development Study), directed by Terence P. Thornberry, Ph.D., at The Research Foundation, University at Albany, State University of New York.

Additional information on these studies appears on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency Web site: www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ccd/.

Delinquency—designed to improve understanding of serious delinquency, violence, and drug use by examining how individual juveniles develop within the context of family, school, peers, and community. Samples of inner-city youth from three cities (Denver, CO; Pittsburgh, PA; and Rochester, NY) were selected. The studies involved repeated contacts with the same juveniles, including face-to-face private interviews every 6 to 12 months for a substantial portion of their developmental years. On average, the studies have retained 90 percent of the juveniles in the sample populations.

Researchers at the three sites used the same core measures to examine:

- ◆ Delinquent behavior.
- ◆ Drug use.
- ◆ Involvement in the juvenile justice system.
- ◆ Community characteristics.
- ◆ Family experiences.
- ◆ Peer relationships.
- ◆ Education experiences.

- ◆ Attitudes and values.
- ◆ Demographic characteristics.

Many of this research program's initial findings were reported in OJJDP's Report *OJJDP Research: Making a Difference for Juveniles*, published in August 1999 (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1999). The current Report focuses on additional research findings and policy implications.

What Have We Learned?

Multiple family transitions are a risk factor for delinquency. Youth in the studies' urban samples experienced a substantial number of transitions during adolescence.³ Family instability was most pronounced in Rochester, where about two-thirds of the sample experienced at least one transition and nearly one-half experienced two or more transitions during a 4-year period. Almost one-half (49 percent) of the Denver youth and almost one-third (30 percent) of the Pittsburgh youth experienced one or more family transitions during that time. Researchers found a consistent relationship between the number of transitions a youth experienced and his or her level of delinquency and drug use.

Adolescent males' early involvement in drug use and delinquency is highly correlated with teen fatherhood. In Rochester, 70 percent of the high-frequency drug users in the sample became teen fathers (compared with 24 percent of nonusers or low-frequency users). Similarly, nearly one-half of high-rate delinquents⁴ later became teen fathers (compared with 23 percent of nondelinquents or low-rate delinquents). In Rochester, researchers also found that teen fatherhood was generally linked to a boy's involvement in deviant behavior such as sexual intercourse before age 16, gang membership, chronic violent behavior, and chronic drug use. Even controlling for other variables, researchers

³ Transitions are changes in the family structure caused by events in the parenting figures' lives such as divorce, separation, death, or long-term hospitalization.

⁴ "High-rate offending" was defined as a high frequency of general delinquency offending. High-rate offenders were those juveniles who fell into the highest quartile of offending frequency.

found that a number of these problem behaviors substantially increased a boy's likelihood of becoming a teen father. Chronic drug use alone more than doubled the probability of teen fatherhood.

In the Pittsburgh sample, early delinquency—but not early drug use—was a significant risk factor for teenage fatherhood. The Pittsburgh study found several other significant risk factors for teen fatherhood, including being raised in a family on welfare and being exposed to drugs (e.g., being offered drugs or witnessing a drug deal).

Teen fatherhood does not make young males more responsible and law-abiding. Some policymakers and researchers hypothesize that fatherhood might encourage young males to become more responsible and assume the tasks of helping to establish and support a family. Researchers, however, have found that teen fatherhood is associated with a significant increase in delinquent behavior. In the same year that the young men in the Pittsburgh study reported becoming fathers, they were 7.5 times more likely than nonfathers to commit serious delinquent acts. In the year after the boys became fathers, their risk of committing serious delinquent acts remained relatively high (4.2 times higher than that of non-fathers). Overall, young fathers in the Pittsburgh sample appeared considerably worse off than non-fathers. They were more likely to have had a court petition alleging delinquency, to drink alcohol frequently, to be involved in drug dealing, and to have dropped out of school. What is perhaps most important, the study indicates that it is a mistake to assume that having a child will force young fathers to turn away from delinquency, drug use, and other negative behavior. In fact, without support, the added pressure of this responsibility might result in drinking or drug use, poor school performance, and further isolation from prosocial peers.

What Does This Mean?

Programs that target at-risk juveniles need to include their families. Previous research on risk and protective factors identified a link between family instability and a child's risk of delinquent behavior. Recent findings of the Causes and Correlates research confirm this link. In particular, research shows that family disruption (whether through divorce,

separation, illness, work-related mobility, or imprisonment) greatly affects a child's risk of juvenile delinquency. Prevention and intervention programs for juvenile delinquents, therefore, need to closely examine the juveniles' family circumstances. Family violence, physical and mental health problems, poverty, unemployment, and the criminal activity of a child's parents can all result in multiple family disruptions. Any program that hopes to improve a juvenile's future must include his or her family in the solution.

Teen pregnancy prevention programs should focus on boys and girls. Historically, teen pregnancy prevention programs have focused only on teenage girls. More recently, however, some programs have focused on teenage boys—both in terms of prevention and in terms of encouraging fathers' involvement in child-rearing. Recent findings from the Causes and Correlates program indicate that focusing on both boys and girls is extremely important, especially among youth at risk for delinquency and drug use.

Selective Bibliography on the Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency

Huizinga, D., Loeber, R., Thornberry, T.P., and Cothorn, L. 2000. *Co-occurrence of Delinquency and Other Problem Behaviors*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs,

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 182211).

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 1999. *OJJDP Research: Making a Difference for Juveniles*. Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 177602).

Thornberry, T.P., Smith, C.A., Rivera, C., Huizinga, D., and Stouthamer-Loeber, M. 1999. *Family Disruption and Delinquency*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 178285).

Thornberry, T.P., Wei, E.H., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., and Van Dyke, J. 2000. *Teenage Fatherhood and Delinquent Behavior*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 178899).

Juvenile Transfers to Criminal Court

The transfer of juveniles from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court to the jurisdiction of the adult criminal court has been part of the juvenile justice system since

OJJDP-Funded Research Projects on the Transfer of Juveniles to Criminal Court

- ◆ Two projects directed by Jeffrey Fagan, Ph.D., Columbia School of Public Health, New York, NY:
 - ❖ Comparative Impact of Juvenile Versus Criminal Court Sanctions on Recidivism Among Adolescent Felony Offenders: A Replication and Extension.
 - ❖ Age, Crime, and Sanction: The Effect of Juvenile Versus Criminal Court Jurisdiction on Age-Specific Crime Rates of Adolescent Offenders.
- ◆ Evaluation of Blended Sentencing in Minnesota, directed by Fred L. Cheesman II, Ph.D., National Center for State Courts, Williamsburg, VA, and Heidi E. Green, MPP, Minnesota Supreme Court. (This project was cofunded by the State Justice Institute.)
- ◆ Juvenile Transfers to Criminal Court Studies, directed by Henry George "Ship" White, Juvenile Justice Accountability Board, Florida Department of Juvenile Justice.
- ◆ Project To Study the Outcome of Juvenile Transfer to Criminal Court, directed by Howard N. Snyder, Ph.D., National Center for Juvenile Justice, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, Pittsburgh, PA.

its inception. The concept of transfer acknowledges that some violent and chronic juvenile offenders are not amenable to treatment and must, for the purposes of public safety and accountability, be dealt with in the criminal justice system. Transfer, however, was originally only a minor part of the juvenile court's routine activities and was invoked only in the most serious cases. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, as the rate of juvenile violent crime rose significantly, many policymakers looked for a new approach. Between 1992 and 1995, 40 States and the District of Columbia modified their transfer provisions to make the transfer of jurisdiction easier and/or broader under certain circumstances. For example, some States lowered the age of criminal court jurisdiction for particularly serious offenses, such as assault with a deadly weapon. When mandating or allowing for the transfer of

jurisdiction, States also considered the number and type of offenses a juvenile had committed.

Transfer mechanisms range from statutory exclusion to concurrent jurisdiction to judicial waiver. Under exclusion statutes, State legislatures exclude from the juvenile court's jurisdiction certain categories of juveniles. Such categories are generally defined by the seriousness of the offense and/or by the number or type of prior offenses committed by the offender. Under concurrent jurisdiction, the district attorney has the option of filing certain types of cases in juvenile court or in adult criminal court. Finally, under judicial waiver, the prosecutor (or defense attorney) asks the juvenile court judge to transfer or waive the juvenile to adult criminal court. Each State has adopted one or more of these mechanisms, generally specifying particular criteria

Three Transfer Mechanisms

Although they may have different names in different States, the three general types of transfer mechanisms are judicial waiver, statutory exclusion, and concurrent jurisdiction. Each is described below.

- ◆ **Judicial waiver (juvenile court judge).** Under judicial waiver, a hearing occurs in juvenile court, typically in response to a prosecutor's request that the juvenile court judge waive or forego the juvenile court's jurisdiction over a matter involving a juvenile and transfer the juvenile to criminal court for trial in the adult system.
- ◆ **Statutory exclusion (the legislature).** In a growing number of States, legislatures have statutorily excluded certain young offenders from juvenile court jurisdiction based on age and/or offense criteria. For example, many States have set the upper age of juvenile court jurisdiction at 15 or 16. (An estimated 218,000 cases involving youth under age 18 were tried in criminal court in 1996 as a result of State laws defining the youth as adults solely on the basis of an age criterion.) Many States also exclude youth charged with certain serious offenses from juvenile court jurisdiction. Typically, these offenses are capital offenses and other murders and violent offenses. Some States exclude other, additional felony offenses from juvenile court jurisdiction.
- ◆ **Concurrent jurisdiction (prosecutor).** Under this transfer option, State statutes give prosecutors the discretion to file certain cases in either juvenile or criminal court because original jurisdiction is shared by both courts. Concurrent jurisdiction provisions, like other transfer mechanisms, are typically limited by age and offense criteria. Unlike judicial waiver, however, prosecutorial transfer is not subject to judicial review and is not required to meet due process requirements. Some States have developed guidelines for prosecutors to follow in "direct filing" cases (i.e., cases involving juveniles that prosecutors file directly in adult criminal court).

Although the term "transfer" refers to three general mechanisms, only one (judicial waiver) actually involves the transfer of a juvenile from the juvenile court to the adult criminal court. Cases that follow the other two paths may never pass through the juvenile court system.

that must be met (e.g., injury to a victim, use of a firearm or other weapon, or a history of serious offenses) to transfer a juvenile to criminal court. (See the sidebar on page 9 for more information.)

Overview of Transfer Research Projects

OJJDP has funded several studies of local and State-level transfer provisions. These research efforts were designed to determine how transfers are being used presently and have been used in the past and to examine the effects of recent legislative changes altering the nature of transfers in specific States. Two projects funded in 1995 include a multi-State study conducted by the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ) and a multiyear study in Florida conducted by the Florida Juvenile Justice Accountability Board (JJAB). In 1997, OJJDP funded a two-State study conducted by Columbia University to replicate and expand a previous study it conducted in the early 1990s.

NCJJ study. Using archival data from the 1980s and 1990s, NCJJ conducted studies in Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Utah. The results of these studies were published in an OJJDP research Summary, *Juvenile Transfers to Criminal Court in the 1990's: Lessons Learned From Four Studies* (Snyder, Sickmund, and Poe-Yamagata, 2000). These three States were selected because they have historically relied on judicial waiver as their primary transfer mechanism.

The study in South Carolina examined waiver cases from 1985 through 1994 because, during that time, the State's only transfer mechanism was judicial waiver. In 1995, State law changed to include other transfer mechanisms.

Because Utah also had a stable judicial waiver provision up until 1995, data from its study cover the period from 1988 to 1994. The Utah data, however, track cases that began in juvenile court but also involved a prosecutor's request for waiver.

The Pennsylvania research included two studies. In the first, researchers collected State data to compare the characteristics of juveniles transferred in 1986 with those of juveniles transferred in 1994, a period during which the State's transfer provisions remained unchanged. In the late 1980s, juvenile

crime in Pennsylvania began to increase substantially, and the study examined how the juvenile justice system dealt with this increase. In the second Pennsylvania study, data from three counties were used to examine the effects of State legislation passed in March 1996 that excluded certain juveniles from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court. Researchers in this second Pennsylvania study examined the cases of juveniles excluded from juvenile court jurisdiction under this provision during the final 9 months of 1996.

Florida study. The Florida JJAB began its multi-phase study in 1995. The study was designed to examine the changes in transfer that resulted from Florida's broad reform of juvenile justice in 1994. One phase of the Florida study used the statewide Client Information System (CIS), which tracks all juvenile offenders through the juvenile justice system. By comparing the use of transfer mechanisms in 1993 with their use in 1995, researchers hoped to determine the effect of new, more lenient transfer provisions put in place in 1994.

Columbia University study. OJJDP is supporting research at Columbia University that is replicating a 1987 study. The original study compared two urban counties in New Jersey with two boroughs of New York City. The jurisdictions in both States were comparable in terms of population, socioeconomic levels, and urban environments. State transfer provisions in New Jersey and New York, however, differ substantially. Under New York law, all persons age 16 and older are considered "adults" and are thus handled in the criminal court system. Under New Jersey law, youth age 18 and older are considered adults. This difference provided researchers an opportunity to examine how the difference in the age of criminal court jurisdiction may have affected the treatment of adolescent offenders. By matching offenders in the two jurisdictions and tracking their cases, researchers sought to determine whether sanctions applied in criminal court were harsher and more consistently applied than juvenile court sanctions and whether criminal court sanctions resulted in less recidivism among offenders than sanctions applied in juvenile court (hypotheses expounded by proponents of the transfer of juveniles to criminal court).

Concentrating on 16- and 17-year-olds charged with first-degree robbery, second-degree robbery, or first-degree burglary, Fagan (1995) used archival data to

track the process of matching pairs of youth from each jurisdiction. In the end, Fagan (1995:253) found that:

Accountability for adolescent offenders in criminal courts was no greater than in the juvenile court, and depending on the social and legal context surrounding the court, appeared to be weaker. Nor was criminal court punishment a more effective strategy for crime control. Quite possibly, more harm than good resulted from the effort to criminalize adolescent crimes.

The replication study being funded by OJJDP, which includes three counties in New Jersey and three boroughs of New York, is designed to expand and update the original research. It expands the list of offenses studied to include serious assault, and researchers are comparing the certainty, quickness, and severity of sanctions and the recidivism associated with criminal versus juvenile court jurisdiction. Further, researchers conducting the replication study are providing an indepth examination of the organizational context of the various jurisdictions to determine how these contexts affect outcomes. This ongoing research from Columbia University will be completed in 2001.

What Have We Learned?

Transfer is generally reserved for the most serious cases and the most serious juvenile offenders. The research studies described in the previous section showed that judges and prosecutors in South Carolina and Utah used similar criteria in determining which juveniles should be transferred to criminal court. Although the decisionmaking process in each State differed significantly, in both States certain common criteria—including a juvenile’s court history and the seriousness of his or her offense—were strong predictors of whether the youth would be transferred. Determinations of the seriousness of an offense or a juvenile’s amenability to treatment changed during the period under consideration. In Pennsylvania, the number of judicial waivers increased 84 percent between 1986 and 1994—an increase that exceeded the 32-percent rise in juvenile crime during the same period. Although some of the increase in waiver derives from the rise in juvenile

crime, the research suggests that the juvenile courts waived a larger number of juvenile drug offenders than other offenders. The research also suggests that Pennsylvania courts began to believe that a greater proportion of adjudicated delinquents were no longer amenable to treatment within the juvenile justice system.

In Pennsylvania, judges and prosecutors generally agree on which juveniles should be transferred. In Florida, however, prosecutors and judges viewed the purpose and impact of reform differently. In four out of five cases examined in the first Pennsylvania study, the juvenile court supported the request for waiver, indicating that prosecutors and judges in that State generally agree about who should be waived and who should not. It may be that prosecutors are simply able to gauge the cases in which a judge is likely to grant a waiver request. The study of exclusions in Pennsylvania indicated that criminal court judges agree with juvenile court judges about which cases should be transferred.

The Florida study included a survey of prosecutors and juvenile court judges in the State’s judicial districts. The survey was designed to help researchers understand these players’ perceptions of the State’s statutory changes. Although prosecutors and juvenile court judges were found to generally agree on the results of the reforms, the survey showed important distinctions. For example, 61 percent of the prosecutors believed that the most significant change was the lowering of the direct file age (from 16 to 14), whereas only 32 percent of the juvenile court judges regarded this as the most significant change. In addition, 36 percent of prosecutors felt that public safety was the goal of transfers, and only 8 percent of judges held that view. The study also showed that 79 percent of prosecutors viewed direct file as the preferred method of transfer, compared with 36 percent of judges.

Exclusion laws are not necessarily having their intended effect. Transfer provisions that went into effect in Florida in 1994 specifically addressed and made it easier to transfer younger offenders, felons, and juveniles with significant offense records. Data from CIS, however, indicate that the reforms had little effect on the types of youth transferred during the year following the changes. The lack of an

immediate impact may mean that prosecutors and judges have been slow to exercise their new authority. It may also reflect a disconnect between the sentiments of legislators and those of practitioners who deal directly with juvenile offenders.

The Florida study has several other components, including a survey of youth who were the subject of proceedings in the criminal or juvenile court. The respondents in the juvenile system and those in the criminal system were matched (according to factors such as age and offense seriousness) to allow researchers to compare the experiences of similar juveniles in the two systems. Finally, the study is exploring the use of blended sanctioning, whereby a juvenile receives both a juvenile and an adult sanction. These last two study elements are continuing, and results will be reported in late 2001. The project has completed all data collection activities on these elements and is currently writing analyses and reports based on the data collected.

What Does This Mean?

Although transfer provisions are often adopted to address a perceived problem of increasing juvenile violence, the studies in Florida and Pennsylvania show that it is unclear whether broader transfer provisions actually result in increased use of transfer. The Florida data, for example, indicate that the State's 1994 reforms did not result in the transfer of more juveniles to criminal court. The Pennsylvania study of exclusions similarly showed that only those juveniles who would have ended up in criminal court anyway remained there. The Pennsylvania exclusion study also revealed a considerable time lag in prosecuting juveniles in criminal court. Thus, while the sanction ultimately imposed was similar to the sanction a youth would have received in the juvenile system, the criminal system expended greater resources to prosecute the case and detain the juvenile prior to sentencing.

Selective Bibliography on Juvenile Transfers to Criminal Court

Bishop, D.M., Frazier, C.E., Lanza-Kaduce, L., and White, H.G. 1999. *A Study of Juvenile Transfers to Criminal Court in Florida*. Fact Sheet. Washington,

DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 99113).

Fagan, J. 1995. Separating the men from the boys: The comparative advantage of juvenile versus criminal court sanctions on recidivism among adolescent felony offenders. In *Sourcebook on Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*, edited by J.C. Howell, B. Krisberg, J.D. Hawkins, and J.J. Wilson. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., pp. 238–260.

Puzzanchera, C.M. 2000. *Delinquency Cases Waived to Criminal Court, 1988–1997*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 200002).

Snyder, H., Sickmund, M., and Poe-Yamagata, E. 2000. *Juvenile Transfers to Criminal Court in the 1990's: Lessons Learned From Four Studies*. Summary. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 181301).

Torbet, P., Griffin, P., Hurst, H., Jr., and MacKenzie, L.R. 2000. *Juveniles Facing Criminal Sanctions: Three States That Changed the Rules*. Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 181203).

Juveniles in Corrections

Even though juvenile arrest and victimization data for the past few years indicate that juvenile crime has been dropping, a large number of juvenile offenders remain in residential detention and corrections programs across the Nation. Responses to OJJDP's Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP) identified more than 125,800 young persons assigned beds on October 29, 1997, in 1,121 public and 2,310 private facilities nationwide. Of these individuals, nearly 105,800 (84 percent) met the inclusion criteria for the Census, which included being under age 21, being assigned a bed in a residential facility at the end of the day on October 29, 1997, having been charged with or court adjudicated for an offense, and being in residential placement as a result of that offense.

Although there are many juveniles residing in facilities on any given day, the quality and condition of these facilities are largely unknown. How well do these facilities operate? Is the safety of juveniles and staff assured? Are facilities fulfilling the dual mission of the youth detention and corrections system: to keep the public safe and provide treatment to young offenders so that they will return to the community as productive citizens? How can facilities measure their effectiveness and identify areas that need improvement? The Research Division supports several projects that examine these questions.

In 1995, OJJDP launched the Performance-based Standards (PbS) project, largely in response to its landmark Conditions of Confinement Study, which found high rates of suicidal behavior by youth in residential placement, few timely or professionally conducted health screenings, and high levels of staff turnover at detention and correctional facilities. In addition, the study found that pervasive crowding at facilities was related to high rates of injury to staff and youth. OJJDP recognized the need for national performance standards to improve the quality and conditions of such facilities and awarded a grant to the Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators (CJCA) to develop and implement performance standards for youth correctional and detention facilities. Through the consensus of more than 40 representatives from major youth corrections and detention agencies, correctional associations, and related organizations, an advisory board and four working groups established outcome measures and data elements to assess the impact of the following PbS goals for the areas of operations:

- ◆ **Security:** To protect public safety and provide a safe environment for youth and staff. Security is essential for effective learning and treatment.
- ◆ **Order:** To establish clear expectations of behavior and an accompanying system of accountability for youth and staff that promotes mutual respect, self-discipline, and order.
- ◆ **Safety:** To engage in management practices that promote the safety and well-being of staff and youth.

- ◆ **Programming:** To provide meaningful opportunities for youth to improve their educational and vocational competence, address underlying behavioral problems, and prepare for responsible lives in the community.
- ◆ **Justice:** To operate the facility in a manner that is consistent with principles of fairness and that provides ways to ensure and protect the legal rights of youth and their families.
- ◆ **Health/Mental Health:** To identify and effectively respond to youth's physical and mental health problems and to related behavioral problems throughout the course of confinement by using professionally appropriate diagnostic, treatment, and prevention protocols.⁵

What Have We Learned?

Standards appear to be making a difference in the quality of service. Thirty-two facilities have been implementing PbS since August 1998. These facilities have completed four rounds of data collection and are continuing to work on improvements before completing their next data collection in spring 2001. Since beginning implementation of PbS, several facilities have reported measurable improvements, such as reduction of youth injuries and decline in staff turnover.

A facility that had experienced a youth suicide and received major criticism from the media, policymakers, and the public before implementing the standards showed dramatic improvement 1 year after implementation. The facility's data report showed that there had been no suicides during the year and that all youth were screened at intake for risk of suicide before being assigned housing. The evaluation also showed a reduction in the use of mechanical restraints and indicated that no youth had been injured when restraints were used. During the same period, the facility's use of isolation and

⁵ Additional information on PbS for juvenile detention and corrections is available from the Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators, Stonehill College, 16 Belmont Street, South Easton, MA 02375; 508-238-0073; 508-238-0651 (fax); CJCA@corrections.com (e-mail); www.corrections.com/cjca/cjcalist.html (Internet).

room confinement was cut in half and there were fewer injuries to youth and fewer escapes from the facility. Each of these areas had been targeted for improvement, and each had been the subject of public criticism. A consequence of the reduction in use of mechanical restraints and greater staff involvement in handling disruptive situations has been an increase in staff reports of fear (a 17-percent increase in 1 year). The facility and PbS project have responded by hiring experts to train staff on de-escalation techniques. Followup for this and other facilities is ongoing to ensure that improvements are sustained and other key performance areas do not suffer.

Implementation of PbS is challenging, but valued. Recent survey results from an evaluation being conducted by the National Academy of Public Administration are encouraging, in terms of both adoption of PbS and improvements in facility outcomes. Even the nearly one-third of facilities that reported experiencing significant difficulties with initial implementation of standards felt strongly that the standards would ultimately be accepted and used in youth correctional and detention facilities. Researchers found that PbS goals are widely shared by facility administrators and staff.

What Does This Mean?

Interest in and adoption of PbS are growing. In fall 2000, the 32 facilities originally engaged in PbS activities were joined by 25 new facilities. OJJDP is working with CJCA to publish and distribute a Bulletin on the PbS project, a PbS user's manual, and resource guides that describe effective programs and provide resources to help facilities improve their practices. Topics to be addressed in the resource guides include suicide prevention, treatment of sex offenders, educational programming, mental health services, and facility communications. The PbS Web site (www.performance-standards.org) is another vehicle that OJJDP uses to provide the field with information on facilities participating in the PbS project.

Additional research on the impact of PbS is needed. Although initial findings on the impact of PbS are encouraging, ongoing evaluation and

research are necessary to ensure that positive changes are sustained and facilities are able to adapt to modifications in staffing patterns and populations. Implementation in a wide range of facilities offers the field a unique opportunity to understand how targeted changes in practice and training and the infusion of additional resources affect important outcomes for youth in confinement.

Standards can be applied to other facility activities. Early successes encouraged the PbS team to look beyond the six areas of operations originally identified for standards and consider what facilities are doing to prepare youth for reintegration when they return to the community. The PbS team has partnered with OJJDP's Intensive Aftercare Program to develop a set of standards and outcome measures relating to facilities' efforts to transition youth from confinement to the community.

Selective Bibliography on Juveniles in Corrections

Sickmund, M. 2000. *Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement Databook*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 200008).

Sickmund, M. 2000. *State Custody Rates, 1997*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 183108).

Youth Gang Research

The Research Division sponsors a broad-based program of research that focuses on many aspects of youth gangs. Through a series of research projects and evaluations, secondary data analysis, and activities of the National Youth Gang Center (NYGC), OJJDP continues to learn valuable information about the prevalence, nature, and impact of youth gangs in communities across the country. Most important, this information is used to craft solutions and strategies to counter the impact of gang activity on youth and schools.

National Youth Gang Center

The National Youth Gang Center (NYGC) collects data, analyzes State legislation related to gangs, conducts reviews of literature dealing with gang issues, identifies promising gang program strategies, and provides technical support to the National Youth Gang Consortium. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) convenes the Consortium—which includes all Federal agencies and bureaus engaged in antigang activities—three times a year to build partnerships and coordinate Federal resources at the local level to develop comprehensive approaches to gang prevention, intervention, and suppression.

Since 1995, NYGC has conducted the annual OJJDP National Youth Gang Survey of law enforcement agencies. Summaries and Fact Sheets based on the survey are published regularly through OJJDP. NYGC also provides training and technical assistance for the Rural Youth Gang Initiative and will do the same for the Gang-Free Schools and Communities Initiative launched in early 2001. The NYGC Web site is an excellent resource for information on gang programs, research, and legislation. Full-text publications, bibliographies of publications relating to gang research, and lists of gang legislation by State and subject can be found at www.iir.com/nygc/.

What Have We Learned?

Although the prevalence of youth gangs is decreasing nationwide, it is increasing in rural communities. In 1998, nearly half (4,463) of the U.S. cities and counties responding to the National Youth Gang Survey reported experiencing youth gang activity. Such activity included an estimated 28,700 gangs and 780,200 active youth gang members in the United States, a modest decrease of about 3 percent from 1997 and a decrease of 5 percent from 1996, when 53 percent of all responding jurisdictions reported active youth gangs. Most of the nationwide decrease occurred in large suburban counties (i.e., those with populations of 250,000 or more). Counter to the nationwide trend, however,

between 1996 and 1998, the number of gang members in rural counties increased 43 percent and the number of gang members in small cities increased 3 percent.

Even with a national decrease in youth gang activity, many communities face major challenges as they address their gang problem. In 1998, more than two-thirds of jurisdictions reported that their gang problem was either “staying about the same” or “getting worse,” compared with previous years. In addition, only 16 percent of jurisdictions reported that gang members in their communities did not use firearms in conjunction with assaults. More than half indicated that gang members used weapons “often” or “sometimes.” Moreover, one-third of all youth gangs today are drug gangs (i.e., gangs organized specifically for the purpose of trafficking in drugs). These drug gangs appear most prevalent in rural counties (38 percent). Jurisdictions report most of their gang members are involved in one or more of the following serious and/or violent crimes: larceny/theft (17 percent), burglary/breaking and entering (13 percent), aggravated assault (12 percent), motor vehicle theft (11 percent), and robbery (3 percent).

Youth gangs are prevalent in schools, where drug and gang activities appear linked. The most recent data available indicate that more than one-third (37 percent) of students report a gang presence at school (Howell and Lynch, 2000). A high correlation exists between student victimization of all types and school gang presence. In addition, most gangs that students see at school are actively involved in criminal activity. Students reported, for example, that about two-thirds of school gangs were involved in violence, drug activity, or gun carrying. Students also reported that gangs were most prevalent in schools where drugs were easy to obtain.

What Does This Mean?

A comprehensive approach appears to be the most promising way to address gang activity. OJJDP’s Comprehensive Gang Program model incorporates five key components that continue to show the greatest promise for communities addressing the activities of youth gangs: community mobilization, social intervention, provision of opportunities, suppression of

OJJDP-Funded Gang Research

- ◆ Action Research on Youth Gangs in Indian Country: Profiling the Problem and Seeking Solutions, directed by Troy Armstrong, Ph.D., Center for Delinquency and Crime Policy Studies, California State University, Sacramento.
- ◆ Case Studies and Evaluation Planning of the OJJDP Rural Youth Gang Initiative, directed by Barry Krisberg, Ph.D., National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Oakland, CA.
- ◆ Evaluation of the Comprehensive Community-Wide Approach to Gang Prevention, Intervention, and Suppression Program, directed by Irving Spergel, Ph.D., School of Social Services Administration, University of Chicago, IL.
- ◆ Finding and Knowing the Gang Naye'e in the Navajo Nation, directed by James W. Zion, Ph.D., Navajo Nation Judicial Branch, Window Rock, AZ.
- ◆ National Youth Gang Center (conducts the annual National Youth Gang Survey), directed by Emory B. Williams, Ph.D., Institute for Intergovernmental Research, Tallahassee, FL.
- ◆ Socialization to Gangs in an Emerging Gang City, directed by G. David Curry, Ph.D., Department of Criminology, University of Missouri, St. Louis.
- ◆ Survey of School-Based Gang Prevention and Intervention Programs, directed by Gary D. Gottfredson, Ph.D., Gottfredson Associates, Inc., Ellicott City, MD.
- ◆ Women and Gangs: A Field Research Study, directed by Ann McGuigan, Ph.D., Illinois State University, Normal. (For a description of the project, refer to page 26 of this Report.)
- ◆ Youth Gangs in Juvenile Detention and Corrections Facilities, directed by David W. Roush, Ph.D., National Juvenile Detention Association, Richmond, KY.
- ◆ Youth Groups and Gangs in Europe, directed by Finn-Aage Esbensen, Ph.D., Department of Criminal Justice, University of Nebraska, Omaha.

gang activity, and organizational change and development. This comprehensive approach coordinates services (e.g., social, academic, vocational, and law enforcement) to prevent youth from becoming involved in gangs and to help jurisdictions intervene with gang-involved juveniles and reduce the criminal impact of gangs. Two current OJJDP projects—the Comprehensive Community-Wide Approach to Gang Prevention, Intervention, and Suppression Program (being used in five communities) and the Rural Youth Gang Initiative (under way in four rural sites)—are implementing the strategies of the Comprehensive Gang model.

OJJDP is expanding its comprehensive approach to youth gangs through the new FY 2000 Gang-Free Schools and Communities Initiative. This initiative includes two new programs being launched by OJJDP to address and reduce youth gang crime and violence in schools and communities across America: OJJDP's Gang-Free Communities

Program, which will offer seed funding to up to 12 communities to replicate OJJDP's Comprehensive Gang Model, and OJJDP's Comprehensive Gang Model: An Enhanced School/Community Approach to Reducing Youth Gang Crime, which will support up to 4 demonstration sites implementing school-focused enhancements to the OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model. Both efforts will include technical assistance and training through OJJDP's NYGC and provide support for program evaluation. The initiative through which these programs are being launched represents a collaboration between OJJDP and the U.S. Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, Labor, and the Treasury.

Selective Bibliography on Youth Gang Research

Burch, J., and Kane, C. 1999. *Implementing the OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of

Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 99112).

Egley, A., Jr. 2000. *Highlights of the 1999 National Youth Gang Survey*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 200020).

Esbensen, F. 2000. *Preventing Adolescent Gang Involvement*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 182210).

Howell, J.C. 2000. *Youth Gang Programs and Strategies*. Summary. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 171154).

Howell, J.C., and Gleason, D.K. 1999. *Youth Gang Drug Trafficking*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 178282).

Howell, J.C., and Lynch, J.P. 2000. *Youth Gangs in Schools*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 183015).

Moore, J.P., and Cook, I.L. 1999. *Highlights of the 1998 National Youth Gang Survey*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 99123).

National Youth Gang Center. 2000. *1998 National Youth Gang Survey*. Summary. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 183109).

Wyrick, P. 2000. *Vietnamese Youth Gang Involvement*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 200001).

Diversion From Juvenile Court: Teen/Youth Courts and Restorative Justice Programs

An estimated 1,755,000 juvenile cases were referred to juvenile court in 1997, but only 57 percent (996,000) went through the formal court process. The rest (43 percent or 759,000) were nonpetitioned. Fewer than half of the nonpetitioned cases resulted in a dismissal. What happened to the other nonpetitioned cases? Undoubtedly, many were diverted to alternative programs such as teen/youth courts and restorative justice programs. These options have been available for several years, and more and more communities today are using them to handle juvenile offenders diverted from the formal court process.

Teen courts, first established about 20 to 25 years ago, are generally used for younger juveniles (ages 10 to 15) with no prior arrests who have been charged with minor violations (e.g., shoplifting, vandalism, and status offenses). These offenders are typically offered diversion to teen court in lieu of more formal handling by the traditional juvenile justice system. Although teen courts often include many of the same steps as the formal juvenile court (e.g., intake, preliminary review of charges, court hearing, disposition), they differ from other juvenile justice programs in that young people, rather than adults, are in charge. Youth in teen courts may act as prosecutors, defense counsel, jurors, court clerks, bailiffs, or judges (or as members of a panel of youth judges). Adults act as administrators who provide oversight, planning, and training. Although some teen court programs involve deliberation on charges, the key feature of all teen court programs is the substantial role that youth play in the imposition of sanctions on young offenders.

OJJDP's Evaluation of Teen Courts Project recently conducted a national survey of teen and youth courts. More than 300 programs responded to the survey (a more than 70-percent response rate). Responses to the survey documented the range of teen and youth court programs used in jurisdictions across the country, the characteristics of teen and youth court clients, the sanctions imposed, the courtroom models used,

the extent of community support received, and the challenges faced. Survey findings are described in the next section (see pages 18–19).

In addition to diverting youth to teen and youth courts, many communities are starting to use another alternative to formal processing: restorative justice conferences. Based on the Australian model of family group conferencing, a restorative justice conference brings together an offending youth, his or her victim, and supporters of both with a trained facilitator to discuss the incident and the harm and effect it has had on the victim and supporters. In a restorative justice conference, the victim has an opportunity to explain how he or she has been harmed and to question the offending youth. Supporters have a chance to describe how they have been affected by the incident, and the conference ends with a reparation agreement in which all participants agree on how the offending youth can make amends to the victim. The reparation agreement may include an apology and/or some type of restitution to be made to the victim. It may also describe other actions to be taken by the youth, such as improving school attendance or completing homework. As part of a balanced and restorative justice model, these conferences seek to hold youth accountable, involve and meet the needs of victims, and build a community of support around youth.

The field of research on restorative justice efforts—for both adults and juveniles—is growing. A recently completed OJJDP-funded evaluation of one such program in Indianapolis, IN, found highly positive results in terms of conference completion, participant satisfaction, and youth reoffending.

Research on Diversion Programs

- ◆ Evaluation of Teen Courts, directed by Jeffrey Butts, Ph.D., State Policy Center, The Urban Institute, Washington, DC.
- ◆ Preventing Juvenile Crime: Evaluating Restorative Justice Conferences as an Innovative Response to Juvenile Crime, directed by Edmund McGarrell, Ph.D., Crime Control Policy Center, The Hudson Institute, Indianapolis, IN.

Research findings on both of the alternative methods discussed in this section—teen/youth courts and restorative justice conferences—continue to provide OJJDP with important information about the obstacles to establishing such programs, the challenges of sustaining volunteers and funding, and the key elements to program success. Research findings can be used by communities to guide program planning and implementation.

What Have We Learned?

The potential benefits of teen/youth courts and restorative justice conferences are widely recognized. Communities are increasingly using teen/youth courts and restorative justice programs, largely because of the great potential benefits of these alternative programs. Such benefits include improved accountability in minor offense cases that are unlikely to result in sanctions from the traditional juvenile justice system, more timely handling of cases, cost savings (teen/youth courts and restorative justice programs rely heavily on volunteers), and enhanced community-court relationships. Some evaluations also show that participants in teen/youth courts and restorative justice programs have higher levels of satisfaction and feel more invested in the process than participants in more traditional juvenile justice programs (and even participants in other diversion programs).

Teen/youth court and restorative justice programs are selective about the types of cases they will handle. Comprehensive screening of case referrals helps ensure that only offending youth who are amenable to intervention end up in teen/youth court or restorative justice programs. Overall, these youth are nonviolent offenders who commit less serious offenses, and most have not had a previous referral. For example, more than 90 percent of teen court programs that responded to the survey reported that they “never” or “rarely” accept youth who have had a previous juvenile court referral. Even fewer programs accept youth who have a prior felony arrest. The Indianapolis Restorative Justice Project reported that it screens out juveniles with prior adjudications and juveniles older than age 14 and requires juveniles to admit responsibility for their offense. (Restorative justice conferences are not fact-finding

hearings. If a youth challenges the allegations, the matter proceeds to court.)

A program's screening processes may influence its impact (e.g., if more difficult cases are screened out, positive results may be less meaningful). Evaluations that appropriately compare these interventions with other diversion programs that serve youth with similar characteristics and offenses and use similar screening procedures are more likely to provide meaningful information about the effectiveness of various diversion options.

Even though many serious cases may be screened out, the cases that are handled by teen/youth courts and restorative justice programs often call for a serious response. Most cases that teen court programs reported handling involve theft, minor assault, disorderly conduct, possession or use of alcohol, and vandalism. These cases are similar to those handled by the Indianapolis Restorative Justice Project, which reported handling primarily conversion (shoplifting), battery, theft, and criminal mischief cases.

Benefits of alternatives to formal court processing may include greater satisfaction for victims, greater involvement of offenders and parents, and lowered recidivism rates. Indianapolis' restorative justice program recorded high levels of satisfaction for victims. More than 90 percent of victims (compared with 68 percent of victims in the control group) either "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they were satisfied with the conference. Typically, victims participating in the program reported feeling much more involved in the process (97 percent versus 47 percent of victims in the control group). In addition, many victims who participated in the program indicated that they would recommend the process to a friend in a similar situation. Although levels of satisfaction for participating offenders and their parents did not differ from those of offenders and parents in other diversion programs, participants and their families felt much more involved in the process. In terms of reoffending, the results of restorative justice conferences are promising. When compared with the total sample and with juveniles who successfully completed other diversion programs (the control group), youth participating in restorative justice

conferences were significantly less likely to be rearrested 6 months after the incident.

A principal goal of both teen/youth courts and restorative justice programs is to hold young offenders accountable for their behavior. Every youth who admits guilt or is found guilty in teen/youth court receives some form of sanction. In many cases, these sanctions do more than punish a young offender; they encourage him or her to repair (at least in part) the damage caused to the community or inflicted on a specific victim. Sanctions may include an order to pay restitution or perform community service. In some cases, sanctions involve writing a letter of apology to a victim. Many teen/youth courts require offenders to serve on a subsequent teen/youth court jury. The satisfaction level of offenders diverted to teen/youth courts has not yet been measured. However, the greater accountability required of these offenders might result in findings similar to those of the restorative justice project.

What Does This Mean?

Communities need clear guidelines to implement alternative programs. As more and more communities begin to adopt alternative programs such as teen/youth courts and restorative justice initiatives, they need clear guidelines on how to develop the programs and what key components to include for successful implementation. OJJDP, through its Training and Technical Assistance Division, provides communities with this type of assistance. Examples include the National Youth Court Center and OJJDP publications such as the *Guide for Implementing the Balanced and Restorative Justice Model*. These resources and OJJDP's evaluation efforts in this area inform the technical assistance that OJJDP provides to communities. Such assistance helps communities continue to provide juvenile offenders, their families, and victims alternatives to formal court processing that offer support and rehabilitation and promote accountability.

More research on teen courts and restorative justice conferences is needed. Although teen/youth courts and restorative justice programs tend to enjoy broad community support, little is known about their actual effectiveness in reducing future delinquent behavior. Favorable media coverage, high

short-term satisfaction levels of parents and youth, and widespread public interest make these programs popular options for policymakers. Yet, little research has been conducted on what the outcomes are for juvenile offenders participating in the programs, whether these alternatives are more effective at reducing future delinquent behavior than the formal juvenile court or other diversion programs, and how the programs affect victims and the community. Preliminary findings from recent studies indicate that participation in teen/youth court may be associated with lowered recidivism rates, improved youth attitudes toward authority, and increased knowledge of the justice system among youth. In addition, although the findings of the Indianapolis Restorative Justice Project (which shows higher levels of satisfaction and lower recidivism rates than other diversion programs) are encouraging, more research is required to determine whether these positive results can be sustained over the long term and replicated reliably in other communities.

Community-based involvement appears to improve the likelihood of a program's longevity and success. Community involvement in both teen/youth courts and restorative justice conferences is extremely important. Programs, therefore, often need to engage in efforts early on to recruit and train volunteers, locate appropriate referrals, and maintain the support of youth-serving organizations. Also important is the continuing involvement of other agencies and organizations, including courts, law enforcement, and social services agencies. Schools and faith organizations can play an important role by providing facility space, volunteers, and opportunities for community service.

Teen/youth court programs indicated that their three greatest challenges are sustaining funding, retaining youth volunteers, and continuing to receive sufficient case referrals. Teen/youth court programs operated by schools or private agencies were significantly more likely to report problems with funding, judicial support, and coordination with other agencies than were those operated by courts, law enforcement, or prosecutors. Although these findings may not be surprising, they reinforce the need for strong community-based collaboration to design, implement, and sustain an effective teen/youth court program.

Selective Bibliography on Diversion From Juvenile Court: Teen/Youth Courts and Restorative Justice Programs

Butts, J., and Buck, J. 2000. *Teen Courts: A Focus on Research*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 183472).

Butts, J., Hoffman, D., and Buck, J. 1999. *Teen Courts in the United States: A Profile of Current Programs*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 99118).

McGarrell, E. In press. *Restorative Justice Conferences as an Early Response to Young Offenders*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 187769).

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 1998. *Guide for Implementing the Balanced and Restorative Justice Model*. Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 167887).

National Statistics on Juvenile Offenders and Victims

OJJDP's Research Division monitors trends relating to juvenile offenders and victims, including information on self-reported offending and official statistics on juvenile offenses, juvenile arrests, and juvenile offenders. Working with other branches of the U.S. Department of Justice, including the Bureau of Justice Statistics and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and other government agencies, such as the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and Bureau of Labor Statistics, OJJDP's Research Division gathers information that provides a complete look at the nature and extent of juvenile delinquency and victimization in the United States. To that end, the Research Division supports the following projects:

◆ **The National Juvenile Court Data Archive (NJCDA).** NJCDA collects, stores, and analyzes data about young people referred to U.S. courts for delinquency and status offenses. A series of OJJDP Fact Sheets and Bulletins about these data informs the field on a regular basis.

◆ **National Juvenile Justice Data Analysis Project (NJJDAP).** NJJDAP was established in 1998 to address an important need of the juvenile justice community: current, high-quality information on a broad spectrum of issues. Most research projects address specific issues through scientific research designs that include data collection and analysis. NJJDAP, on the other hand, makes use of existing data sets. By searching out experts on data sets and contracting them to complete analyses, NJJDAP takes full advantage of existing expertise. The project team also has in-house expertise on important juvenile justice data sets such as the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY97) and the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement. NJJDAP is able to develop reports, bulletins, and other products on a wide range of topics. To date, it has produced the CJRP Databook (a Web-based interactive program), fact sheets on self-reported delinquency (based on NLSY97), briefing materials on crowding in detention centers, briefing materials on school suspension, and analyses of the National Crime Victimization Survey.

◆ **Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement.** Conducted for the first time in 1997, CJRP gathers detailed information on juveniles in residential placement facilities as a result of contact with the juvenile justice system. CJRP collects data on characteristics of juveniles in the facilities (date of birth, race, sex, and most serious offense), court of jurisdiction (juvenile or criminal), adjudicatory status (pre- or post-adjudication), and the State or county with jurisdiction over the juvenile. OJJDP has developed an online databook that contains both national and State-level tables based on the data from CJRP. (The databook can be found in the Statistical Briefing Book via OJJDP's Web site, www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org, under "JJ Facts & Figures.") Data from the second CJRP (conducted in 1999) will identify trends

during the past 2 years, and the online databook will be updated to include this information. Information from the 1999 CJRP will be released in late 2001.

◆ **Survey of Youth in Residential Placement (SYRP).** SYRP will survey the same youth included in CJRP: those in residential custody as a result of their contact with the juvenile justice system. SYRP researchers will interview youth directly about their offense history, service needs, experience in custody, and general background (including standard demographic items). The survey will also examine the risk and protective factors of the youth. OJJDP began a 2-year development phase for this survey in 1998 by awarding a cooperative agreement to Westat, Inc., and the first full implementation of the survey will occur in 2002.

◆ **Juvenile Probation Survey.** OJJDP is developing the Juvenile Probation Survey to complement various other censuses that deal with juvenile custody. Even though juvenile probation has been described as "the workhorse of the juvenile justice system" (Torbet, 1996), few data exist on the use of probation and no data exist on the number of

Resources for OJJDP Statistical Projects

The Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement, the Juvenile Residential Facility Census, and the Juvenile Probation Survey, directed by Joseph Moone, M.S., Program Manager, Research and Program Development Division, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, in collaboration with the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

National Juvenile Court Data Archive and National Juvenile Justice Data Analysis Project, directed by Howard N. Snyder, Ph.D., National Center for Juvenile Justice, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, Pittsburgh, PA.

Planning for the Survey of Youth in Residential Placement, directed by Andrea Sedlack, Ph.D., Westat, Inc., Rockville, MD.

OJJDP's Web-Based Statistical Briefing Book

More and more, OJJDP has turned to high-tech solutions and the Internet to inform the public of new research findings and their implications for the field. The OJJDP Statistical Briefing Book (www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/index.html) allows users to access online data via OJJDP's Web site to learn more about juvenile crime trends across the Nation and in specific communities. The Briefing Book also provides basic information on juvenile crime and victimization and on youth involved in the juvenile justice system. Data in several content areas listed on the site (e.g., juvenile populations, juvenile arrests, juveniles in court, and juveniles in corrections) provide timely and reliable statistical answers to the most frequently asked questions of policymakers, the media, and members of the general public.

juveniles on probation at any given time. The new Juvenile Probation Survey will fill this gap. OJJDP hopes to field test the survey in 2001.

- ◆ **Juvenile Residential Facility Census (JRFC).** To complement CJRP, OJJDP developed JRFC, which will describe both the residential environments in which juveniles are held and the services they receive while residing in the facilities. The census will cover security arrangements, health services, mental health treatment, substance abuse treatment, education, and facility capacity. A large-scale feasibility test of the census was performed in October 1998, and the census was implemented nationally for the first time in October 2000.

What Have We Learned?

Juvenile violent crime continues to decline. In 1999, law enforcement agencies arrested an estimated 2.5 million persons under the age of 18—an 8-percent decrease from 1998 but still an increase of 11 percent over the number arrested in 1990. In 1999, juveniles accounted for 17 percent of all arrests and 16 percent of all violent crime arrests. In 1999, for the fifth consecutive year, the juvenile violent crime arrest rate (i.e., the number of juvenile arrests per 100,000 persons ages 10 to 18 in the population) declined. Specifically, between 1995 and 1999, the juvenile violent crime arrest rate declined 9 percent. The juvenile murder rate fell 68 percent in 1999 from its peak in 1993, reaching its lowest level since the 1960s.

In 1997, courts with juvenile jurisdiction disposed more than 1.7 million delinquency cases. The number of delinquency cases disposed in 1997 (about the same as the number disposed in 1996) represented a 48-percent increase from the number disposed in 1988. Most cases (84 percent) handled in juvenile court in 1997 had been referred by law enforcement, although some referral variations existed across offenses.

Younger juveniles account for a substantial proportion of juvenile arrests and the juvenile court caseload. Thirty-two percent of juveniles arrested in 1999 were younger than age 15. The proportion of juvenile arrests involving younger juveniles (under age 15) was highest for arson (67 percent), followed by sex offenses (51 percent), vandalism (44 percent), and other assaults (43 percent). Of all delinquency cases processed by the Nation's juvenile courts in 1997, 58 percent involved juveniles younger than age 16.

Female delinquency continues to grow. In 1999, 27 percent of juvenile arrests involved a female offender. Between 1990 and 1999, the number of female juvenile offenders arrested increased more or decreased less than the number of male juvenile offenders arrested in most offense categories. The number of juvenile court delinquency cases involving females increased 83 percent between 1988 and 1997, while cases involving males increased 39 percent during this period. Females accounted for one in seven juveniles in residential placement in 1997.

Twenty-five percent of the juveniles in residential custody nationwide were charged with Violent Crime Index offenses. Data from the 1997 Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement, which replaced the Children in Custody series, show more than 105,790 juveniles in public and private facilities on October 29, 1997. One-quarter of the juveniles in placement had been charged with or adjudicated for a violent offense. Youth charged with delinquent offenses made up 93 percent of juvenile offenders in both private and public residential placement; those charged with status offenses made up 7 percent.

Minority juveniles continue to be overrepresented in the custody population. For every 100,000 non-Hispanic black juveniles in the U.S. population, 1,018 were in a residential placement facility on October 29, 1997. The rate was 515 for Hispanics and 204 for non-Hispanic whites.

What Does This Mean?

Even with recent declines, juvenile crime remains too high. Despite decreases in recent years, juvenile arrests in 1999 were 11 percent higher than in 1990. For violent crimes committed by juveniles, 1999 arrests were 5 percent higher than in 1990. Such increases confirm that juvenile crime and delinquency remain serious problems in the Nation.

Communities should place special focus on young offenders and female offenders. These two groups account for a greater proportion of the delinquency population than ever before. Therefore, the unique factors that contribute to these groups' increased involvement in crime and delinquency and ways to effectively intervene with the groups should be examined and tested.

Additional research on juveniles in custody is necessary. To understand where to focus resources, communities need to learn more about the characteristics and needs of juveniles in custody. Unfortunately, most information about juveniles in residential facilities is provided by the facilities themselves. OJJDP's Research Division is planning the Survey of Youth in Residential Placement (described on page 21), which will gather individual-level data directly from the juveniles in residential facilities. In addition, the Juvenile

Residential Facility Census (see page 22) will gather information on programs and services offered by residential facilities across the country.

Selective Bibliography on National Statistics on Juvenile Offenders and Victims

Moone, J. 2000. *Innovative Information on Juvenile Residential Facilities*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 200011).

Porter, G. 2000. *Detention in Delinquency Cases, 1988–1997*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 200017).

Puzzanchera, C.M. 2000. *Delinquency Cases Waived to Criminal Court, 1988–1997*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 200002).

Puzzanchera, C.M. 2000. *Juvenile Court Placement of Adjudicated Youth, 1988–1997*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 200015).

Puzzanchera, C.M., Stahl, A., Finnegan, T., Snyder, H.N., Poole, R., and Tierney, N. 2000. *Juvenile Court Statistics 1997*. Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 180864).

Scahill, M.C. 2000. *Female Delinquency Cases, 1997*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 200016).

Scahill, M.C. 2000. *Juvenile Delinquency Probation Caseload, 1988–1997*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 200019).

Scahill, M.C. 2000. *Person Offense Cases in Juvenile Court, 1988–1997*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 200006).

Sickmund, M. 2000. *Offenders in Juvenile Court, 1997*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 181204).

Sickmund, M. 2000. *State Custody Rates, 1997*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 183108).

Sickmund, M., and Wan Y. 1999. *Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement: 1997 Databook*. Data presentation and analysis package. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice (available online, see page C–2).

Snyder, H.N. 1999. *Juvenile Arrests 1998*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 179064).

Snyder, H.N. 2000. *Counting America's Youth: Easy Access to Population Data*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 200014).

Snyder, H.N. 2000. *Juvenile Arrests 1999*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 185236).

Snyder, H.N., Finnegan, T.A., Kang, W., Poole, R., Stahl, A., and Wan, Y. 2001. *Easy Access to Juvenile Court Statistics: 1989–1998*. Data presentation and

analysis package. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice (available online, see page C–2).

Snyder, H.N., Finnegan, T.A., and Wan, Y. 2001. *Easy Access to the FBI's Supplementary Homicide Reports: 1980–1998*. Data presentation and analysis package. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice (available online, see page C–2).

Snyder, H.N., and Poole, R. 2000. *Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics, 1994–1998*. Data presentation and analysis package. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice (available online, see page C–2).

Snyder, H.N., Poole, R., and Wan, Y. 2000. *Easy Access to Juvenile Populations*. Data presentation and analysis package. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice (available online, see page C–2).

Stahl, A. 2000. *Delinquency Cases in Juvenile Courts, 1997*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 200004).

Stahl, A. 2000. *Juvenile Vandalism, 1997*. Fact Sheet. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (FS 200010).

Stahl, A., McGlynn, E., and Wan, Y. 2000. *Easy Access to State and County Juvenile Court Case Counts 1997*. Data presentation and analysis package. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice (available online, see page C–2).

Torbet, P.M. 1996. *Juvenile Probation: The Workhorse of the Juvenile Justice System*. Bulletin. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (NCJ 158534).

New and Emerging Research Efforts

Girls Program Evaluations and Girls Study Group

According to the FBI, between 1990 and 1999, the number of arrests of juvenile females increased more or decreased less than the number of male arrests in most offense categories. In 1980, females represented only 11 percent of all juvenile arrests for violent offenses. By 1999, that proportion had increased to 17 percent. The increase in arrests of juvenile females affects several levels of the juvenile justice system, from probation services to residential programs and aftercare. Between 1988 and 1997, the number of juvenile court delinquency cases involving males increased 39 percent, while the number of cases involving females increased 83 percent. During this period, the relative change in delinquency case rates was greater for females than for males in all major offense categories.

In response to this disturbing trend, OJJDP's Research Division launched a program of research on delinquent girls and initiatives that target female juvenile offenders. In FY 1999, OJJDP's Field-Initiated Research Program solicited applications for evaluations of projects for at-risk and delinquent girls. The following projects were selected for funding:

◆ **A Comparative Evaluation of Three Programs for Adolescent Female Offenders (University of Michigan).** Wayne County, MI, which includes the city of Detroit, is in the process of developing community-based models of treatment to reduce the number of institutional placements for adjudicated female juvenile offenders. The project's goal is to evaluate the following Wayne County programs for adolescent female offenders: a new program that incorporates gender-specific

programming, home-based intervention, and community involvement (e.g., services for pregnant/parenting adolescents); an intensive probation program that includes limited gender-specific programming; and a secure, female-only residential program that provides limited gender-specific treatment but no specialized programs to address the needs of pregnant/parenting offenders. The study will use a quasi-experimental design to evaluate the efficacy of the three programs listed above. In particular, researchers will use random assignment to compare the new community-based intervention model with the established intensive probation program. Researchers will also compare the outcomes of these community-based programs with those of the secure, female-only residential program.

The research project will examine a range of outcomes, including recidivism, substance use, depression, community integration, academic performance, career aspirations, parenting readiness, and responsible sexual behavior. The project will also explore how specific program components relate to these outcomes. By determining whether characteristics of the participants relate to different outcomes in the three modes of treatment, researchers will also help identify important intervening variables that may result in positive outcomes for female offenders.

◆ **Evaluation of the GIRLS Project (University of Georgia, Department of Counseling and Human Development).** This study will provide a process and outcome evaluation of the GIRLS (Gaining Insight into Relationships for Lifelong Success) Project, an ongoing project that addresses problems of female delinquency through the use of a relational approach to intervention.

The program involves two primary levels of intervention. The first is a psychoeducational counseling group that deals with relationships and focuses on the girl in relation to self, family, peers, and teachers. The evaluation of this intervention will examine each of the four relational domains through the use of multimethod data collection (e.g., self-reports, other reports, school records, and recidivism data). The program's second level of intervention includes court services workers involved in local juvenile justice systems and focuses on individual consultation, educational workshops, and local juvenile justice system policies and procedures. Researchers will evaluate this level of intervention by using qualitative observational data gathered from monthly meetings and focusing on court services workers' use of gender-sensitive treatment recommendations and referrals.

This evaluation will investigate the applicability of a relational approach to the treatment of female juvenile offenders; examine components of the relational approach that deal with a girl's relationships to self, family, peers, and teachers; evaluate the impact of increasing the knowledge base of professionals involved in the local juvenile justice system; and provide an empirically based, alternative model of treatment that can be replicated in other settings.

- ◆ **Women and Gangs: A Field Research Study (Illinois State University).** This study focuses on gang-involved women in Little Chicago, a neighborhood in Champaign, IL, with chronic gang problems. Research will consist of direct interviews with women who are hardcore or background members of the Vice Lords or Black P–Stones gang and systematic observations of gang activities over a 6-month period. The research will explore the women's role in maintaining social capital through membership in a gang and the gang's role in offering stable social supports for female gang members in neighborhoods plagued by chronic economic deprivation.

In 2000, OJJDP released a solicitation announcing the establishment of a Girls Study Group. The purpose of this study group will be to build a sound theoretical and empirical foundation to guide future

development, testing, and dissemination of strategies that effectively prevent and reduce girls' involvement in delinquency and violence and minimize the negative consequences of such involvement. Major tasks of the Girls Study Group will be to:

- ◆ Systematically review the research literature on juvenile female antisocial, delinquent, and violent behavior; child abuse and neglect; and criminal victimization.
- ◆ Develop a theoretical framework for the project based on gender-neutral and female-specific risk and protective factors.
- ◆ Explore what is known about the developmental pathways that lead females to engage in delinquent and criminal behavior.
- ◆ Conduct secondary analyses of data sets that may shed new light on female delinquency.
- ◆ Examine research literature on program evaluations to identify programs, program elements, and implementation principles of strategies and public policies that are particularly effective or promising in preventing or reducing female juvenile delinquency.

The Girls Study Group will collaborate with OJJDP's new National Girls Institute to develop programs, address evaluation issues, and disseminate the study group's findings to policymakers, practitioners, and researchers.

Research on American Indian and Alaska Native Juveniles

The Indian Country Law Enforcement Initiative is a joint effort by the U.S. Departments of Justice and the Interior to address the compelling need to improve the administration of criminal and juvenile justice in Indian Country. OJJDP's Tribal Youth Program (TYP) was established in FY 1999 as part of this initiative and provides funding for programming, training and technical assistance, and research. Based on ongoing consultation and coordination with practitioners and researchers in Indian Country, OJJDP's program of research on American Indian and Alaska Native (AI/AN) juveniles is conducted

according to the following basic principles: investigators should involve indigenous people in the design and implementation of research, a study's research findings should have clear and practical implications for the community in which it was conducted and for AI/AN communities in general, and methods of inquiry should be based on and sensitive to local customs and values. TYP research projects currently under way include:

- ◆ **Evaluation Facilitation of the Tribal Youth Program (Michigan Public Health Institute).** This participatory evaluation involves a subset of TYP program sites that volunteered to be involved in the research effort. The evaluation facilitator will provide training and technical assistance to program assessment teams at each site for a participatory evaluation that covers program processes and outcomes, analyze the juvenile and tribal justice system structures and operations at each evaluation site, and analyze the relationships between tribal governments and county, State, and Federal government agencies as they relate to juvenile justice responsibilities and operations. The evaluation's approach is designed to build local evaluation capacity, while keeping the capacity community driven and directed toward practical application and utility of findings.
- ◆ **Development and Demonstration of a Culturally Appropriate Approach to Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (directed by Sylvia Wilber, College of Menominee Nation, WI).** The goal of this project is to develop, demonstrate, and evaluate a culturally appropriate, integrated service approach to the prevention of juvenile delinquency among American Indian youth ages 11 to 18. This approach will be implemented by the Menominee Nation, and a guide will be developed for other tribal and urban Indian organizations or agencies to improve juvenile justice approaches with American Indian youth.
- ◆ **Research on Native American Delinquency and Juvenile Justice (directed by Lisa Bond-Maupin, Ph.D., New Mexico State University, Las Cruces).** This project combines quantitative and qualitative data collection approaches to provide information on delinquency and on the

legal processing of juveniles in a Southwestern tribe over an 11-year period. This study will examine the effect of opening a reservation casino on delinquency and processing of juveniles.

- ◆ **Action Research on Youth Gangs in Indian Country: Profiling the Problem and Seeking Solutions (California State University, Sacramento).** This project will use qualitative and quantitative methods to examine Indian youth gangs in a number of reservation and urban settings. The study will allow researchers to identify the broad-based factors shaping the origin, organization, and activities of American Indian youth gangs. The study will also identify and recommend programmatic efforts to address gangs and youth involved in gangs in Indian Country.

The following projects are currently in development:

- ◆ **Longitudinal Study of Tribal Youth Risk and Resiliency.** A 2-year planning period will precede implementation of an accelerated longitudinal study of tribal youth development and delinquency. The study will examine risk and protective factors within the cultural and historical context of American Indian youth and provide a unique database for examining the development of delinquency among American Indians. Findings will highlight the role of cultural and historical factors in increasing or reducing tribal youth's risk of delinquency.
- ◆ **Tribal Youth Field-Initiated Research and Evaluation Program.** As part of OJJDP's ongoing commitment to field-initiated research, funding will be available for research and evaluation projects that focus on one or more of the following areas: child abuse and neglect, substance abuse, and indigenous approaches to juvenile justice. Research findings will inform OJJDP's prevention and intervention efforts with tribal youth offenders, high-risk youth, and juvenile victims of crime.
- ◆ **Indian Country Supplement to the National Youth Gang Survey.** In response to a growing number of reports of gang activity on Indian lands, NYGC will develop and administer an

Indian Country supplement to its ongoing National Youth Gang Survey of law enforcement officials. The survey will assess the prevalence, composition, and activities of youth gangs in Indian territories not traditionally included in the national survey.

Understanding and Monitoring the “Whys” Behind Juvenile Crime Trends

The Nation’s two primary data sources on juvenile crime—the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) and the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program—present similar pictures of the trends in juvenile violent crime during the past two decades. Both sources indicate a fairly stable pattern through most of the 1980s and a sharp increase in juvenile violence in the later part of the 1980s, lasting until the early 1990s, when rates of juvenile violence began a steady decline.

This significant improvement in national rates of juvenile violence offers a welcome relief, especially in light of dire predictions of a wave of violence by young superpredators in the new millennium. However, the sudden and precipitous change in rates of juvenile violence raises questions, such as the following, that have not yet been answered with a strong degree of certitude:

- ◆ Why did rates fall?
- ◆ Did the fall in rates happen everywhere?
- ◆ Where did rates fail to fall and why?
- ◆ What actions, policies, programs, and other steps should be continued to sustain the decline in rates of juvenile violence or to reverse an increase in such rates?

Numerous reporters, commentators, politicians, and scholars have put forth explanations for the rise and fall in juvenile crime. Many of these theories have been offered and supported with varying degrees of empirical evidence and with varying degrees of attention to juvenile crime trends and local divergence from national trends. Explanations include population-based theories, epidemiological and etiological

theories (risk and protective factors), economic theories/policies, crime-focused public policies, social policies, and theories based on spiritual and cultural trends. To understand these theories fully, researchers and policymakers must sift through competing explanations for the rise and fall of juvenile crime rates and determine not only which merit further scrutiny in the exploration of juvenile crime and violence trends but where and how to pursue research hypotheses that emerge as promising based on this exercise.

To better understand factors correlated with the trend in juvenile crime and violence and explain future trends in delinquency and youth violence, OJJDP’s Research Division issued a solicitation in fall 2000 for research applications to undertake a definitive study of such recent trends. This 5-year research project will explore ways to determine the reasons for changes in local juvenile crime trends in the 1990s and monitor rates during this millennium. Federal, State, and local policymakers need a better sense of what went right in communities where declines occurred and what went wrong where increases occurred or where rates continued at high levels. Researchers, therefore, need to develop methods to understand and monitor the reasons for such changes. OJJDP expects the lessons learned from this inquiry to yield a number of tools that Federal, State, and local policymakers and planners can use to anticipate, monitor, and explain future trends and plan effective prevention and intervention strategies.

Mental Health and Juvenile Justice: Building a Model for Effective Service Delivery

Researchers estimate that between 9 and 13 percent of youth in the general population suffer from a diagnosable mental disorder at any given time.⁶ The prevalence of mental disorders among the

⁶ See Friedman, R.M., Katz-Leavy, J.W., Manderscheid, R.W., and Sandheimer, D.L. 1996. Prevalence of serious emotional disturbances in children and adolescents. In *Mental Health, United States*, edited by R.W. Manderscheid and M.A. Sonnenschein. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Mental Health Services, pp. 71–89.

approximately 1.8 million youth who enter the juvenile justice system each year is likely even higher. Yet, very little is known about the mental health needs of juvenile offenders. No large-scale national investigation of mental disorders in juvenile offenders has been conducted, and the lack of methodological consistency across smaller prevalence studies often produces inconsistent results. Since the mid-1990s, OJJDP has recognized the critical role that mental health problems play in the lives of youth involved in the juvenile justice system. As a result, OJJDP has been working for several years on a number of efforts to increase knowledge and improve services in this area. OJJDP, for example, has been active in the Federal Partnership for Children's Mental Health, organized by the Center for Mental Health Services of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

A recognized gap in the continuum of services for juvenile offenders is the lack of mental health programming, particularly for youth in detention and secure corrections. The lack of aftercare or reentry programming for these incarcerated juveniles is also of particular concern. Although the lack of services may be most acute for juveniles in detention, secure corrections, and aftercare, OJJDP believes that the best strategy for

closing these gaps is to develop a comprehensive model that addresses the mental health needs of youth at every point in the juvenile justice system.

To that end, OJJDP's Research Division in FY 2000 initiated an effort to build on existing research and knowledge in the area of mental health and juvenile justice. This multiyear research and development effort will:

- ◆ Review what is known about theory and best practices in this area.
- ◆ Examine the prevalence of mental health problems and co-occurring substance abuse disorders in a sample of youth in the juvenile justice system.
- ◆ Document the services available to meet the needs of this population.
- ◆ Develop a model that incorporates existing theory and best practices to provide comprehensive mental health services to youth in the juvenile justice system.

The model developed under this initiative will subsequently be used in a demonstration and evaluation project that replicates and evaluates the model at several sites.

Highlights

Evaluations of School-Related Projects

In recent years, OJJDP has partnered with the U.S. Department of Education (through the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Office) and other Federal agencies to launch several school-related demonstration programs that include national evaluations. Two important efforts being managed by OJJDP's Research Division are national evaluations of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative and the Truancy Reduction Demonstration Program.

- ◆ **Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative.** The Safe Schools/Healthy Students evaluation, being conducted by Research Triangle Institute (RTI) in Research Triangle Park, NC, will carefully document the initiative's activities and outcomes at 77 Safe Schools/Healthy Students sites. The evaluation encompasses the formation of community collaboratives, the impact of the collaborations on school safety and health, student development, economic analyses, surveillance of core indicators, and intensive outcome analyses.
- ◆ **Truancy Reduction Demonstration Program.** The Colorado Foundation for Families and Children is conducting the national evaluation of the Truancy Reduction Demonstration Program. The evaluation will examine the seven sites that received demonstration funding, document the implementation process and challenges the sites have faced, and gather specific information about the interventions and student and family outcomes. A primary goal of the evaluation is to identify key components of projects that have successfully reduced truancy and other risk factors for delinquency. Findings are expected in 2002.

- ◆ **Annual Report on School Safety.** OJJDP also works with the U.S. Department of Education's Safe and Drug-Free Schools Office to produce the Annual Report on School Safety, which provides an overview of the nature and extent of crime and violence on school property. The report describes measures taken by some schools to prevent and address school violence and provides communities with guidelines for reducing school violence in their jurisdictions. OJJDP's Web site (www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org) provides online access to the most recent version of the report.

Evaluations of Substance Abuse Programs

Drug-Free Communities Support Program

The Drug-Free Communities Support Program (DFCSP) is designed to strengthen community-based coalitions' efforts to reduce substance abuse by youth. The coalitions include community representatives from the following groups or areas: youth; parents; business; media; schools; youth service organizations; law enforcement; civic groups; volunteer organizations; fraternal groups; healthcare professionals; State, local, or tribal government agencies with expertise in the field of substance abuse; and other organizations involved in reducing substance abuse. The program enables coalitions to enhance collaboration and coordination in an effort to target the use of illegal drugs and the underage use of alcohol and tobacco. Coalitions also encourage citizen participation in efforts to reduce substance abuse and disseminate information about effective programs.

In 1999, Caliber Associates, Inc., received an award to evaluate DFCS. The evaluation has two components—a process evaluation and an outcome evaluation of community-based, collaborative substance abuse prevention projects whose initiatives (1) target the use of illegal drugs, alcohol, and/or tobacco by juveniles and (2) implement comprehensive long-term plans to reduce substance abuse and study its relationship to youth violence. The process evaluation is examining the implementation of programs in more than 100 sites. Twelve of these sites will be studied in depth to measure the outcome of program activities.

Early findings of the evaluation indicate that DFCS coalitions serve urban, suburban, rural, and tribal areas. Coalitions are concentrated in urban and suburban areas (40 percent) and in areas that encompass urban, suburban, and rural communities (34 percent). A large proportion of coalitions target an entire community (42 percent), approximately one-fourth target youth, and almost one-third target a specific age group (elementary, middle, or high school). The strategies and activities that coalitions plan to implement reflect the range of services and activities frequently used in the prevention and treatment of substance abuse. Forty-six percent of coalitions engage in data-driven planning and decisionmaking with other agencies, 37 percent continue to mobilize and form partnerships, 55 percent provide training and education services, and 56 percent plan to improve their information-sharing techniques. Evaluators continue to track the implementation of these programs, and final results are expected in 2003.

Enforcing the Underage Drinking Laws Program

OJJDP is helping States address the problem of underage drinking through a \$25 million per year program of block grants, discretionary programs, and training and technical assistance. OJJDP's Enforcing the Underage Drinking Laws (EUDL) program (formerly the Combating Underage Drinking program) is helping all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico to develop comprehensive and coordinated initiatives to enforce State laws that prohibit the sale of alcoholic beverages to minors (defined as individuals under 21 years of

age) and to prevent the purchase or consumption of alcoholic beverages by minors. States are using funds from this program to support activities in one or more of the three areas outlined in the legislation: enforcement, public education activities, and innovative programs. In addition to providing block grant funds, OJJDP awards States and other jurisdictions discretionary funds to foster State and local collaboration in developing comprehensive approaches to the problem of underage drinking, with an emphasis on increasing law enforcement activity. Wake Forest University School of Medicine in Winston-Salem, NC, received a grant from OJJDP to evaluate States' and local communities' use of their block grants and discretionary funds and the program's impact during its first 2 years in a sample of communities.

The evaluation design includes four major data collection components:

- ◆ A telephone survey of key actors in the program from all 50 States.
- ◆ In-depth case studies of program implementation in six States.
- ◆ Telephone surveys of a sample of youth ages 16 to 20 in the six States.
- ◆ A telephone survey of police departments and sheriff's offices in a sample of States that have received grants.

Early findings of these surveys and case studies indicate that the EUDL program is bringing together groups that have not previously worked together—particularly law enforcement agencies and substance abuse treatment agencies. Some States appear to be facing difficulties in program implementation—especially among agencies that have limited experience working together (such as alcohol beverage control agencies, which are reportedly involved in the program in 66 percent of States). The survey also indicates that citizens' groups—such as Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD)—are highly involved in the program in only 28 States.

Data from the evaluation's youth survey underscore the magnitude of the underage drinking problem. Data show that underage drinking is pervasive, with

about half (46 percent) of the sample of youth ages 16 to 20 reporting current alcohol use (within the past 30 days), 27 percent reporting alcohol use during the past 7 days, and 21 percent reporting binge drinking (defined as having five or more drinks in a row on at least one occasion during a 2-week period). Moreover, a substantial percentage of youth surveyed reported engaging in a number of risky behaviors associated with alcohol use, including driving while under the influence of alcohol and riding with a driver who has been drinking. Negative consequences of drinking reported by current drinkers in the sample included experiencing headaches and hangovers, being unable to remember what had happened after a drinking incident, passing out, getting into fights, having sex without birth control, breaking or damaging property, missing school, and being the victim of a forced sex attempt.

These and other early findings provide a good baseline for continued evaluation of the EUDL program. Final evaluation results are expected in 2002.

Child Victimization

Although the focus of OJJDP's work has traditionally been on juvenile offenders, its program and research activities also target child victimization. In 2000, OJJDP established the Child Protection Division to consolidate OJJDP's demonstration, replication, and technical assistance and training projects focusing on child victimization. In furtherance of these efforts, the Research Division manages several important research and evaluation projects that relate to child victimization. Descriptions of several of these programs follow.

Safe Start Demonstration Project

The purpose of the Safe Start Demonstration Project is to prevent and reduce the impact of family and community violence on young children (primarily from birth to age 6). The project promotes the creation of comprehensive service delivery systems by helping communities expand existing partnerships among service providers in the fields of early childhood education/development, health, mental health, family strengthening and support, domestic violence prevention, substance abuse prevention and

treatment, crisis intervention, child welfare, law enforcement, courts, and legal services. These comprehensive service delivery systems are designed to improve access to and quality of services for young children at high risk of exposure to violence, young children who have already been exposed to violence, and both groups' families and caregivers. The following nine sites have received Safe Start awards and are now in the planning phase of the project: Baltimore, MD; Bridgeport, CT; Chatham County, NC; Chicago, IL; Pinellas County, FL; Rochester, NY; San Francisco, CA; Spokane, WA; and Washington County, ME.

The Safe Start evaluation will document and assess these communities' efforts to prevent and reduce the impact of family and community violence on young children. The overall evaluation design is intended to allow researchers to carefully document the formative aspects of the project and measure the project's effectiveness in terms of level of implementation of the strategic planning process, extent of systems reform and service integration, and impact of the initiative on the lives of children and families. At the national level, evaluation activities will be carried out by the National Evaluation Team, which includes staff from four organizations: Caliber Associates, Inc.; the Association for the Study and Development of Community; Roper Starch Worldwide, Inc.; and Research Triangle Institute. The staff will provide ongoing training and technical assistance to local site evaluators in designing and implementing plans to assess the impact of specific local programs and strategies.

Second Comprehensive Study of Missing Children

The first National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children (NISMART 1) was conducted in 1988 and published in 1990. This study was conducted pursuant to the Missing Children's Assistance Act, which requires periodic studies of the scope of the problem of missing children in the United States. NISMART 1 provided the first comprehensive data available on the incidence of missing children. Although NISMART 1 was an important study, the data are already more than a decade old.

NISMART 2, currently under way, is the second national study to measure the incidence of each category of missing children. Researchers surveyed 16,000 households to determine how many children are missing on an annual basis. NISMART 2 also included a survey of approximately 8,000 youth to determine what happens during missing child episodes. In addition, the survey included interviews of law enforcement officers to secure information about child abductions, interviews of directors of youth residential programs to determine how many residents run away from such settings, and an analysis of data on throwaway children (youth who have been abandoned or forced from their homes). Results of NISMART 2 (expected in 2001) will help parents and other members of the public better understand the dimensions of the missing children problem and the factors that place children at greatest risk of becoming missing. Practitioners and policymakers can use the new information to design programs and policies to ensure the safety of the Nation's youth. The study is being conducted for OJJDP by the Institute for Survey Research at Temple University in Philadelphia, PA; the Family Research Laboratory at the University of New Hampshire, Durham; and Westat, Inc., of Rockville, MD.

Crimes against Children Research Center

Supported by OJJDP's Research Division, the Crimes against Children Research Center (CCRC) works to combat crimes against children by conducting high-quality research and providing statistics to members of the public, policymakers, law enforcement personnel, and child welfare practitioners. CCRC focuses its research on both the nature and impact of crimes such as child abduction, homicide, rape, assault, and physical and sexual abuse. CCRC, which is located at the University of New Hampshire in Durham, produces a variety of informative publications on child victimization issues for the field.

Pathways to Desistance: A Prospective Study of Serious Adolescent Offenders

During the past few decades, researchers of adolescent crime and disorders have shown increasing

interest in and appreciation for placing a particular period of development (e.g., adolescence) within the context of an individual's entire life course. This is often referred to as a "life course approach" to investigations. This emphasis has resulted in several large longitudinal studies that have significantly improved researchers' understanding of the development of antisocial behavior in adolescents. Juvenile justice and child welfare professionals can use information provided by such studies to make better informed decisions regarding policy and practice. For example, the identification of risk factors that precede the onset of specific problem behaviors provides valuable information about where communities should concentrate programming resources for children of different ages. Existing longitudinal research, however, has not been particularly useful in providing clear guidance for dealing with adolescents who are already deeply involved in the juvenile justice system. Evidence is sketchy on the relative influences of interventions, sanctions, and developmental events on outcomes for serious adolescent offenders. Although a significant percentage of adolescent offenders decrease or stop antisocial activity in late adolescence, it is unclear exactly how such desistance occurs or what factors influence the process.

Through a partnership with the National Institute of Justice, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and the William T. Grant Foundation, OJJDP is sponsoring a study that will intensively follow a sample of 1,200 serious adolescent offenders in Philadelphia, PA, and Phoenix, AZ, as they navigate late adolescence. The study, *Pathways to Desistance: A Prospective Study of Serious Adolescent Offenders*, will bring together a number of respected researchers (see page 35 for a listing) and demonstrate the cooperative efforts of several Federal agencies and private foundations.

The goals of the *Pathways to Desistance* study are to describe patterns of desistance from delinquent and criminal behavior, identify key developmental events related to desistance, and compare the effects of different interventions and sanctions on desistance. Specifically, the study seeks to:

- ◆ Determine whether there are distinct pathways out of involvement with juvenile crime and, if so, identify such pathways.
- ◆ Identify the characteristics of adolescents who progress along each of these pathways.
- ◆ Identify the types of life events or influences that appear to promote desistance from criminal activity among adolescents.
- ◆ Determine the type and magnitude of the effect that researchers can expect from the intervention strategies most commonly used with serious adolescent offenders.

Findings from the study will provide policymakers with evidence regarding the utility of different processing and sanctioning options, a topic widely discussed at the State and national level. Findings will also be valuable to practitioners who need direction regarding what factors to consider during risk assessments and what indicators to monitor or assess on an ongoing basis when working with serious adolescent offenders.

Working With States and Communities To Improve Evaluation and Information Collection Efforts

OJJDP has several projects that focus on helping communities evaluate their efforts to prevent and reduce juvenile delinquency and risky behavior. These projects include the Juvenile Justice Evaluation

Pathways to Desistance: Prospective Study of Serious Adolescent Offenders

Principal investigators for this project are Edward P. Mulvey, Ph.D., and Elizabeth Cauffman, Ph.D., from the University of Pittsburgh's Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, Department of Law and Psychiatry. Other researchers on the project are Larry Steinberg, Ph.D., of Temple University and Jeffrey Fagan, Ph.D., of Columbia University.

Center (JJEC) and the Juvenile Justice Statistics and Systems Development Project.

Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center

The goal of JJEC is to provide training, technical assistance, and other resources to States to enhance their ability to evaluate juvenile justice programs. The first phase of the project focused on assessing existing evaluation practices and technical assistance needs in 56 "States" (i.e., jurisdictions eligible to receive OJJDP formula and block grants), especially as they relate to programs and initiatives funded through OJJDP's State Formula Grants Program. The assessment included a survey of three groups of State juvenile justice stakeholders: juvenile justice specialists, Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) directors, and State Advisory Group (SAG) chairs. Results of the assessment show that training and technical assistance should:

- ◆ Increase knowledge at the State and local level of evaluation principles and techniques.
- ◆ Help States develop and improve infrastructures for supporting systematic evaluation.
- ◆ Foster relationships between State agencies, local programs, and evaluators.

The following ongoing activities of JJEC are designed to address the needs identified in the assessment:

- ◆ Conducting four regional evaluation training conferences with the Coalition for Juvenile Justice. The training conferences feature a combination of skill-building workshops and sessions highlighting successful local and national juvenile justice evaluation efforts.
- ◆ Providing onsite technical assistance to States that are designing evaluation systems, developing statewide performance measures for juvenile justice projects, or conducting large-scale evaluation studies.
- ◆ Supporting the Justice Research and Statistics Association's Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center Online.
- ◆ Providing seed money to encourage partnerships between SACs and SAGs. The goal of such

The Justice Research and Statistics Association's Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center Online

The Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center Online, supported by OJJDP, is designed to provide evaluation resources and information specific to juvenile justice programs and initiatives. The Web site (www.jrsa.org/jjec) provides guidance to States and localities conducting their own evaluations and includes an evaluation manual that details how local programs can collect and use evaluation material. The site also includes a series of nontechnical briefing papers related to the evaluation of juvenile justice programs and provides contact information for States interested in benefiting from onsite help in designing evaluation systems, developing statewide performance measures for juvenile justice projects, or conducting large-scale evaluation studies.

partnerships is to build sustainable relationships that will enhance juvenile justice evaluation capacity over the long term.

Juvenile Justice Statistics and Systems Development Project

To meet the challenge of managing cases involving youth effectively and efficiently, juvenile court administrators and judges need ready access to information that will support the operation, management, and decisionmaking of the full-service juvenile court system. Broad knowledge and effective decisionmaking, which should be hallmarks of every juvenile justice system, require not only the collection of data but the collaboration of community leaders who will give meaning to the data. This need for collaboration is the focus of the book *Juvenile Justice With Eyes Open*, produced by the Juvenile Justice Statistics and Systems Development (SSD) project and published by NCJJ in 2000. Using concepts from this book, the SSD project developed and field-tested an approach that local jurisdictions can use to systematically identify and, in turn, fulfill their information needs. This approach includes:

- ◆ Conducting trainings and seminars for local juvenile justice leaders on use of the rational decisionmaking model as a design tool for management information systems.

- ◆ Developing data specifications necessary for an effective information system to meet a jurisdiction's operational, management, and research needs.
- ◆ Identifying the data needs of collateral service providers.
- ◆ Modeling agreements and protocols with collateral service providers to allow for the sharing of case-level and/or aggregate data.

The SSD project has also identified several jurisdictions across the country that are effectively using juvenile justice information to make key juvenile justice decisions, such as determining the sentences of juvenile offenders. Case studies of these jurisdictions will be published in 2001.

OJJDP Projects That Help States and Communities Enhance Evaluation Capacity

- ◆ Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (Justice Research and Statistics Association).
- ◆ Juvenile Justice Statistics and Systems Development Project (National Center for Juvenile Justice, Pittsburgh, PA).

Conclusion

Research is the foundation for identifying and developing programs to prevent and reduce juvenile crime and delinquency. The best way to identify strategies that work is by learning about the factors that place youth at risk for delinquency, recognizing youth's patterns of offending, and identifying strategies that are effective in responding to youth's needs and behaviors. Therefore, investing in research is one of the most important ways that OJJDP can respond to the needs of children at risk of delinquency and their families and communities. OJJDP is accordingly committed to sponsoring a program of research, evaluation, and statistics that seeks to determine what the roots of delinquency are, what policies and programs can help protect youth and families from risk factors, and how communities can support these efforts.

The ultimate goal of OJJDP's Research Division is to prevent at-risk youth from pursuing a delinquent career and to help youth already in the juvenile justice system turn away from future delinquency and criminal behavior and become productive citizens. One of the most important concepts demonstrated

by this Report is the need to use what researchers have learned to craft solutions and interventions that address the problems of juvenile crime and violence. OJJDP will continue its strong tradition of using knowledge gained through research to inform program initiatives. Together, OJJDP divisions and program units provide a continuum of activity that fully supports the efforts of researchers, policymakers, courts, schools, juvenile justice facilities, practitioners, parents, and juveniles.

Despite the knowledge OJJDP has gained through the efforts of its Research Division, much remains to be done. Over the years, OJJDP has developed strong partnerships with the many highly skilled researchers in the field of juvenile justice and risk behavior. These partnerships will continue, and many new partnerships will be formed as OJJDP continues to support an array of research studies, evaluations, and statistical activities. With the help of researchers in the field, OJJDP will use what it has learned to develop programs and solutions that will make a difference to juveniles, their families, and their communities.

Appendix A: Active Projects, September 1999 to Present

Grants

Action Research on Youth Gangs in Indian Country: Profiling the Problem and Seeking Solutions

California State University Sacramento
Center for Delinquency and Crime Policy Studies
7750 College Town Drive, Suite 104
Sacramento, CA 95826
OJJDP Grant 00–TY–FX–0033

Age, Crime, and Sanction: The Effect of Juvenile Versus Criminal Court Jurisdiction on Age-Specific Crime Rates of Adolescent Offenders

Columbia University
The Joseph L. Mailman School of Public Health
Health Sciences Division
600 West 168th Street
New York, NY 10032
OJJDP Grant 99–JR–VX–0002

Analysis of Social Contextual Mediators of Adolescent Violence

Vera Institute of Justice
233 Broadway, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10274
OJJDP Grant 99–JN–FX–0004

Assessing ADM Disorders Among Juvenile Detainees

Northwestern University
633 Clark Street
Evanston, IL 60208
OJJDP Grants 98–JD–FX–0002, 99–JE–FX–1001

Assessment of Psychiatric Risk in Incarcerated Youth

Research Foundation for Mental Hygiene, Inc.
1051 Riverside Drive
New York, NY 10032
OJJDP Grant 98–JB–VX–0115

Chicago Project for Violence Prevention

University of Illinois at Chicago
School of Public Health
Office of Research Services
Chicago, IL 60612
OJJDP Grant 96–MU–FX–0013

Community Policing and Youth Study

COSMOS Corporation
3 Bethesda Metro Center, Suite 950
Bethesda, MD 20814
OJJDP Grant 2001–JN–FX–K002

A Comparative Evaluation of Three Programs for Adolescent Female Offenders

Regents of the University of Michigan
Division of Research Development and Administration
3003 South State Street, Room 1060
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1274
OJJDP Grant 00-JR-VX-0008

Comparative Impact of Juvenile Versus Criminal Court Sanctions on Recidivism Among Adolescent Felony Offenders: A Replication and Extension

Columbia University
The Joseph L. Mailman School of Public Health
Health Sciences Division
600 West 168th Street
New York, NY 10032
OJJDP Grant 97-JN-FX-0001

Consortium on Children, Families, and the Law

Clemson University
Institute on Family and Neighborhood Life
158 Poole Agricultural Center
Clemson, SC 29634-0132
OJJDP Grant 99-JF-FX-1001

Cost-Benefit Analysis of Juvenile Justice Programs

University of Texas at Dallas
P.O. Box 830688
Richardson, TX 75083
OJJDP Grant 98-JN-FX-0001

Crimes against Children Research Center

University of New Hampshire
Office of Sponsored Research
4 Garrison Avenue
Durham, NH 03824-3585
OJJDP Grants 98-JN-FX-0012,
00-JW-VX-0005, 99-JP-FX-1001

Criminal Justice Response to Parental Abduction Cases

American Bar Association Fund for Justice and Education
ABA Center on Children and the Law
740 15th Street NW.
Washington, DC 20005
OJJDP Grant 93-MC-CX-0010

Delinquency Prevention Through Media Literacy: Evaluation of the Flashpoint Program

Education Development Center, Inc.
Health and Human Development Programs
55 Chapel Street
Newton, Massachusetts 02158-1060
OJJDP Grant 00-JN-FX-0004

Development and Demonstration of a Culturally Appropriate Approach to Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

College of Menominee Nation
P.O. Box 1179
Keshena, WI 54135
OJJDP Grant 00-TY-FX-0034

Development and Evaluation of a Cognitive-Behavior Group Intervention for Adolescents in a Youth Correctional Facility: The Coping of Life

Oregon Research Institute
1715 Franklin Boulevard
Eugene, OR 97403
OJJDP Grant 00-JN-FX-0003

Early Onset Offending: Development and Consequences

University of Washington
Social Development Research Group
9725 Third Avenue NE., Suite 401
Seattle, WA 98115
OJJDP Grant 99-JN-FX-0001

Empathy and Juvenile Sex Offenses

University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center
Center on Child Abuse and Neglect
940 NE 13th Street
CHO-3B-3406
Oklahoma City, OK 73104
OJJDP Grant 99-JN-FX-0002

Enhancing Personnel Training and Understanding Minority Overrepresentation in the Juvenile Justice System

Prairie View A&M University
Texas Juvenile Crime Prevention Center
P.O. Box 4017
Prairie View, TX 77446
OJJDP Grant 98-JN-FX-0014

Evaluation of the Combating Underage Drinking Program

Wake Forest University
School of Medicine
Winston-Salem, NC 25157
OJJDP Grant 98-AH-F8-0101

Evaluation of the Comprehensive Community-Wide Approach to Gang Prevention, Intervention, and Suppression Program

University of Chicago
School of Social Services
5801 South Ellis
Chicago, IL 60637
OJJDP Grants 95-JD-CX-K002,
96-JD-FX-K001, 97-MU-FX-K014

Evaluation of the Creation and Implementation of a Family Index

Superior Court of California County of Riverside
4075 Main Street, Suite 310
Riverside, CA 92501
OJJDP Grant 00-JR-VX-0002

Evaluation of the Drug-Free Communities Support Program

Caliber Associates, Inc.
10530 Rosehaven Street, Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
OJJDP Grant 98-JN-FX-0016

Evaluation Facilitation of the Tribal Youth Program

Michigan Public Health Institute
Data System, Evaluation and Training
2464 Woodlake Circle, Suite 300
Okemos, MI 48864
OJJDP Grant 00-TY-FX-K001

Evaluation of the GIRLS Project

University of Georgia
Department of Counseling and Human Development
University of Georgia Research Foundation, Inc.
621 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center
Athens, GA 30602-4103
OJJDP Grant 00-JR-VX-0005

Evaluation of Intensive Community-Based Aftercare Demonstration and Technical Assistance Program

National Council on Crime and Delinquency
1970 Broadway, Suite 500
Oakland, CA 94612
OJJDP Grants 95-JN-CX-007, 95-JN-FX-0023

Evaluation of the Juvenile Mentoring Program (JUMP)

Information Technology International
6701 Democracy Boulevard, Suite 700
Bethesda, MD 20817-1572
OJJDP Grants 97-JN-FX-003, 98-JG-FX-0002

Evaluation of OJJDP's Rural Youth Gang Initiative

National Council on Crime and Delinquency
1970 Broadway, Suite 500
Oakland, CA 94612
OJJDP Grant 99-JD-FX-K001

Evaluation of Parents Anonymous®

National Council on Crime and Delinquency
1970 Broadway, Suite 500
Oakland, CA 94612
OJJDP Grant 00-JP-FX-K003

Evaluation of Partnerships To Reduce Juvenile Gun Violence Program

COSMOS Corporation
3 Bethesda Metro Center, Suite 950
Bethesda, MD 20814
OJJDP Grant 97-MU-FX-0004

Evaluation Planning Proposal for the Free To Grow National Demonstration Program

Columbia University
The Joseph L. Mailman School of Public Health
600 West 168th Street
New York, NY 10032
OJJDP Grant 99-JN-FX-0020

Evaluation of the Safe Start Initiative

Caliber Associates, Inc.
10530 Rosehaven Street, Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
OJJDP Grant 99-JW-VX-K001

Evaluation of Teen Courts

The Urban Institute
2100 M Street NW.
Washington, DC 20037
OJJDP Grant 98-JN-FX-0003

Evaluation of the U.S. Department of Labor's Education and Training of Youthful Offenders Initiative

National Council on Crime and Delinquency
1970 Broadway, Suite 500
Oakland, CA 94612
OJJDP Grant 99-JN-FX-K007

Evaluation of the Youth-Led Substance Abuse Prevention Program

University of New Hampshire
School of Health and Human Services
Hewitt Hall
4 Library Way
Durham, NH 03824-3563
OJJDP Grant 97-JN-FX-0019

Field-Initiated Research Program: Juvenile Suicide in Confinement—A National Survey

National Center on Institutions and Alternatives
40 Lantern Lane
Mansfield, MA 02048
OJJDP Grant 99-JN-FX-0005

Finding and Knowing the Gang Naye'e in the Navajo Nation

Navajo Nation Judicial Branch
P.O. Box 520
Window Rock, AZ 86515
OJJDP Grant 95-JD-FX-0013

Frameworks for Designing and Evaluating Community-Level Programs for Youth

National Academy of Sciences
National Research Council
Board on Children, Youth, and Families
2101 Constitution Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20418
OJJDP Grant 99-JN-FX-0011

Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence

The George Washington University
Office of Sponsored Research
2121 I Street NW.
Washington, DC 20052
OJJDP Grant 97–MU–FX–K012

The Impacts of Childhood Abuse on Juvenile Violence and Domestic Violence: Measuring and Detecting the Intervening Influences of Race and Poverty

University of Minnesota
Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs
Humphrey Center
301 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
OJJDP Grant 99–JN–FX–0007

Integrated Juvenile Justice Standards

National Center for State Courts
300 Newport Avenue
Williamsburg, VA 23185
OJJDP Grant 2001–MU–MU–0003

Integration of Pregnancy and Early Childhood Home Visitation Into Operation Weed and Seed

University of Colorado Health Sciences Center
Department of Pediatrics
1825 Marion Street
Denver, CO 80218
OJJDP Grants 98–MU–MU–0006,
98–JN–FX–0005

Interagency Coordination and Information Sharing Early Intervention Model

Mayor's Anti-Gang Office
City of Houston
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, TX 77251
OJJDP Grant 98–JN–FX–0010

Issues in Resolving Cases of International Child Abduction

American Bar Association Fund for
Justice and Education
ABA Center on Children and the Law
740 15th Street NW.
Washington, DC 20005
OJJDP Grant 93–MC–CX–0007

Juvenile Crime, Prevention, Treatment, and Control

National Academy of Sciences
National Research Council
2101 Constitution Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20418
OJJDP Grant 97–JN–FX–0020

Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center

Justice Research and Statistics Association, Inc.
777 North Capitol Street NE., Suite 801
Washington, DC 20002
OJJDP Grant 98–JN–FX–0112

Juvenile Justice Statistics and Systems Development Project

National Center for Juvenile Justice
National Council of Juvenile and Family
Court Judges
P.O. Box 8970
Reno, NV 89507
OJJDP Grant 95–JN–FX–K008

Juvenile Sex Offender Typology

University of Virginia
Department of Health Evaluation Sciences
P.O. Box 9003
Charlottesville, VA 22903
OJJDP Grant 00–JF–FX–1001

Juvenile Transfers to Criminal Court Studies

Florida Department of Juvenile Justice
Juvenile Justice Accountability Board
2737 Centerview Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32399-3100
OJJDP Grants 95-JN-FX-0030,
99-JF-FX-0100

A Longitudinal Multidisciplinary Study of Developmental Patterns (Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency)

University of Colorado at Boulder
Institute of Behavioral Science
Campus Box 572
Boulder, CO 80309-0572
OJJDP Grant 96-MU-FX-0017

Missouri Juvenile Courts—A Technological Reformation

Missouri Office of State Courts Administrator
P.O. Box 104480
Jefferson City, MO 65110
OJJDP Grant 00-JN-VX-0087

National Evaluation of SafeFutures Program: Phase I Study of Program Development and Implementation

The Urban Institute
2100 M Street NW.
Washington, DC 20037
OJJDP Grant 95-JN-FX-K012

National Evaluation of the Safe Kids/Safe Streets Program

Westat, Inc.
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850-3129
OJJDP Grant 97-MU-MU-0005

National Evaluation of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative

Research Triangle Institute
P.O. Box 12194
3040 Cornwallis Road
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709
OJJDP Grant 99-SI-FX-K001

National Juvenile Court Data Archive

National Center for Juvenile Justice
710 Fifth Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-4783
OJJDP Grant 99-MU-MU-0020

National Juvenile Justice Data Analysis Project

National Center for Juvenile Justice
710 Fifth Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-4783
OJJDP Grant 99-JN-FX-K002

National Youth Gang Center

Institute for Intergovernmental Research
P.O. Box 12729
Tallahassee, FL 32317
OJJDP Grant 95-JD-MU-K001

A Panel Study of a Reciprocal Causal Model of Delinquency (Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency)

University at Albany, State University of New York
Hindelang Criminal Justice Research Center
135 Western Avenue, DR-241
Albany, NY 12222
OJJDP Grant 96-MU-FX-0014

Pathways to Desistance: A Prospective Study of Serious Adolescent Offenders

University of Pittsburgh
Office of Research
350 Thackeray Hall
139 University Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
OJJDP Grant 00–MU–MU–0007

Performance-based Standards for Juvenile Detention and Corrections

Stonehill College
Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators
16 Belmont Street
South Easton, MA 02375
OJJDP Grants 95–JN–FX–K011,
98–JB–VX–K003

Planning for the Survey of Youth in Residential Placement

Westat, Inc.
1650 Research Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20850–3129
OJJDP Grant 98–JB–VX–K002

Prevention of Parent or Family Abduction of Children Through Early Identification of Risk Factors

American Bar Association Fund for Justice and Education
ABA Center on Children and the Law
740 15th Street NW.
Washington, DC 20005
OJJDP Grant 92–MC–CX–0007

Progressions in Antisocial and Delinquent Child Behavior (Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency)

University of Pittsburgh Medical Center
Western Psychiatric Institute
3811 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213–2593
OJJDP Grant 96–MU–FX–0012

Project To Design and Test Clinical Intervention for Substance Abusing Juvenile Offenders in Detention

Vera Institute of Justice
233 Broadway, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10279
OJJDP Grant 99–JR–VX–0004

Project To Study the Outcome of Juvenile Transfer to Criminal Court

National Center for Juvenile Justice
National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges
P.O. Box 8970
Reno, NV 89507
OJJDP Grant 95–JN–FX–0029

Proposal To Evaluate Community Assessment Centers

National Council on Crime and Delinquency
1970 Broadway, Suite 500
Oakland, CA 94612
OJJDP Grants 95–JN–FX–0002, 98–JB–VX–0113

Proposed Scientific Panel To Report to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Serious Violent Juvenile Offender Study)

University of Pittsburgh
Office of Research
350 Thackeray Hall
139 University Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
OJJDP Grant 95–JD–FX–0018

Race, Overconfinement, and Crowding in Juvenile Correctional Facilities

Regents of the University of Michigan
Institute for Social Research
3003 South State Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48106–1274
OJJDP Grant 96–JN–FX–0011

**Re-engaging Youth in School:
Evaluation of the Truancy Reduction
Demonstration Project**

Colorado Foundation for Families and Children
1580 Logan Street, Suite 315
Denver, CO 80203
OJJDP Grant 99-MU-MU-0014

**Research on Native American
Delinquency and Juvenile Justice**

The Regents of New Mexico State University
Arts and Science Research Center
MSC RC, Box 30001
Las Cruces, NM 88003-8001
OJJDP Grant 00-TY-FX-0035

**Risk-Focused Policing at Places:
An Experimental Evaluation of the
Communities That Care Program in
Redlands, California**

Police Foundation
1201 Connecticut Avenue NW., Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036
OJJDP Grant 00-JR-VX-0004

**Screening and Assessment:
Instrument and Model**

Policy Research Associates, Inc.
345 Delaware Avenue
Delmar, NY 12054
OJJDP Grant 99-JR-VX-0006

**Second National Incidence Studies of
Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and
Throwaway Children (NISMA 2)**

Temple University
Institute for Survey Research
1601 North Broad Street
Philadelphia, PA 19122
OJJDP Grant 95-MC-CX-K004

**Secondary Analysis of Childhood
Victimization Data**

University at Albany, State University of New York
Hindelang Criminal Justice Research Center
135 Western Avenue, DR-241
Albany, NY 12222
OJJDP Grant 97-JN-FX-0015

**Self-Reported Outcomes in a
Randomized Trial of a Community-Based
Multi-Agency Program for Mid- to
High-Risk Youth**

University of Southern California
Social Science Research Institute
University Park
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0375
OJJDP Grant 00-JR-VX-0001

Sex Offender Typology

Health Related Research
825 Crawford Parkway
Portsmouth, VA 23704
OJJDP Grant 98-JN-FX-0008

**Sex Offender Typology: Feasibility Study
of Data Collection**

University of Illinois
Center for Legal Studies
P.O. Box 19243
Springfield, IL 62794-9243
OJJDP Grant 98-JN-FX-0006

**Survey of School-Based Gang Prevention
and Intervention Programs**

Gottfredson Associates, Inc.
3239 B Corporate Court
Ellicott City, MD 21042
OJJDP Grant 98-JN-FX-0004

Tools and Strategies for Protecting Kids on the Internet

National Academy of Sciences
National Research Council
Computer Science and Telecommunications Board
2101 Constitution Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20418
OJJDP Grant 99–JN–FX–0071

Updating the Juvenile Justice Monograph

Policy Research Associates, Inc.
345 Delaware Avenue
Delmar, NY 12054
OJJDP Grant 99–JN–FX–0018

The Utility of Mental Health Assessments in Incarcerated Youth

Research Foundation for Mental Hygiene, Inc.
1051 Riverside Drive
New York, NY 10032
OJJDP Grant 99–JR–VX–0005

Victimization In and Around Schools: Explanations To Inform a Strategic Response

The Urban Institute
2100 M Street NW.
Washington, DC 20037
OJJDP Grant 00–JR–VX–0003

Violence Prevention: Replication, Evaluation, and Dissemination of Information

The Regents of the University of Colorado
Institute of Behavioral Science
Campus Box 19
Boulder, CO 80303–0019
OJJDP Grant 99–JN–FX–K006

Women and Gangs: A Field Research Study

Illinois State University
University Research Office
Box 3040
Normal, IL 61790
OJJDP Grant 00–JR–VX–0006

Youth-Focused Community Policing

Chicago Police Department
City of Chicago
1121 South State
Chicago, IL 60605
OJJDP Grant 98–JN–FX–0106

Youth-Focused Community Policing

Commission for Children, Youth, and Their Families
City of Los Angeles
333 South Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90013
OJJDP Grant 98–JN–FX–0009

Youth-Focused Community Policing

Fox Valley Technical College
1825 North Bluemound Drive
P.O. Box 2277
Appleton, WI 54913–2277
OJJDP Grant 96–JN–FX–K001

Youth-Focused Community Policing

Kansas City Police Department
Unified Government of Wyandotte County
701 North Seventh Street, Room G–2
Kansas City, KS 66101–3065
OJJDP Grant 98–JN–FX–0013

Youth-Focused Community Policing

Office of the City Manager
City of Oakland
One City Hall Plaza, 3rd Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
OJJDP Grant 98–JN–FX–0011

Youth-Focused Community Policing

Office of the Mayor
City of Mound Bayou
106 South Green Avenue
Mound Bayou, MS 38762
OJJDP Grant 98–JN–FX–0089

Youth-Focused Community Policing

Rio Grande Valley Empowerment Zone
301 South Texas
Mercedes, TX 78570
OJJDP Grant 98–JN–FX–0056

Youth Gangs in Juvenile Detention and Corrections Facilities

National Juvenile Detention Association
301 Perkins Building
Richmond, KY 40475–3127
OJJDP Grant 96–JD–FX–0004

Youth Groups and Gangs in Europe

University of Nebraska at Omaha
College of Public Affairs and Community Service
Department of Criminal Justice
6001 Dodge Street
Omaha, NE 68182
OJJDP Grant 99–JD–FX–0006

Interagency and Intra-Agency Agreements

Center for Students With Disabilities in the Juvenile Justice System

U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue SW., Room 3531
MES Building
Washington, DC 20202
OJJDP IAA 00–JN–R–012

Children's Mental Health: Developing an Action Agenda

National Institutes of Health
9000 Rockville Pike
Building 31, Room B1B04
Bethesda, MD 20892
OJJDP IAA 00–JN–R–085

Data Collection Programs for OJJDP (Includes Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement, Juvenile Residential Facility Census, National Juvenile Justice Program Directory, and Survey of Juvenile Probation)

U.S. Department of Commerce
Bureau of the Census
Government Division
Washington Plaza, Building 2
Washington, DC 20233
OJJDP IAA 98–JN–R–034, 00–JX–R–022

Development of Conduct Disorder in Girls

National Institute of Mental Health
6001 Executive Boulevard, Room 6200
Bethesda, MD 20892–9663
OJJDP IAA 99–JE–R–051

Diffusion of State Risk/Protective-Focused Prevention

National Institute on Drug Abuse
6001 Executive Boulevard
Room 5153, MSC 9589
Bethesda, MD 20892–9589
OJJDP IAA 97–JN–R–072, 97–JN–R–079

Evaluation of Blended Sentencing in Minnesota and Creation and Implementation of Family Index in Riverside County, CA

State Justice Institute
1650 King Street, Suite 600
Alexandria, VA 22314
OJJDP IAA 99–JR–R–096

**Expedited Appeals for Dependency
Cases and Erie County Family
Treatment Court**

State Justice Institute
1650 King Street, Suite 600
Alexandria, VA 22314
OJJDP IAA 00–JN–R–080

**Interagency Forum on Child
and Family Statistics**

National Institutes of Health
National Institute of Child Health and Human
Development
Bethesda, MD 20892–7510
OJJDP IAA 99–JN–R–075

**Intergenerational Transmission
of Antisocial Behavior**

National Institute of Mental Health
6001 Executive Boulevard
Room 6119, MSC 9621
Bethesda, MD 20892–9663
OJJDP IAA 98–JN–R–094

**Multisite, Multimodal Treatment Study
of Children With ADHD**

National Institute of Mental Health
Division of Service and Intervention Research
6001 Executive Boulevard
Bethesda, MD 20892–9663
OJJDP IAA 99–JP–R–050

**National Evaluation of Performance-
based Standards Program for Juvenile
Confinement Facilities**

National Academy of Public Administration
P.O. Box 91
Mansfield, MA 02048
OJJDP IAA 98–JB–R–061

**National Longitudinal Survey
of Youth 1997**

U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of Labor Statistics
Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics
2 Massachusetts Avenue NE., Suite 4945
Washington, DC 20212
OJJDP IAA 97–JN–R–045, 99–JF–R–077

Research on Child Neglect

National Institute of Mental Health
6001 Executive Boulevard
Room 6200, MSC 9617
Bethesda, MD 20892–9633
OJJDP IAA 00–JW–R–043

**Risk Reduction Via Promotion of Youth
Development**

National Institute of Mental Health
Mental Health Prevention Research Branch
6001 Executive Boulevard
Bethesda, MD 20892–9663
OJJDP IAA 97–JN–R–031

**Study of the Marketing of Age-Restricted
Violent Entertainment to Children**

Federal Trade Commission
600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW.
Washington, DC 20580
OJJDP IAA 99–JN–R–091

Contract

Contract To Evaluate OJJDP Programs

Caliber Associates, Inc.
10530 Rosehaven Street, Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030
OJP–95–C–006, OJP–99–C–007

Appendix B: OJJDP Publications and Products From the Research Division, August 1999 to the Present

The publications listed below are available free of charge through OJJDP's Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse by calling 800-638-8736, visiting OJJDP's Web site at www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org, or e-mailing the Clearinghouse at puborder@ncjrs.org.

Publications

1998 National Youth Gang Survey (Summary). 2000. 84 pp. NCJ 183109.

Presents findings of the 1998 National Youth Gang Survey, the fourth in a series of annual surveys administered by the National Youth Gang Center. To facilitate comparative analyses, the 1998 survey used the same nationally representative sample of law enforcement agencies as its 1996 and 1997 predecessors. Survey results indicate that despite declines from previous years, youth gangs remain a serious problem. In 1998, an estimated 780,200 gang members were active in 28,700 youth gangs in 4,463 jurisdictions nationwide. The Summary provides analysis and statistics on number and locations of gangs; member demographics (age, sex, and race/ethnicity); gang involvement in crime and drugs; and antigang task force activity. Copies of the *National Youth Gang Survey* for previous years also are available.

1999 Report to Congress: Title V Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs (Report). 2000. 55 pp. NCJ 182677.

Presents the efforts and accomplishments of grant activities funded under Title V Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs. Under this program, OJJDP provides the framework, tools, and funding for States and communities to establish comprehensive, community-based strategies that deter youth from becoming involved in the

juvenile justice system. The Report begins with a review of current trends in juvenile justice and the role of the Title V grants program in preventing and controlling youth problem behaviors. The Report goes on to describe the allocation of Title V resources to participating States and communities and examine the impact the program has had in changing community norms related to collaboration and systems-level change. The Report also focuses on the coordination of State and Federal efforts to support local delinquency prevention and reviews OJJDP's commitment to delinquency prevention and the promise it holds for moving toward a healthier, safer future for America's children, youth, and families. Reports for previous years also are available.

America's Children: Key National Indicators of Well-Being 2000 (Report). 2000. 114 pp. NCJ 186147.

Provides a comprehensive look at critical aspects of child well-being, such as economic security, health, behavior, social environment, and education. The Report, the fourth annual synthesis of information on the status of the Nation's children, presents 25 key indicators of the well-being of children. The Report was compiled by the Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, a consortium of 20 Federal agencies, including the U.S. Departments of Justice and Education, that gather data on children. (Not available online. Call or e-mail the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse.)

Annual Report on School Safety, 1999 (Report). 2000. 66 pp. NCJ 181757.

Presents a description of the nature and extent of crime and violence on school property. The Report, prepared jointly by the U.S. Departments of Education and Justice, examines data on homicides and suicides at school, injuries at school, crimes against

students, crimes against teachers, weapons at school, the consequences of bringing firearms to school, and student perceptions of school safety. The Report highlights 54 communities that have implemented a collaborative, problem-solving model to prevent school violence; presents summary information on effective programs; and lists resources for more information about school safety and crime issues.

Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement Databook (Fact Sheet). 2000. 2 pp. FS 200008.

Provides information on the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP) Databook. This online interactive data dissemination tool was developed for OJJDP by the National Center for Juvenile Justice. It enables users to access CJRP data quickly and easily without using statistical analysis software. CJRP is a comprehensive, manageable, and reliable statistical series providing information about juvenile offenders in residential placement. The Databook can address a wide variety of questions about juvenile detention, corrections, and placement.

Challenging the Myths (Bulletin). 2000. 8 pp. NCJ 178993.

Evaluates the validity of the “superpredator” theory, which concluded that a new breed of violent juveniles was emerging in the early 1990s and predicted a wave of violent juvenile crime that would continue into the next decade. This Bulletin examines juvenile crime statistics, concludes that recent data do not support the superpredator theory, and offers alternative explanations of recent trends in juvenile crime. The Bulletin is part of the 1999 National Report Series, which highlights selected themes at the forefront of juvenile justice policymaking and extracts relevant National Report sections (including selected graphs and tables).

Characteristics of Crimes Against Juveniles (Bulletin). 2000. 12 pp. NCJ 179034.

Examines data from the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) on the characteristics of crimes committed against juveniles. Part of the Crimes Against Children Series, this Bulletin analyzes 1997 NIBRS data (collected from 12 States) for crimes such as assault, kidnaping, robbery, and

sexual assault. The Bulletin finds that juveniles make up 12 percent of all crime victims known to police, including 71 percent of all sex crime victims and 38 percent of all kidnaping victims. Simple assault is the most commonly reported crime against juveniles.

Children as Victims (Bulletin). 2000. 24 pp. NCJ 180753.

Presents an overview of statistics on juveniles as victims of crimes and maltreatment. The Bulletin examines recent trends in violent crimes against children and youth (murder, assault, and sexual assault), analyzes patterns of victimization in cases of child abuse and neglect, and summarizes data on missing children. The Bulletin notes that juveniles are twice as likely as adults to be victims of serious violent crime and that children with a history of maltreatment are at increased risk for delinquency. The Bulletin is part of the 1999 National Report Series, which highlights selected themes at the forefront of juvenile justice policymaking and extracts relevant National Report sections (including selected graphs and tables).

Comprehensive Responses to Youth at Risk: Interim Findings From the SafeFutures Initiative (Summary). 2000. 96 pp. NCJ 183841.

Presents the findings from an evaluation of the first 3 years of the SafeFutures initiative in six sites — Boston, MA; Contra Costa County, CA; Fort Belknap, MT; Imperial County, CA; Seattle, WA; and St. Louis, MO. The Summary describes the SafeFutures initiative, its goals, and its theoretical foundation; includes an overview of the demonstration sites; discusses each site’s management structure for SafeFutures; examines each of the nine SafeFutures components; and provides examples of local programs addressing each component. The examples were chosen to illustrate the variety of programs implemented and are not intended to serve as an exhaustive inventory of SafeFutures programming.

Co-occurrence of Delinquency and Other Problem Behaviors (Bulletin). 2000. 8 pp. NCJ 182211.

Provides information on the extent of overlap between delinquency and other problem behaviors.

Using data from the first 3 years of OJJDP's Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency, this Youth Development Series Bulletin examines the co-occurrence of serious delinquency with specific problem areas: school behavior, drug use, mental health, and combinations of these behaviors. Preliminary findings show that a large proportion of serious delinquents are not involved in persistent drug use, nor do they have persistent school or mental health problems; the problem that co-occurs most frequently with serious delinquency is drug use; and, for males, as the number of problem behaviors other than delinquency increases, so does the likelihood that an individual will be a serious delinquent.

Counting America's Youth: Easy Access to Population Data (Fact Sheet). 2000. 2 pp. FS 200014.

Describes Easy Access to Juvenile Populations, a new online interactive data dissemination tool that provides demographic information about U.S. juveniles. A component of OJJDP's online Statistical Briefing Book, the data site enables users to view, print, and download juvenile population estimates according to age, sex, race, and Hispanic ethnicity. Using estimates provided by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Easy Access to Juvenile Populations provides detailed tables of population estimates for 1990 and 1998 for the entire United States, each State, and each of the Nation's 3,141 counties.

Delinquency Cases in Juvenile Courts, 1997 (Fact Sheet). 2000. 2 pp. FS 200004.

Provides data on the estimated 1,755,100 delinquency cases processed in juvenile courts in the United States in 1997. The number of these cases handled by juvenile courts increased 48 percent between 1988 and 1997. During this time period, the number of drug law violation cases increased 125 percent, person offense cases increased 97 percent, public order offense cases increased 67 percent, and property offense cases increased 19 percent. The estimates provided in this Fact Sheet are based on data from more than 1,900 jurisdictions containing nearly 70 percent of the U.S. juvenile population

(youth age 10 through the upper age of original juvenile court jurisdiction in each State).

Delinquency Cases Waived to Criminal Court, 1988–1997 (Fact Sheet). 2000. 2 pp. FS 200002.

Presents estimates of the number of cases transferred from juvenile court to criminal court through judicial waiver between 1988 and 1997. These estimates are based on data from more than 1,900 jurisdictions representing nearly 70 percent of the U.S. juvenile population. In 1997, U.S. courts with juvenile jurisdiction handled over 1.7 million delinquency cases. More than half of these cases were handled formally (that is, a petition was filed requesting an adjudication or waiver hearing). In 1997, waivers to criminal court represented less than 1 percent of the formally processed delinquency caseload.

Detention in Delinquency Cases, 1988–1997 (Fact Sheet). 2000. 2 pp. FS 200017.

Provides statistical information on the increased number of delinquency cases handled by juvenile courts and the proportion of delinquency cases detained. Between 1988 and 1997, the profile of the national detention population shifted, with a greater proportion of youth charged with person offenses and a greater proportion of females and of black youth in the detention population. The increase in number of very young offenders in juvenile detention centers has placed new demands on these institutions. The previous Fact Sheet, *Detention in Delinquency Cases, 1987–1996*, also is available.

Effective Intervention for Serious Juvenile Offenders (Bulletin). 2000. 8 pp. NCJ 181201.

Presents the results of a meta-analysis (a systematic synthesis of quantitative research results) that posed two questions: whether intervention programs can reduce recidivism rates among serious delinquents and, if so, what types of programs are most effective. This Bulletin describes the procedures used to select studies for the meta-analysis, presents the methods of analysis used to answer the above questions, and discusses effective interventions for noninstitutionalized and institutionalized juvenile offenders.

Family Disruption and Delinquency (Bulletin). 1999. 6 pp. NCJ 178285.

Examines the impact that multiple changes in family structure have on an adolescent's risk of serious problem behavior. Research teams in three cities—Rochester, NY; Denver, CO; and Pittsburgh, PA—interviewed 4,000 youth and their caretakers to analyze the prevalence of delinquent behaviors and drug use and the number of family transitions the youth had experienced. The researchers found that the youth had faced a substantial number of family transitions, which can result in decreased financial security and increased stress and conflict. In Rochester and Denver, the number of transitions had a significant effect on delinquency and drug use; the Pittsburgh data showed the same trend, although not at a statistically significant level.

Female Delinquency Cases, 1997 (Fact Sheet). 2000. 2 pp. FS 200016.

Describes the types of offenses committed by juvenile female offenders and provides data on detention, intake decisions, waiver to criminal court, and adjudication and disposition. Juvenile courts processed an estimated 1,755,100 delinquency cases in 1997, nearly one-fourth (23 percent) of which involved a female offender, compared with 19 percent in 1988. Between 1988 and 1997, the number of delinquency cases involving females increased 83 percent.

Fighting Juvenile Gun Violence (Bulletin). 2000. 12 pp. NCJ 182679.

Describes the implementation of OJJDP's Partnerships To Reduce Juvenile Gun Violence Program at demonstration sites in Baton Rouge and Shreveport, LA; Oakland, CA; and Syracuse, NY. The program seeks to increase the effectiveness of existing gun violence strategies by enhancing and coordinating prevention, intervention, and suppression efforts and strengthening community links. This Bulletin identifies the program's goals, outlines strategies the demonstration sites needed to achieve those goals, describes the role of the national evaluation team in providing technical assistance and helping the sites develop comprehensive plans, and details each site's approach to gun violence. The Bulletin also explains

what has been learned after implementation and provides program outcomes.

The High/Scope Perry Preschool Project (Bulletin). 2000. 8 pp. NCJ 181725.

Discusses the High/Scope Perry Preschool Project, an early childhood intervention program that has been in operation for almost 40 years. The more the field learns about risk factors for delinquency, the more obvious it is that effective prevention programs targeting children at risk can provide benefits beyond their costs. This Bulletin reviews the results to date from an ongoing, well-designed study of the program, presents two positive cost-benefit analyses, and examines the implications for future policy decisions.

Highlights of the 1999 National Youth Gang Survey (Fact Sheet). 2000. 2 pp. FS 200020.

Summarizes findings of the 1999 National Youth Gang Survey, the fifth annual gang survey conducted since 1995 by the National Youth Gang Center. The Fact Sheet summarizes data on the percentage of jurisdictions reporting active youth gangs in 1999; the reported numbers of youth gangs and gang members; the age, race/ethnicity, and social class of gang members; the proportions of gang members who were involved in specific types of crimes and who were migrants from other jurisdictions; and the percentage of youth gangs that were considered drug gangs. Facts Sheets that provide highlights of the 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998 National Youth Gang Center surveys also are available.

Implementation of the Intensive Community-Based Aftercare Program (Bulletin). 2000. 20 pp. NCJ 181464.

Provides an overview of the Intensive Aftercare Program (IAP) model—the goal of which is to reduce recidivism among high-risk juvenile parolees—and describes its implementation in participating sites. The IAP model posits that effective intervention with serious, chronic juvenile offenders requires not only intensive supervision and services after institutional release, but also a focus on reintegration during incarceration and a highly structured and gradual transition process that bridges institutionalization and aftercare. The Bulletin also assesses the

extent to which implementation has been successful, both overall and with respect to the specific components, and identifies factors that facilitated or impeded program implementation.

Innovative Information on Juvenile Residential Facilities (Fact Sheet). 2000. 2 pp. FS 200011.

Describes the first Juvenile Residential Facility Census (JRFC), an effort designed to collect information about the facilities in which juvenile offenders are held. JRFC will gather information on the health care, education, substance abuse treatment, and mental health treatment provided to youth in these facilities. The census will also indicate the use of screenings or tests conducted to determine counseling, education, health, or substance abuse needs and will examine prominent issues about conditions of confinement, including the restraint of youth and improper absences from the facility.

Juvenile Arrests 1999 (Bulletin). 2000. 12 pp. NCJ 185236.

Provides a summary and analysis of national and State juvenile arrest data reported in the FBI's October 2000 report, *Crime in the United States, 1999*. After peaking in 1994, juvenile violent crime arrests, which had increased substantially since the late 1980s, declined dramatically. The juvenile arrest rate for violent crime in 1999 was 36 percent below its peak in 1994. From 1993 to 1999, the juvenile arrest rate for murder decreased 68 percent—to its lowest level since the 1960s. The number of juvenile arrests has declined in every violent crime category despite an 8-percent growth in the juvenile population from 1993 to 1999. *Juvenile Arrests* Bulletins also are available for 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998.

Juvenile Court Placement of Adjudicated Youth (Fact Sheet). 2000. 2 pp. FS 200015.

This Fact Sheet is part of the Residential Placement Series and reports out-of-home placements for youth adjudicated by courts as delinquent offenders from 1988 to 1997. Residential placements—which include placements in residential treatment centers, juvenile corrections facilities, foster homes, and group homes—are among the types of dispositions

used by juvenile courts. The number of adjudicated cases resulting in out-of-home placement rose from 104,800 in 1988 to 163,200 in 1997. However, from 1988 to 1997, adjudicated cases involving placement increased least for white youth (52 percent), compared with black youth (60 percent) and youth of other races (69 percent).

Juvenile Court Statistics 1997 (Report). 2000. 120 pp. NCJ 180864.

Profiles more than 1.7 million delinquency cases and 158,000 status offense cases handled by the juvenile courts in 1997. Detailed information is provided on the offenses involved, referral sources, detention practices, and case dispositions. This Report, the 71st in the Juvenile Court Statistics Series, also includes demographic characteristics of offending juveniles and describes various trends since 1988. The national caseload estimates for 1997 contained in this Report were based on approximately 917,400 automated case records plus court-level statistics summarizing nearly 217,400 additional cases. Data were contributed to the National Juvenile Court Data Archive by nearly 2,000 courts (with jurisdiction over 71 percent of the juvenile population). The analysis includes 88 tables, 29 figures, and an appendix with county- and State-level case statistics from 1997. *Juvenile Court Statistics* for previous years also are available.

Juvenile Delinquency Probation Caseload, 1988–1997 (Fact Sheet). 2000. 2 pp. FS 200019.

Presents findings on the juvenile delinquency probation caseload that are based on national data on delinquency cases processed by juvenile courts from 1988 through 1997. The national estimates were generated using information contributed to the National Juvenile Court Data Archive. As set forth in this Fact Sheet, courts with juvenile jurisdiction handled nearly 1.8 million delinquency cases in 1997. Probation supervision was the most severe disposition in almost 37 percent (645,600) of all delinquency cases. The number of cases placed on probation grew 48 percent between 1988 and 1997. During that time, the overall delinquency caseload also increased 48 percent.

Juvenile Justice: A Century of Change (Bulletin). 1999. 20 pp. NCJ 178995.

Reviews developments in juvenile justice system structure and process from the establishment of the Nation's first juvenile court in 1899 to the present. This Bulletin presents an overview of the history of juvenile justice, discusses U.S. Supreme Court decisions that have shaped the modern system, compares the juvenile and criminal justice systems, describes current case processing, and summarizes changes States have made with regard to juvenile court jurisdictional authority, sentencing, and confidentiality. The Bulletin is part of the 1999 National Report Series, which highlights selected themes at the forefront of juvenile justice policymaking and extracts relevant National Report sections.

Juvenile Mentoring Program: A Progress Review (Bulletin). 2000. 8 pp. NCJ 182209.

Describes OJJDP's Juvenile Mentoring Program (JUMP), which provides one-to-one mentoring for youth at risk of delinquency, gang involvement, educational failure, or dropping out of school. Youth mentoring programs provide a forum in which volunteer adult mentors develop supportive relationships with at-risk youth to help them through childhood and adolescence. Currently, there are 164 JUMP projects in 41 States, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Information on JUMP projects is collected through an automated JUMP management information system, intensive case studies, and extensive communication with grantee agencies.

Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1999 National Report (Report). 1999. 232 pp. NCJ 178257.

Presents comprehensive information on the juvenile justice system and juvenile crime, violence, and victimization. This OJJDP National Report brings together the latest available statistics from a variety of sources and includes numerous tables, graphs, and maps, accompanied by analyses in clear, non-technical language. The Report provides baseline information on juvenile population trends; patterns of juvenile victimization, including homicide, suicide, and maltreatment; the nature and extent of juvenile offending, including data on arrest rates,

antisocial behavior, and juveniles in custody; and the structure, procedures, and activities of the juvenile justice system, including law enforcement agencies, courts, and corrections. This Report updates information originally presented in *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: A National Report*, the benchmark publication issued in 1995. A subject index is included.

Juvenile Transfers to Criminal Court in the 1990's: Lessons Learned From Four Studies (Summary). 2000. 68 pp. NCJ 181301.

Presents the findings of four studies of juvenile transfers to criminal court conducted by the National Center for Juvenile Justice. The studies, conducted in Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Utah, addressed three basic research issues: the criteria used in transfer decisions, changes in transfer decisionmaking criteria during the 1980s and 1990s over and above changes in legislation, and the impact of new legislation that excludes additional offenders from juvenile court jurisdiction. The Summary presents an overview of each study and outlines key findings. Background on transfer mechanisms, past research, and study methodology is also provided.

Juvenile Vandalism, 1997 (Fact Sheet). 2000. 2 pp. FS 200010.

Presents statistics on juvenile vandalism in 1997, based on findings of the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting Program. The Fact Sheet reports that in 1997, law enforcement agencies made approximately 136,500 arrests of persons under age 18 for vandalism and that vandalism arrests peak at age 16. Unlike most offenses, vandalism is an offense for which the racial distribution of youth arrested reflects their profile in the general population. The Fact Sheet also notes that formal court processing of juvenile vandalism cases increased between 1988 and 1997.

Juvenile Victims of Property Crimes (Bulletin). 2000. 12 pp. NCJ 184740.

Presents data on juvenile victims of property crimes. Part of OJJDP's Crimes Against Children Bulletin Series, this Bulletin describes juveniles' risk for property victimization and the nature of such crimes. Data from the National Crime Victimization Survey and

the National Incident-Based Reporting System illustrate that juveniles are at a particularly high risk for victimization through property offenses. In 1997, one in six juveniles ages 12 to 17 was a victim of a property crime—a rate 40 percent higher than the rate for adults. The data also indicate that property crimes against juveniles are seldom reported to the police.

Kidnaping of Juveniles: Patterns From NIBRS (Bulletin). 2000. 8 pp. NCJ 181161.

Examines data from the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) on kidnaping of juveniles. Part of OJJDP's Crimes Against Children series, this Bulletin analyzes 1997 NIBRS data (collected from 12 States) on kidnaping that suggest that these crimes can be categorized into three groups based on the identity of the perpetrator: family kidnaping, acquaintance kidnaping, and stranger kidnaping. The Bulletin provides statistical descriptions of these crimes as they relate to factors such as the time of day and location of the incident or the perpetrator's use of a weapon.

Kids and Guns (Bulletin). 2000. 12 pp. NCJ 178994.

Presents an overview of statistics indicative of the impact of gun availability on the lives of youth. The Bulletin examines data on gun use in homicides committed by and against juveniles, weapons arrest rates, relationship of handgun carrying to other problem behaviors, and firearm-related suicide. The Bulletin notes that the recent decline in firearm-related juvenile homicides and suicides is encouraging and reinforces the need to remain vigilant in keeping weapons out of the hands of children. The Bulletin is part of OJJDP's 1999 National Report Series, which highlights selected themes at the forefront of juvenile justice policymaking and extracts relevant National Report sections (including selected graphs and tables).

Minorities in the Juvenile Justice System (Bulletin). 1999. 16 pp. NCJ 179007.

Presents information on overrepresentation of minority youth in the juvenile justice system (compared with their proportion in the general population) and focuses on disproportionate confinement of minorities. This Bulletin includes statistics on

racial-ethnic makeup of juvenile offenders from arrest, court-processing, and confinement records. The Bulletin notes that there is substantial evidence of widespread disparity in juvenile case processing of minority and nonminority youth and that racial-ethnic differences can occur at all stages of the process. The Bulletin is part of OJJDP's 1999 National Report Series, which highlights selected themes at the forefront of juvenile justice policymaking and extracts relevant National Report sections (including selected graphs and tables).

Offenders in Juvenile Court, 1997 (Bulletin). 2000. 16 pp. NCJ 181204.

Presents findings from *Juvenile Court Statistics 1997*, the latest in a series of annual reports on cases handled by U.S. courts with juvenile jurisdiction. Although courts with juvenile jurisdiction handle a variety of cases, including abuse, neglect, adoption, and traffic violations, the *Juvenile Court Statistics* reports focus on the disposition of delinquency cases and formally processed status offense cases. Juvenile courts in the United States processed nearly 1.8 million delinquency cases in 1997, a 48-percent increase over the number of cases handled in 1988. This Bulletin includes detailed tables and figures on juvenile delinquency cases handled in U.S. courts.

OJJDP Research: Making a Difference for Juveniles (Report). 1999. 55 pp. NCJ 177602.

Summarizes key initiatives undertaken by OJJDP's Research and Program Development Division in research, evaluation, and statistics from 1996 through 1998. The Report (the first in a series on the activities of the Research Division) provides a review of critical findings on the root causes of juvenile delinquency and negative behavior, highlights some of OJJDP's innovative research efforts, and explores emerging research on very young offenders, school violence, girls in the juvenile justice system, and other issues. The Research Division's mission is to generate credible and useful information for improved decisionmaking. Using this information, OJJDP's other divisions implement model demonstration programs, replicate successful programs, provide training and technical assistance, and inform the public about the nature and extent of

juvenile crime and what works to prevent and stop such crime.

Person Offense Cases in Juvenile Court, 1988–1997 (Fact Sheet). 2000. 2 pp. FS 200006.

Provides information on person offense cases handled by juvenile courts from 1988 to 1997. In 1997, U.S. juvenile courts handled an estimated 390,800 delinquency cases in which the most serious charge was an offense against a person. Person offenses include assault, robbery, rape, and homicide. The person offense caseload was 97 percent greater in 1997 than in 1988. Person offense cases accounted for 22 percent of all delinquency cases in 1997, compared with 17 percent in 1988. Fact Sheets providing information on person offense cases handled by juvenile courts for previous years also are available.

Predictors of Youth Violence (Bulletin). 2000. 12 pp. NCJ 179065.

Presents findings of OJJDP's Study Group on Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders, which conducted a 2-year analysis of data collected by long-term studies of juvenile violence. This Bulletin, part of OJJDP's series of Bulletins on serious and violent juvenile offenders, describes risk and protective factors for youth violence, including individual, family, school, peer-related, community/neighborhood, and situational factors. It also includes a sidebar that ranks predictors of violent or serious delinquency for age groups 6–11 and 12–14.

Preventing Adolescent Gang Involvement (Bulletin). 2000. 12 pp. NCJ 182210.

Provides information on the history of American youth gangs and current knowledge about gangs. This Bulletin, part of OJJDP's Youth Gang Series, presents an overview of the research examining risk factors associated with gang membership. It focuses on the following five domains: individual and family demographics, personal attributes, peer group, school, and community. The Bulletin also describes prevention and intervention strategies and programs geared toward gang members and youth at risk of becoming involved in gangs.

Prevention of Serious and Violent Juvenile Offending (Bulletin). 2000. 16 pp. NCJ 178898.

Describes developmental precursors to serious and violent juvenile offending and outlines effective approaches to prevention of such offending. Part of OJJDP's series on serious and violent juvenile offenders, this Bulletin describes family-, parent-, and child-focused prevention programs and offers examples of well-designed intervention programs. The Bulletin is based on work by OJJDP's Study Group on Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders, which conducted a 2-year analysis of data collected by long-term studies of juvenile violence.

Race, Ethnicity, and Serious Violent Juvenile Offending (Bulletin). 2000. 8 pp. NCJ 181202.

Discusses racial and ethnic differences in rates of serious and violent offending among juveniles. The Bulletin describes various data sources (justice system records and self-report offending and victimization surveys) and notes their strengths and weaknesses for purposes of identifying racial and ethnic patterns. The Bulletin also summarizes statistics on national trends in juvenile offending by race and ethnicity, discusses research findings on racial and ethnic differences among chronic offenders, and offers various explanations of the patterns observed. Definitions of "race" and "ethnicity" are discussed, and the need for consistency in data comparisons is indicated.

Reintegration, Supervised Release, and Intensive Aftercare (Bulletin). 1999. 24 pp. NCJ 175715.

Examines what has worked and what has not worked in reintegrating juvenile offenders into the community. In the late 1980s, OJJDP began supporting a long-term research and development initiative for an intensive juvenile aftercare model. The Bulletin's main text describes the intensive aftercare program model, distinguishes it from other models and programs, and analyzes individual intensive aftercare programs. The Bulletin also includes an evaluation of existing aftercare programs, describes studies of these programs, and presents the authors' conclusions.

Reporting Crimes Against Children (Bulletin). 1999. 8 pp. NCJ 178887.

Presents an analysis of National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) data on reports of crimes against juveniles to police and other authorities (e.g., school officials). The findings presented in this Crimes Against Children Series Bulletin indicate that a majority of juvenile victimizations are not being reported to police or any other authority. Even serious victimizations involving weapons and injury are significantly less likely to be reported when juveniles are the victims than when adults are victimized. The Bulletin focuses on the categories of violent crime (rape and sexual assault, robbery, and assault) and theft included in NCVS data.

Residential Placement of Adjudicated Youth, 1987–1996 (Fact Sheet). 1999. 2 pp. FS 99117.

Provides information on adjudicated delinquency cases that resulted in out-of-home placement from 1987 to 1996. Juvenile courts employ a variety of dispositions for youth adjudicated as delinquent offenders. In 1996, 28 percent of these cases resulted in a disposition ordering out-of-home placement, including placements in residential treatment centers, juvenile correctional facilities, foster homes, and group homes. As set forth in this Fact Sheet, the number of adjudicated cases that resulted in out-of-home placement rose from 105,600 in 1987 to 159,400 in 1996.

School and Community Interventions To Prevent Serious and Violent Offending (Bulletin). 1999. 12 pp. NCJ 177624.

Describes school and community interventions shown to reduce risk factors for drug abuse and serious and violent juvenile offending. Based on findings of OJJDP's Study Group on Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders, this Bulletin examines five types of school interventions (structured playground activities, behavioral consultation, behavioral monitoring, metal detectors, and schoolwide reorganization) and eight types of community interventions (citizen mobilization, situational prevention, comprehensive citizen intervention, mentoring, afterschool recreation programs, policing strategies, policy changes, and mass media interventions). The

Bulletin is part of OJJDP's series on serious and violent juvenile offenders.

Second Comprehensive Study of Missing Children (Bulletin). 2000. 6 pp. NCJ 179085.

Describes the second National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children (NISMART 2), which will measure the incidence of each of eight categories of missing children. The current study will update the findings of NISMART 1, published in 1990. The Bulletin outlines the history and components of both NISMART studies, defines eight categories of missing children, includes a sidebar that describes the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, presents photographs and case details for five missing children, and lists seven planned reports that will be based on NISMART 2 data.

Self-Reported Delinquency by 12-Year-Olds, 1997 (Fact Sheet). 2000. 2 pp. FS 200003.

Presents data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1997. The first wave of the survey interviewed a nationally representative sample of nearly 9,000 youth who were between the ages of 12 and 16 at the end of 1996. The survey asked youth to report whether they had engaged in a variety of delinquent behaviors or other behaviors that may lead to future delinquency. These youth will be interviewed annually to track changes in these behaviors. This Fact Sheet presents estimates of these self-reported behaviors by the youngest age group—youth who were 12 years old at the end of 1996.

State Custody Rates, 1997 (Bulletin). 2000. 4 pp. NCJ 183108.

Presents State-by-State statistics on custody rates for juvenile delinquents and status offenders held in public and private facilities. Using Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP) findings for 1997, the Bulletin compares the role of private facilities, where most status offenders are held, with that of public facilities, where most delinquent offenders are detained. State rankings based solely on custody rates for delinquents in public facilities differ from those based on rates for all juveniles in both public and private facilities. The detailed data provided in this Bulletin enable readers to better understand the

role that public and private custodial facilities play in their own States and across the Nation.

A Study of Juvenile Transfers to Criminal Court in Florida (Fact Sheet). 1999. 2 pp. FS 99113.

Provides a brief overview of the four research components of Florida's study on juvenile transfers to criminal court. The study, funded by OJJDP since 1995, is assessing the impact of transfer laws and practices, including the effectiveness of using transfer as a crime control strategy. Florida leads the Nation in juvenile transfers to criminal court. The number of transfers has come to rival the number of residential placement dispositions for juvenile offenders in Florida. Therefore, the State is an ideal policy laboratory in which to study questions about transfer.

Teen Courts: A Focus on Research (Bulletin). 2000. 16 pp. NCJ 183472.

Presents the results of a national survey of teen courts conducted as part of OJJDP's Evaluation of Teen Courts Project by researchers at The Urban Institute. Developed as an alternative to the traditional juvenile court system for younger and less serious offenders, teen courts operate on the premise that the judgment of a juvenile offender's peers may have a greater impact than the decisions of adult authority figures. The teen court concept has gained popularity in recent years as juvenile courts have had to deal with increased numbers of serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders. This Bulletin examines several teen court evaluations but cautions that empirical data are needed to fully evaluate the effectiveness of this intervention.

Teen Courts in the United States: A Profile of Current Programs (Fact Sheet). 1999. 2 pp. FS 99118.

Provides information on the results of a survey of teen courts, which have become a popular intervention for relatively young and usually first-time offenders. The number of teen courts nationwide grew from an estimated 50 programs in 1991 to between 400 and 500 programs in 1998. To document their characteristics and effectiveness, OJJDP funded an evaluation of these courts in 1998. As set forth in this Fact Sheet, most teen courts have relatively

small caseloads (48 percent indicated that they received fewer than 100 referrals per year) and teen courts nationwide handled approximately 65,000 cases in 1998.

Teenage Fatherhood and Delinquent Behavior (Bulletin). 2000. 8 pp. NCJ 178899.

Presents findings from the Rochester Youth Development Study and the Pittsburgh Youth Study on risk factors for teenage paternity, specifically the role of delinquency in early fatherhood. Both studies concluded that early delinquency is a highly significant risk factor for becoming a teen father. In addition, the Rochester study reported that the possibility of teen paternity rises dramatically as risk factors accumulate, and the Pittsburgh study found that teen fatherhood may be followed by greater involvement in delinquency. The Bulletin includes a list of resources for teen fathers.

Vietnamese Youth Gang Involvement (Fact Sheet). 2000. 2 pp. FS 200001.

This Fact Sheet describes an OJJDP-funded study in the city of Westminster in Orange County, CA. Westminster's study examined factors related to gang involvement by Vietnamese American youth. It is one of only a few systematic quantitative studies on this topic. This Fact Sheet summarizes findings from the study's final report, *Cultural Explanations for Vietnamese Youth Involvement in Street Gangs*.

Violence After School (Bulletin). 1999. 8 pp. NCJ 178992.

Presents information on temporal patterns (e.g., time of day and school versus nonschool day) of violent crimes committed by and against juveniles. The Bulletin presents the most recent available data from victim survey and police incident reports, emphasizes that serious violent crime involving juveniles peaks in the hours immediately after the close of school, and discusses implications of the data for community strategies to reduce violent juvenile crime. The Bulletin is part of OJJDP's National Report Series, which highlights selected themes at the forefront of juvenile justice policymaking and extracts relevant National Report sections (including selected graphs and tables).

Violent Neighborhoods, Violent Kids (Bulletin). 2000. 16 pp. NCJ 178248.

Presents findings of research that examined the types of delinquent behavior found among boys living in the three most violent neighborhoods in Washington, DC, and the role that institutions such as families, schools, churches, and youth-serving organizations play in the boys' lives. Findings are based on statistical analyses of data collected in interviews with a random sample of 213 boys, ages 13 to 17, who in the summer of 1996 lived in one of the three census tracts identified. The Bulletin classifies the boys according to the type of criminal behavior, if any, they reported committing and describes patterns as to where and when violence takes place and what types of boys are engaged in violent acts.

Youth Gang Drug Trafficking (Bulletin). 1999. 12 pp. NCJ 178282.

Presents nationally representative data on the extent and nature of youth gang involvement in drug trafficking, based on results from OJJDP's 1996 *National Youth Gang Survey*. This Youth Gang Series Bulletin analyzes survey data on both gang member involvement in drug sales and gang control of drug distribution. It discusses demographic factors including sex, age, and race/ethnicity of gang members and presents data on connections between drug sales and other offenses. The Bulletin also examines prevention strategies and programs that may be effective in jurisdictions that report youth gang involvement in drug trafficking.

Youth Gang Programs and Strategies (Summary). 2000. 96 pp. NCJ 171154.

Outlines programs and strategies that have been and are being used to break the appeal of gangs and reduce gang violence. As discussed in this Summary, preventing gang formation is a challenging task. Gangs emerge, grow, dissolve, and disappear for reasons that are poorly understood. In addition to describing existing programs and strategies used to

disrupt gangs and divert youth from joining them, this Summary discusses evaluations and national assessments of some of these programs and strategies. It also provides an overview of what practitioners and administrators need to know before designing and implementing such programs and strategies.

Youth Gangs in Schools (Bulletin). 2000. 8 pp. NCJ 183015.

Presents results of analyses of gang-related data gathered by the 1995 School Crime Supplements (SCS). This Youth Gang Series Bulletin examines characteristics of gangs in schools, reasons for greater gang prevalence in some schools, and the impact of gangs on victimization at school. It also considers the involvement of gangs in three types of criminal activity: violence, drug sales, and gun carrying. More than one-third of students surveyed in the SCS reported gangs in their schools, and more than two-thirds reported gang involvement in at least one type of criminal activity. The Bulletin concludes that existing school security measures are not sufficient; additional interventions are needed to combat gangs in schools.

CD-ROM

Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1999 National Report (CD-ROM). 2000. NCJ 178991.

Provides juvenile justice professionals, policy-makers, the media, and concerned citizens with the most comprehensive source of information about juvenile crime, violence, and victimization and about the response of the juvenile justice system to these problems—all in a user-friendly CD-ROM format. The CD-ROM allows users to view the 232-page Report in a portable document format (PDF). It also provides a comprehensive “educator’s kit,” which includes statistical information in full-page, presentation-ready graphs; data for the graphs; more than 40 source documents in PDF; and links to government Web sites.

Appendix C: Research-Related Online Resources

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Web Site

www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org

OJJDP's Web site is designed to provide users with information and links to resources on general topics of interest in the juvenile justice and delinquency prevention field—including conferences, funding opportunities, and new publications—and on OJJDP's Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders, which provides a framework within which communities can combat juvenile crime. Resources from OJJDP's Research and Program Development Division are interspersed throughout the site.

OJJDP's site includes eight main pages:

- ◆ **About OJJDP** (which provides important information on the agency's organization, staff, authorizing legislation, and resources).
- ◆ **JJ Facts & Figures** (where users can obtain the most recent facts and figures on juvenile justice, delinquency prevention, and violence and victimization).
- ◆ **Highlights** (which describes time-sensitive opportunities, recent additions to OJJDP's site, and new sources of information).
- ◆ **Grants & Funding** (where users can learn about current and past funding opportunities and current grantees).
- ◆ **Resources** (which provides State-by-State lists of contacts and information and links to other youth-focused organizations and agencies).

- ◆ **Programs** (which provides information on the design, implementation, evaluation, and training and technical assistance components of OJJDP programs, several of which are described in the "Other Research-Related Web Sites" section of this appendix).
- ◆ **Publications** (which includes summaries and text of youth-focused publications and other resources and links users to the NCJRS Abstracts Database).
- ◆ **Calendar of Events** (which provides information on upcoming and past OJJDP-sponsored conferences).

OJJDP Statistical Briefing Book

www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/index.html

The OJJDP Statistical Briefing Book includes detailed information on juvenile crime and victimization and on youth involved in the juvenile justice system. Data in the following content areas provide timely and reliable statistical answers to the most frequently asked questions of policymakers, members of the media, and the general public: population characteristics, juvenile arrests, juveniles as victims and offenders, and juveniles in court and in corrections. Data analysis and dissemination tools available through the Briefing Book give users quick and easy access to detailed statistics on a variety of juvenile justice topics. Among these online tools are the Easy Access series and the Juvenile Court Data Archive. The National Center for Juvenile Justice developed and maintains the OJJDP Statistical Briefing Book Web documents.

Easy Access Series

Easy Access is a family of electronic databases developed for OJJDP by the National Center for Juvenile Justice to give a larger audience access to recent, detailed information on juvenile crime and the juvenile justice system.

Easy Access to Juvenile Populations. Available online at www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/ezapop.

Includes juvenile population estimates derived from two data files prepared by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. The first provides annual estimates at the county level of the number of males and females in a single age group residing in the county on July 1 of the calendar years from 1990 to 1999. The second provides annual estimates of the resident population at the county level in 5-year age groups subdivided by sex, race, and Hispanic ethnicity.

Easy Access to Juvenile Court Statistics 1989–1998. Available online at www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/ezajcs98.

Enables researchers, students, and juvenile justice professionals to analyze the large database that underlies the annual *Juvenile Court Statistics* reports. Demographic, offense, and case processing variables are included, allowing users to develop detailed descriptions of the delinquency cases processed in the Nation's juvenile courts. Results are presented in tabular and graphic formats and can be stored in output files that can be easily read by spreadsheet or word processing packages.

Easy Access to State and County Juvenile Court Case Counts 1997. Available online at www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/ezaco/home.asp.

Uses data provided to the National Juvenile Court Data Archive by State and county agencies responsible for collecting and/or disseminating information on the processing of youth in juvenile courts. Displays summary counts of petitioned and nonpetitioned delinquency, status, and dependency caseloads by reporting jurisdictions.

Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement: 1997 Databook. Available online at www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/cjrp97/openpage.asp.

Allows users to access data from the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP) quickly and easily without using statistical analysis software. Data relate to juvenile detention, corrections, and placement.

The following Easy Access programs will be available online in the near future:

Easy Access to FBI Arrest Statistics, 1994–1998. Available online at www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/ezaarr.html.

Presents national, State, and county estimates of juvenile and adult arrests, rates, and trends for the FBI's Crime Index offenses. Results can be saved to a print file for easy insertion in other documents.

Easy Access to the FBI's Supplementary Homicide Reports: 1980–1998. Available online at www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/ezamu.html.

Explores variations and trends in State and national homicide victim and offender profiles. Allows users to receive immediate answers to questions about age, sex, race, weapon, and victim-offender relationship. Results are presented in tabular and graphic formats and can be stored in output files that can be easily read by spreadsheet or word processing packages.

National Juvenile Court Data Archive

www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/njcda/

Collects, stores, and analyzes data about young people referred to U.S. courts for delinquency and status offenses. Juvenile and family courts across the country voluntarily provide the archive with demographic information about juveniles involved in delinquency and status offense cases, the reasons for their referral to court, and the court's response (e.g., whether the youth were adjudicated, given probation, ordered to pay restitution, or placed in a correctional facility). These data are used to develop

national estimates of the delinquency and status offense cases handled by U.S. courts with jurisdiction over juveniles. The data also form the basis for OJJDP's annual *Juvenile Court Statistics* Report, which includes the most detailed information available on youth involved in the juvenile justice system and the activities of juvenile courts in the United States. A national resource since 1927, the archive offers low-cost, high-benefit data collection.

Other Research-Related Web Sites

Evaluation of the Juvenile Mentoring Program (JUMP)

www.itiincorporated.com/JUMP/jump

Examines the characteristics of youth, mentors, matches, and program dynamics in some 162 JUMP projects located throughout the United States. JUMP uses a variety of processes to collect data and support the evaluation, including, for example, an automated JUMP Management Information System, where grantees can enter pertinent information about their program; the Problem Oriented Screening Instrument for Teens (POSIT), which is used to obtain pre- and postmentoring data from teenage youth participating in JUMP; and youth and mentor exit forms, which provide valuable information about the mentoring experience. The research began in 1997 and is funded through 2001.

Evaluation of the SafeFutures Program

www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/safefutures/evaluate.html

Measures the success of SafeFutures' efforts to prevent and reduce juvenile violence and delinquency. The evaluation compares desired program outcomes (reducing delinquency, youth violence, and the associated risk factors) with the strategic planning process and the development of effective, integrated services. The evaluation plan relies on qualitative and quantitative components to describe the target population, monitor the juvenile justice system's prevention and intervention services, and track the system's

evolution. The process evaluation, which has been conducted during the first 18 months of the program, will continue over the life of the project.

Evaluation of the Truancy Reduction Demonstration Project

www.coloradofoundation.org/nationaltruancyproject/default.asp

Provides technical support for evaluating community-based, interagency truancy reduction programs. Facilitates ongoing community self-assessments, strengthens community collaboratives, assists with program development, and conducts evaluation activities. Defines the scope and characteristics of truancy; identifies community strengths and gaps; identifies, targets, and recruits key local stakeholders who can contribute to the program's success; and develops program strategies targeting students who are truant or at risk of being truant. Conducts site-based and cross-program analyses to find the critical success factors of community-based collaboratives and truancy reduction programs.

Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center

www.jrsa.org/jjec

Provides assistance to States and localities in evaluating juvenile justice programs funded by the Title II Formula Grant Program. The site offers information on assessing program effectiveness to individuals throughout the juvenile justice field. Users can search specific juvenile justice program areas for information on performance measures, evaluation designs, evaluation instruments, and publications. Users will also find links to the Federal Government's juvenile-related programs and initiatives. The site enables States to share evaluation information with one another by making available examples of State reports, contracts, and forms.

National Center for Juvenile Justice

www.ncjj.org

Includes a brief overview of the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ), founded in 1973 as the research division of the National Council of Juvenile

and Family Court Judges, and links to NCJJ and OJJDP publications and electronic databases, including the Easy Access series. NCJJ's areas of expertise include data collection, research and analysis, information management and dissemination, program planning, facility design evaluation, and technical assistance. Its information and services are designed to meet the needs of juvenile and family court judges, educators, State and Federal legislators, researchers, parents, juvenile correctional personnel, attorneys, and members of the media. NCJJ has also produced *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1999 National Report*, the most comprehensive source of information about juvenile crime, violence, and victimization.

The National Youth Gang Center (NYGC)

www.iir.com/nygc

Expands and maintains the body of critical knowledge about youth gangs and effective responses to them. Assists State and local jurisdictions in the collection, analysis, and exchange of information on gang-related demographics, legislation, literature, research, and promising program strategies. Coordinates activities of the OJJDP Youth Gang Consortium—a group of Federal agencies, gang program representatives, and other service providers. In carrying out its mission, NYGC performs six major tasks: collects and analyzes statistical data on gangs, compiles gang-related legislation, reviews gang literature, identifies promising program strategies, coordinates Youth Gang Consortium activities, and provides technical assistance to the Rural Gang Initiative and the Gang-Free Schools and Communities Initiative.

Performance-based Standards (PbS) for Juvenile Correction and Detention Facilities

www.performance-standards.org

Implements performance-based standards that improve the services and practices at 57 youth detention and correction centers in 21 States across the

country. These standards cover the following areas of correctional facility operation: safety, order, security, programming, health and mental health, and justice. The project's main goals are to develop a set of standards that individual facilities should strive to meet, create tools to help facilities attain these goals through regular self-assessment and self-improvement, allow facilities to evaluate their performance over time and in comparison with other facilities nationwide, and promote effective practices and help facilities support one another. Participating facilities use this Web site to tabulate data, receive reports, and obtain resources and technical assistance for improving performance. Visitors to the site may obtain information about the tools used by the PbS project, including performance-based standards, data collection instruments, facility improvement plans, site reports, diagnostic pages, and resources.

Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Juvenile Delinquency

www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ccd/index.html

Improves the understanding of serious delinquency, violence, and drug use by examining how youth develop within the context of family, school, peers, and community. This program includes three coordinated longitudinal projects: the Denver Youth Survey at the University of Colorado, the Pittsburgh Youth Study at the University of Pittsburgh, and the Rochester Youth Development Study at the University at Albany, State University of New York. These projects share a similar research design that involves repeated contacts with youth during a substantial portion of their developmental years. In each project, researchers conduct individual, face-to-face interviews with inner-city youth considered at high risk for involvement in delinquency and drug abuse. Multiple perspectives on each child's development and behavior are obtained through interviews with the child's primary caretaker and, in two sites, through interviews with teachers. In addition to interview data, the studies collect extensive information from official agencies, including police, courts, schools, and social services.

Publications From OJJDP

OJJDP produces a wide variety of materials, including Bulletins, Fact Sheets, Reports, Summaries, videotapes, CD-ROM's, and the *Juvenile Justice* journal. These materials and other resources are available through OJJDP's Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse (JJC), as described at the end of this list.

The following list of publications highlights the latest and most popular information published by OJJDP, grouped by topical areas:

Corrections and Detention

Construction, Operations, and Staff Training for Juvenile Confinement Facilities. 2000, NCJ 178928 (28 pp.).

Disproportionate Minority Confinement: 1997 Update. 1998, NCJ 170606 (12 pp.).

Implementation of the Intensive Community-Based Aftercare Program. 2000, NCJ 181464 (20 pp.).

Juvenile Arrests 1999. 2000, NCJ 185236 (12 pp.).

Reintegration, Supervised Release, and Intensive Aftercare. 1999, NCJ 175715 (24 pp.).

State Custody Rates, 1997. 2000, NCJ 183108 (4 pp.).

Courts

Employment and Training for Court-Involved Youth. 2000, NCJ 182787 (112 pp.).

Focus on Accountability: Best Practices for Juvenile Court and Probation. 1999, NCJ 177611 (12 pp.).

From the Courthouse to the Schoolhouse: Making Successful Transitions. 2000, NCJ 178900 (16 pp.).

Juvenile Court Statistics 1997. 2000, NCJ 180864 (120 pp.).

Juvenile Justice (Juvenile Court Issue), Volume VI, Number 2. 1999, NCJ 178255 (40 pp.).

Juveniles and the Death Penalty. 2000, NCJ 184748 (16 pp.).

Juvenile Transfers to Criminal Court in the 1990's: Lessons Learned From Four Studies. 2000, NCJ 181301 (68 pp.).

Juveniles Facing Criminal Sanctions: Three States That Changed the Rules. 2000, NCJ 181203 (66 pp.).

Offenders in Juvenile Court, 1997. 2000, NCJ 181204 (16 pp.).

Teen Courts: A Focus on Research. 2000, NCJ 183472 (16 pp.).

Delinquency Prevention

1999 Report to Congress: Title V Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs. 2000, NCJ 182677 (60 pp.).

Competency Training—The Strengthening Families Program: For Parents and Youth 10–14. 2000, NCJ 182208 (12 pp.).

Comprehensive Responses to Youth at Risk: Interim Findings From the SafeFutures Initiative. 2000, NCJ 183841 (96 pp.).

Co-occurrence of Delinquency and Other Problem Behaviors. 2000, NCJ 182211 (8 pp.).

High/Scope Perry Preschool Project. 2000, NCJ 181725 (8 pp.).

The Incredible Years Training Series. 2000, NCJ 173422 (24 pp.).

Juvenile Mentoring Program: A Progress Review. 2000, NCJ 182209 (8 pp.).

Law Enforcement Referral of At-Risk Youth: The SHIELD Program. 2000, NCJ 184579 (8 pp.).

The Nurturing Parenting Programs. 2000, NCJ 172848 (12 pp.).

Prevention of Serious and Violent Juvenile Offending. 2000, NCJ 178898 (16 pp.).

Gangs

1998 National Youth Gang Survey. 2000, NCJ 183109 (92 pp.).

Preventing Adolescent Gang Involvement. 2000, NCJ 182210 (12 pp.).

Youth Gang Programs and Strategies. 2000, NCJ 171154 (96 pp.).

The Youth Gangs, Drugs, and Violence Connection. 1999, NCJ 171152 (12 pp.).

Youth Gangs in Schools. 2000, NCJ 183015 (8 pp.).

General Juvenile Justice

The Community Assessment Center Concept. 2000, NCJ 178942 (12 pp.).

Increasing School Safety Through Juvenile Accountability Programs. 2000, NCJ 179283 (16 pp.).

Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants Strategic Planning Guide. 1999, NCJ 172846 (62 pp.).

Juvenile Justice (Mental Health Issue), Volume VII, Number 1. 2000, NCJ 178256 (40 pp.).

Juvenile Justice. (American Indian Issue). Volume VII, Number 2. 2000, NCJ 184747 (40 pp.).

Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1999 National Report. 1999, NCJ 178257 (232 pp.). Also available on CD-ROM. 2000, NCJ 178991.

OJJDP Research: Making a Difference for Juveniles. 1999, NCJ 177602 (52 pp.).

Special Education and the Juvenile Justice System. 2000, NCJ 179359 (16 pp.).

Teenage Fatherhood and Delinquent Behavior. 2000, NCJ 178899 (8 pp.).

Missing and Exploited Children

Kidnaping of Juveniles: Patterns From NIBRS. 2000, NCJ 181161 (8 pp.).

Overview of the Portable Guides to Investigating Child Abuse: Update 2000. 2000, NCJ 178893 (12 pp.).

Parents AnonymousSM: Strengthening America's Families. 1999, NCJ 171120 (12 pp.).

When Your Child Is Missing: A Family Survival Guide. 1998, NCJ 170022 (96 pp.). Also available in Spanish. 2000, NCJ 178902.

Substance Abuse

The Coach's Playbook Against Drugs. 1998, NCJ 173393 (20 pp.).

Developing a Policy for Controlled Substance Testing of Juveniles. 2000, NCJ 178896 (12 pp.).

Family Skills Training for Parents and Children. 2000, NCJ 180140 (12 pp.).

Violence and Victimization

Characteristics of Crimes Against Juveniles. 2000, NCJ 179034 (12 pp.).

Children as Victims. 2000, NCJ 180753 (24 pp.).

The Comprehensive Strategy: Lessons Learned From the Pilot Sites. 2000, NCJ 178258 (12 pp.).

Fighting Juvenile Gun Violence. 2000, NCJ 182679 (12 pp.).

Kids and Guns. 2000, NCJ 178994 (12 pp.).

Predictors of Youth Violence. 2000, NCJ 179065 (12 pp.).

Promising Strategies To Reduce Gun Violence. 1999, NCJ 173950 (276 pp.).

Race, Ethnicity, and Serious and Violent Juvenile Offending. 2000, NCJ 181202 (8 pp.).

Safe From the Start: Taking Action on Children Exposed to Violence. 2000, NCJ 182789 (76 pp.).

The materials listed on this page and many other OJJDP publications and resources can be accessed through the following methods:

Online:

To view or download materials, visit OJJDP's home page: www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org.

To order materials online, visit JJC's 24-hour online store: www.puborder.ncjrs.org.

To ask questions about materials, e-mail JJC: askncjrs@ncjrs.org.

To subscribe to JUVJUST, OJJDP's electronic mailing list, e-mail to listproc@ncjrs.org, leave the subject line blank, and type *subscribe juvjust your name*.

Phone:

800-638-8736
(Monday–Friday, 8:30 a.m.–7 p.m. ET)

Fax:

410-792-4358 (to order publications)
301-519-5600 (to ask questions)
800-638-8736 (fax-on-demand, Fact Sheets and Bulletins only)

Mail:

Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse/NCJRS
P.O. Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20849-6000

JJC, through the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS), is the repository for tens of thousands of criminal and juvenile justice publications and resources from around the world. An abstract for each publication or resource is placed in a database that you can search online: www.ncjrs.org/database.htm.

U.S. Department of Justice

Office of Justice Programs

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Washington, DC 20531

Official Business

Penalty for Private Use \$300

PRESORTED STANDARD
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/OJJDP
PERMIT NO. G-91

