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A Message From
Attorney General John Ashcroft

The U.S. Department of Justice is committed to serving our nation’s children proactively as well as reactively. Our mission is not simply to hold juveniles accountable when they commit crimes, but, even more, to prevent those crimes from occurring. This requires that we intervene in the lives of children to prevent them from becoming delinquents in the first place. As our awareness of the challenges our children face has sharpened, we have grown even more determined in our efforts to protect their lives and to help them find a positive path in life.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, a component of the Office of Justice Programs, plays an important role in the Department’s efforts to defend and protect our children. As evidenced by its participation in President Bush’s White House Conference on Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children and its many programmatic efforts on behalf of children, OJJDP is providing leadership on a wide range of juvenile justice issues.

We are also committed to protecting children from victimization. To give just one example, we are pursuing aggressive and innovative strategies to defend our children in a growing arena for predators—the Internet. As technology has evolved, so have the means of exploiting our children. OJJDP’s Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program helps state and local law enforcement agencies throughout the nation to develop effective responses to cyber-enticement and child pornography cases.

This and the other programs highlighted in this Report document the Justice Department’s dedication to ensuring that all America’s children have the opportunity to grow up safe, strong, and free.
A Message From
Assistant Attorney General
Deborah J. Daniels

Within the Office of Justice Programs, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has the primary responsibility for addressing issues related to children. The challenges that confront children are of great concern to us at OJP and are something we address on a daily basis. OJJDP funds a number of programs that promote child safety and help delinquent youth to turn their lives around.

OJJDP works to meet the needs of missing, exploited, and runaway children and their families through direct services, research and demonstration programs, and training and technical assistance provided to a variety of community members. As national coordinator for AMBER Alert, I have been working with many partners to help states improve their ability to respond rapidly to recover abducted children. OJJDP, in conjunction with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, has played a pivotal role in the campaign to promote national implementation of AMBER Alert.

OJJDP also coordinates the juvenile component of OJP’s Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative. A collaborative effort involving a number of federal agencies, the Reentry Initiative is working to ensure that serious, violent offenders who have been released from correctional facilities can successfully reenter their communities and become productive, law-abiding citizens.

Children are the future of our nation. Protecting them from harm and providing them with the opportunity to lead successful lives are essential if that future is to be realized.
Since its establishment in 1974, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), a component of the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, has provided national leadership, coordination, and resources to assist states and communities in combating juvenile delinquency and child victimization. The nature and extent of the problems confronting youth, and our knowledge of these problems, are constantly changing, and the urgent demands of other pressing national issues present special challenges. Accordingly, OJJDP takes these evolving circumstances into account in setting its priorities each year.

The activities highlighted in this Report reflect OJJDP’s priorities for fiscal year 2002. A major focus was to ensure that serious and violent juvenile offenders have the opportunity to reenter their communities successfully on release from correctional facilities. Other priorities included streamlining the dissemination of information and reaching out to faith-based organizations. OJJDP also worked extensively on child victimization issues, youth gang initiatives, and tribal youth programs.

These and other activities described in OJJDP Annual Report 2002 illustrate the Office’s continuing commitment to preventing and reducing delinquency, strengthening the juvenile justice system, and protecting children against abuse and exploitation. Together with its federal, state, and local partners, OJJDP is working for the day when every American child will have the opportunity to live and learn in a safe and nurturing environment.

J. Robert Flores
Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
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How To Access Information From OJJDP

All OJJDP publications mentioned in this Report—and many more—are available from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse (JJC) via the Internet, telephone, and fax.

**Internet:**  
www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ojjdp (to view or download materials)  
www.puborder.ncjrs.org (to order publications online)  
To ask questions, visit askjj.ncjrs.org.

**Telephone:** 800–851–3420

**Fax:** 410–792–4358 (to order publications)

To stay informed about the latest OJJDP publications and activities, subscribe to the JUVJUST electronic mailing list and *OJJDP News @ a Glance*, the Office’s bimonthly newsletter. For information on how to subscribe, visit OJJDP’s Web site at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ojjdp.
An Introduction to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) was created by Congress in 1974 to help states and communities prevent and control delinquency and improve their juvenile justice systems.\(^1\) A component of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), OJJDP is the primary federal agency responsible for addressing juvenile crime and delinquency and the problems of abused, neglected, missing, and exploited children and for coordinating federal efforts in these areas.

Although the nature and extent of delinquency and abuse continually change, the Office remains committed to providing national leadership and supporting a broad array of activities to help states, local communities, and tribal jurisdictions meet the many juvenile justice challenges facing them. These challenges include preparing juvenile offenders to return to their communities following release from secure correctional facilities; dealing with the small percentage of serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders; holding offenders appropriately accountable for their unlawful actions; combating alcohol and drug abuse; helping states address the disproportionate confinement of minority youth; and helping children who have been victimized by crime and child abuse.

The mission of OJJDP is to provide national leadership, coordination, and resources to prevent and respond to juvenile offending and child victimization. OJJDP accomplishes this mission by helping states, local communities, and tribal jurisdictions 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 sponsors a wide range of research and evaluation efforts, statistical studies, and demonstration programs; provides technical assistance and training; produces and distributes online and printed documents and other products containing reliable and relevant information about juvenile justice topics; manages programs that address situations involving missing and exploited children; and administers formula, block, and discretionary grant programs. Together, these activities form a continuum of programs necessary to respond effectively to juvenile delinquency, crime, and victimization.

This Report highlights OJJDP’s major activities and accomplishments during fiscal year (FY) 2002. These highlights reflect the Office’s continuing commitment to programs that have the greatest potential for reducing juvenile delinquency and the victimization of children and for improving the juvenile justice system.

---

\(^1\)The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 5601 et seq. (JJDP Act), established OJJDP.

---

For Further Information

More information about OJJDP is available on the Office’s Web site at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ojjdp and from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse (see information on page xii).
Chapter 1
Highlighting Major Accomplishments

FY 2002 brought challenges, accomplishments, and new directions at OJJDP. Accomplishments included improving dissemination efforts, reaching out to the faith-based community, and sponsoring several major conferences. In addition, a new Administrator was named to head OJJDP.

During this time, the Office also continued to focus its efforts on programs that help prevent, intervene in, and treat delinquent behavior by funding activities that provide youth with skills and values that will enable them to achieve their potential. The Office also worked extensively on child victimization issues, public safety and law enforcement, youth gang initiatives, and tribal youth programs.

OJJDP continued to provide critical statistical information to the field during FY 2002, including data about juvenile crime rates. The Office is especially pleased that the steady decline in juvenile crime arrests is continuing, according to data reported annually by local law enforcement agencies nationwide to the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI’s) Uniform Crime Reporting Program. The most recent data show that the juvenile arrest rate for violent crime in 2001 was 44 percent below its peak in 1994, reaching its lowest level since 1983, while the rate for murder dropped 70 percent from its peak in 1993. In 2001, law enforcement agencies in the United States made an estimated 2.3 million arrests of persons under age 18, down 4 percent from 2000.

This chapter highlights OJJDP’s major accomplishments in FY 2002. These accomplishments, together with the other activities discussed elsewhere in this Report, illustrate OJJDP’s ongoing commitment to helping the nation address its many juvenile justice issues.

New Administrator

J. Robert Flores was sworn in as Administrator of OJJDP on April 17, 2002. Mr. Flores, who has experience in both the public and private sectors, served in the Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section of the Criminal Division of the U.S. Department of Justice from 1989 to 1997. Before joining DOJ, he was an Assistant District Attorney in Manhattan. More recently, Mr. Flores was Vice President and Senior Counsel for the National Law Center for Children and Families. Mr. Flores also was a congressional appointee to the Commission on Online Child Protection.

During his tenure as Administrator, Mr. Flores hopes to expand the role of faith-based organizations and community groups in delinquency prevention efforts; increase OJJDP’s collaboration with other agencies; continue to address the disproportionate representation of minority youth in the juvenile justice system; and look for innovative ways to assist American Indian and Alaska Native communities in their efforts to address juvenile justice issues and reduce delinquency.

An OJJDP satellite videoconference on December 6, 2002, featured a discussion with Mr. Flores. Topics included OJJDP research findings and initiatives; program priorities, including child prostitution, disproportionate minority confinement, tribal youth programs, and truancy; and resources available through OJJDP. Information about the videoconference is available on OJJDP’s Web site.
Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative

Helping ensure that serious and violent juvenile offenders safely and successfully return to their communities after leaving correctional institutions was a major focus of OJP and OJJDP in FY 2002. The Office was one of many federal partners participating in the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative, an innovative program that awarded more than $100 million in funding to 68 programs that target serious, high-risk juvenile and adult offenders returning from commitment in a state training school, a juvenile or adult correctional facility, or, where necessary, a residential treatment facility. The goals of the initiative, discussed on pages 30–31, are to reduce recidivism; enhance public safety; equip returning offenders with the ability to become productive, law-abiding citizens; and leverage existing community resources by fostering linkages and accessing currently provided services.

New Approach to Sharing Information

Although sharing pertinent information with juvenile justice practitioners, policymakers, and the public remains a priority at OJJDP, the Office began updating and streamlining its dissemination efforts in FY 2002. Changes include targeting mailings of publications and program solicitations to more specifically defined audiences and encouraging readers to download documents from the Office’s Web site rather than ordering paper copies. This new approach to information dissemination, which has helped reduce paper clutter for OJJDP’s constituents and has brought considerable savings in postage and print costs to taxpayers, is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 9.

A major new dissemination activity in FY 2002 was the introduction of OJJDP News @ a Glance. This popular bimonthly newsletter provides up-to-date notices of agency activities, recent publications, funding opportunities, and upcoming events.

Program Solicitations and Peer Reviews

As part of OJJDP’s efforts to streamline its publications process, the Office instituted a new approach to promoting the program solicitations that announce availability of funding opportunities. Rather than printing bulk copies of the solicitations, OJJDP used online contacts, such as listservs and Webmasters, to promote the availability of program announcements. One result was lower print and mail costs, as most organizations downloaded the solicitations from the OJJDP Web site. In addition, because of increased exposure through online promotion, the number of applicants rose.

During FY 2002, OJJDP issued 8 program solicitations and received more than 1,400 applications in response. To ensure that only programs of the highest quality are funded, OJJDP conducts an intense peer review of all eligible applications for competitive discretionary funding. Peer reviewers include practitioners, researchers, and academicians from the public and private sectors. OJJDP convened 80 peer review panels to evaluate applications for the 8 programs competitively funded.

Outreach to Faith-Based Groups

OJJDP made a concerted effort in FY 2002 to reach out to faith-based groups, which historically have not been a part of its activities. The Office expanded its electronic and print mail lists to include more faith-based organizations, thus making these organizations more aware of opportunities for funding. In November 2001, OJJDP published a Fact Sheet about faith-based programs. Public/Private Ventures’ Evaluation of Faith-Based Programs describes a research and demonstration effort to involve faith-based institutions as the anchoring organizations within local partnerships designed to address the developmental needs of high-risk juveniles.
OJJDP also encouraged existing grantees to recognize the role that faith-based organizations can play in community prevention efforts. The National Youth Gang Symposium featured a workshop on faith-based approaches to gangs. The National Mentoring Center sponsored a workshop to show mentoring programs how they might collaborate with faith-based organizations. Faith- and community-based initiatives were also the topic of a meeting of the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Several faith-based organizations also were selected to participate in OJJDP grant programs. For example, 12 percent of OJJDP’s Juvenile Mentoring Program grants were awarded to faith-based organizations. Faith-based groups also participate in several of the community coalitions funded through the Drug-Free Communities Support Program and the Title V Community Prevention Grants Program. All of the above programs are discussed later in this Report.

Major Conferences

OJJDP also sponsored and participated in several major conferences during FY 2002:

✦ The third National Youth Gang Symposium, held in June 2002 in Orlando, FL, drew 1,200 participants. The event offered an array of activities and information focusing on innovative and viable gang-related programs and strategies. The conference and other OJJDP gang initiatives are described in Chapter 5.

✦ OJJDP also participated in the first National Youth Summit held in June 2002 in Washington, DC. The summit, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in collaboration with several other federal agencies, brought together a diverse group of young people and adults to promote positive youth development. U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft addressed the summit.

✦ In August 2002, more than 2,000 professionals involved in preventing, investigating, and prosecuting crimes against children gathered in Dallas, TX, for the 14th Annual Crimes Against Children Conference, sponsored by OJJDP and presented by the Dallas Children’s Advocacy Center and the Dallas Police Department. Attendees included law enforcement and child protective services workers, attorneys, child advocates, and
The first White House Conference on Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children was held October 2, 2002, in Washington, DC. OJJDP and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children joined the White House in sponsoring the conference. President Bush presented the keynote address, and OJJDP released a major new series of Bulletins summarizing findings from the Second National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children (NISMART–2). The conference and NISMART findings are discussed in Chapter 2.

Youth Court Achievements

OJJDP had several major accomplishments involving youth courts during FY 2002. OJJDP and the National Youth Court Center (NYCC), which the Office funds, designated September as the first National Youth Court Month. As part of the observance, NYCC disseminated an online action kit to help communities promote youth courts. Earlier in the year, OJJDP’s youth court program was recognized at the United Nations’ Special Session on Children. An OJJDP-funded youth court training package received a prestigious national award from the Association of Educational Publishers. Finally, the NYCC Web site received the 2002 “CivicMind” award. OJJDP’s youth court activities are discussed on pages 25–26.
Chapter 2
Responding to Child Victimization

Many of the nation’s children face a tough time growing up. They are preyed upon by other children and sometimes by adults, including family members and acquaintances. These children are often subjected to physical, mental, and sexual abuse. Even children who are not victims of such abuse often witness violence in their neighborhoods and homes and in the media. In addition, ready access to the Internet has left parents and child protection and law enforcement agencies struggling to protect children from online victimization, including pornography and child prostitution.

Protecting children from abuse and other crimes has long been a priority at OJJDP, and as the types of abuse have changed over the years, so have OJJDP’s responses. The Office supported a broad array of programs during FY 2002, all designed to help families and communities respond to child victimization. The programs run the gamut from providing reliable statistics about missing and exploited children to demonstrating constructive interventions for children exposed to violence to confronting cyber crimes of online sexual exploitation.

Many of OJJDP’s FY 2002 achievements focused on the issue of missing children. For example, the Office released new findings from a series of research studies, called public attention to the issue of missing and exploited children through a White House conference, sponsored a ceremony to mark the 20th anniversary of the Missing Children’s Act, and collaborated with state and local entities to adopt AMBER Alert plans, which notify the public immediately when a child is reported missing.

Although OJJDP’s primary goal is to prevent child victimization, addressing intervention and treatment issues is equally important. Research has found that individuals who experience maltreatment during childhood are significantly more likely to display a variety of problems during adolescence, including serious and violent delinquency, teen pregnancy, drug use, low academic achievement, and mental health problems. Research also shows that children who witness domestic violence experience higher levels of childhood behavioral, social, and emotional problems than children who have not witnessed such violence. Thus, intervention and treatment are of paramount importance.

OJJDP addressed these issues through a variety of activities. One program, Children’s Advocacy Centers, helps all components of the system—law enforcement, child protection workers, medical and mental health professionals, and prosecutors—work together on child abuse and neglect cases. Because courts play a pivotal role in child abuse cases, OJJDP supports several programs in this area. One initiative provides advocates to make sure that the judicial system serves the best interests of abused and neglected children, and another helps communities replicate model court programs.

Reliable information and training are also important tools in combating child victimization, and OJJDP continued to provide both to practitioners, researchers, and the public during FY 2002. A national conference, for example, offered practical information about successful intervention strategies for addressing crimes against children. The OJJDP-funded National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) continued to play a pivotal role in working with parents, law enforcement, and the public on issues related to missing and exploited children. In addition, OJJDP published several new documents about child victimization—some directed to parents, others to law enforcement.

The programs discussed in this chapter represent OJJDP’s commitment to helping communities and the juvenile justice system respond more effectively
to child victimization. Diverse in design and implementation, all of these programs offer information and strategies to help America’s children grow up safely.

**AMBER Alert Activities**

Statistics indicate that kidnapped children are at greatest risk of harm in the first hours after an abduction; of those children who are killed by their abductor, 74 percent are killed within 3 hours, and 99 percent within 24 hours. That is why it is so important to get information about missing children out to the public as soon as possible. One way to do this is through AMBER Alert plans.

The first AMBER plan was introduced in Texas in 1996 in memory of Amber Hagerman, a young girl from the Dallas area who was kidnapped and murdered. Shocked and outraged by Amber’s death, citizens contacted radio stations in the Dallas area and suggested that they broadcast special alerts to help prevent such tragedies in the future. In response, the Dallas/Fort Worth Association of Radio Managers teamed with local law enforcement agencies in northern Texas to develop an early warning system that could help find abducted children.

Other communities across the nation also began to implement AMBER plans. As of March 2003, 49 local and regional plans and 38 statewide plans had been established, and AMBER plans had been credited with the recovery of 47 children.

The plans use the same Emergency Alert System (EAS) that is deployed in severe weather emergencies. When a law enforcement agency confirms that a child has been abducted, it notifies a designated primary EAS radio station, which relays the information to all area radio and TV stations and cable systems. Radio stations then interrupt their programming with the alert, and TV stations and cable systems run a “crawl” message on the screen (often with a photo of the child).

During FY 2002, NCMEC (see page 11) spearheaded a campaign to promote national implementation of AMBER Alerts. The alerts were in the national spotlight as Congress began working on legislation to pass a national AMBER Alert Act and when President Bush directed the Attorney General to name an AMBER Alert National Coordinator, Deborah J. Daniels, Assistant Attorney General for OJP, was designated as National Coordinator and is helping to develop, enhance, and coordinate AMBER plans nationwide. Ms. Daniels serves as a central point of contact and works with states and local communities to increase the number of AMBER plans and to ensure that these plans work together to create a national network.

Complete details about AMBER Alert are available on the NCMEC Web site (www.missingkids.com). The site includes guidelines for establishing a local AMBER Alert plan, an “AMBER Alert Kit” for law enforcement agencies and broadcasters, and information on AMBER Alert plan locations. Detailed information about national coordination of AMBER Alert activity is available on OJP’s AMBER Web site (www.ojp.usdoj.gov/amberalert).

Our intent is not to make AMBER a federal program. Rather, we want to help communities, states, and regions to develop effective AMBER Alert plans and collaborations among themselves.

Deborah J. Daniels, Assistant Attorney General for OJP and AMBER Alert National Coordinator

---

2President Bush signed the AMBER Alert Act into law on April 30, 2003.
Association of Missing and Exploited Children's Organizations

To help improve the quality, availability, and coordination of services provided to missing and exploited children and their families, OJJDP awarded a grant to the Association of Missing and Exploited Children’s Organizations (AMECO) of Bronxville, NY, in FY 2002. The organization works to ensure the effective management and coordination of public and private sector assistance to missing and exploited children and their families. AMECO services include parent-to-parent mentoring for families who have a child missing (Team H.O.P.E.). Further information about AMECO is available from its Web site (www.amecoinc.org).

Children’s Advocacy Centers

A Children’s Advocacy Center (CAC) is a comprehensive, child-focused program, located in a child-friendly setting, that brings together law enforcement, child protection professionals, prosecutors, and mental health and medical staff to handle child abuse and neglect cases. Because CACs are designed by communities to meet their particular needs, there are many types. The mission of all CACs, however, is to ensure that children are not further victimized by the systems designed for their protection and to provide consistent, compassionate support for child victims and their families.

Since FY 1993, OJJDP has provided funds to the National Children’s Alliance (NCA, formerly the National Network of Children’s Advocacy Centers), of Washington, DC, to help communities develop CACs and multidisciplinary teams. As authorized by the Victims of Child Abuse Act, OJJDP established four Regional Children’s Advocacy Centers (RCACs) in 1994 to further assist in the development of CACs. These centers are the Midwest RCAC in St. Paul, MN; the Northeast RCAC in Philadelphia, PA; the Southern RCAC in Huntsville, AL; and the Western RCAC in Colorado Springs, CO. Information on states served by each RCAC is available from NCA (call 800–239–9950 or visit www.nca-online.org).

During FY 2002, NCA provided 414 subgrants to help communities develop and support CACs. The RCACs and NCA also provided 179 training events. Through funding from OJP’s Office for Victims of Crime in FY 2002, OJJDP provided $200,000 to NCA for tribal demonstration grants. NCA has awarded grants to three American Indian communities to help them develop fully operational CACs. This tribal initiative will continue through FY 2004, and each site will receive $110,000 each year.

During FY 2002, the RCACs and NCA also continued to expand the NCAnet program, which links communities through teleconferencing. Eighteen sites participated in teleconferencing and received training and technical assistance in areas such as peer review of medical findings and forensic interviews, multidisciplinary case review/consultations, and current issues in assessing child abuse.

Court Appointed Special Advocate Program

Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) programs help ensure that abused and neglected children who are living in foster care (or are at risk of being placed in foster care by a judicial system) receive timely, sensitive, and effective representation in dependency hearings. CASA volunteers are appointed by judges to advocate in court for the best interests of abused or neglected children. The program started as a pilot program in Seattle, WA, in January 1977, with 110 trained volunteers. Today, there are more than 58,000 CASA volunteers nationwide.

The National Court Appointed Special Advocate Association (NCASAA) of Seattle, WA, which was founded in 1982 to help replicate and support CASA programs across the nation, has been supported by OJJDP since 1984. Today, NCASAA represents more than 950 programs, which are
located in every state and in Washington, DC, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. NCASAA encourages the development of new CASA programs and strengthens existing programs by providing training and technical assistance, information, and resources to all components of the juvenile justice system. The association is focusing on communities where representation rates are low, the numbers of abused and neglected children are high, and service systems are not meeting the needs of families and children. NCASAA is also helping to develop state CASA organizations, which will help provide services to local programs.

NCASAA offers seminars, conferences, electronic online services, a resource library, information materials, publications, and consultation services. NCASAA also sponsors an annual national training conference for CASA program staff and volunteers, social workers, judges, and attorneys. The 2002 conference, “Changing a Million Lives—One Life at a Time,” was held April 27–30, 2002, in San Diego, CA. Antwone Fisher, who wrote a best-selling book and a movie script about his experiences as a foster child, was a featured speaker, and 1,394 individuals attended the conference.

During FY 2002, NCASAA released its national training curriculum, which is the basis of volunteer training in most CASA programs, and provided local and regional training sessions on the manual. NCASAA also piloted a self-assessment tool developed as part of its Quality Assurance initiative, which includes the NCASAA Standards for CASA Programs. The self-assessment will be mandatory for all programs in 2003. In addition, NCASAA provided 80 grants to CASA programs and chapters during FY 2002. More information about NCASAA is available at its Web site (www.nationalcasa.org).

Crimes Against Children Conference

OJJDP sponsored the 14th Annual Crimes Against Children Conference on August 5–8, 2002, in Dallas, TX. The conference provided practical instruction—based on the latest information and ideas and the most successful intervention strategies—for professionals involved in preventing, investigating, and prosecuting crimes against children. Presented by the Dallas Children’s Advocacy Center and the Dallas Police Department, the conference brought together nearly 2,000 law enforcement and child protective services workers, attorneys, child advocates, and others who work directly with cases involving crimes against children.

Speakers included U.S. Senator Kay Bailey Hutchinson (R-TX) and Donna Norris, mother of Amber Hagerman, a young Dallas girl who was kidnapped and murdered. (The first AMBER Alert was introduced in Texas in 1996 in memory of Amber; see page 8). In addition, Patricia Bradbury, whose daughter was kidnapped but returned safely because of AMBER Alert, spoke at a press conference held in connection with the conference.

Conference workshops gave participants the opportunity to hear veteran detectives describe investigative techniques for cases involving child victims and to learn about evidence collection techniques from special agents of the FBI. Prosecutors demonstrated questioning techniques and offered case development guidelines. Workshops were also taught by experts in child protective services.

Internet Crimes Against Children

OJJDP awarded a total of $1.8 million in FY 2002 funding to six law enforcement agencies to create Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) Task Force programs in their communities. The following additional agencies were awarded grants as part of OJJDP’s efforts to expand the ICAC program to areas that do not currently have a regional task force presence: the City of San Jose, CA; Georgia Bureau of Investigation; Indiana State Police; Kentucky State Police; Louisiana Attorney General’s Office; and St. Louis, MO, Police Department.
OJJDP created the ICAC Task Force Program in 1998 to help state and local law enforcement agencies prevent and respond to online crimes against children. ICAC funding helps these agencies develop regional, multijurisdictional, and multi-agency task forces to prevent, interdict, and investigate ICAC offenses. ICAC regional task forces conduct investigations and prosecute criminals who sexually exploit children. These task forces conduct computer forensic examinations and provide other law enforcement agencies with technical assistance necessary to investigate these crimes. The task forces also provide prevention education—through publications, presentations, and public service announcements—to parents, children and teenagers, educators, prosecutors, law enforcement, and professionals working on child victimization issues. Currently, 36 regional task forces coordinate the activities of more than 160 law enforcement agencies in 46 states. As of September 2002, ICAC task forces had participated in more than 3,500 investigations and assisted in more than 2,500 computer forensic examinations.

In FY 2002, OJJDP published Protecting Children in Cyberspace: The ICAC Task Force Program. This Bulletin provides an overview of the ICAC program.

**Model Courts Initiative**

Studies indicate that children who are abused and neglected are at significantly higher risk for academic failure, chronic delinquency, adult criminal behavior, antisocial personality disorder, and violent crime. Studies have also shown that the longer a child remains in out-of-home care, the greater the probability of negative outcomes. Preliminary research suggests that more efficient and effective dependency courts can reduce the length of time children spend in the system. Through the Model Courts initiative, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) of Reno, NV, provides intensive training and technical assistance to improve the courts’ handling of child abuse and neglect cases and ensure more timely decisionmaking in permanency planning.

With OJJDP funding support, NCJFCJ assisted 24 Model Court programs across the nation during FY 2002. Model Court sites tailor and implement the promising practices outlined in Resource Guidelines: Improving Court Practice in Child Abuse and Neglect Cases, a nationally recognized handbook developed by NCJFCJ for use by dependency courts and the child welfare community with which they collaborate. NCJFCJ also incorporates lessons gleaned from reforms in Model Court sites into publications and other forms of technical assistance for dependency courts nationwide. More information about the Model Courts initiative and the achievements of individual courts is available on NCJFCJ’s Web site (www.pppncjfcj.org/html/model_courts.html).

**National Center for Missing and Exploited Children**

Since 1984, NCMEC, located in Alexandria, VA, has spearheaded a national effort to prevent child abduction and exploitation and to return missing children to their families. The center operates a 24-hour toll-free hotline (800–843–5678), which has received more than 1.7 million calls from around the world. The hotline staff can handle phone calls in more than 140 languages.

NCMEC maintains a Web site (www.missingkids.com), which includes publications and information about protecting children. The center also manages the CyberTipline (www.cybertipline.com), where citizens can report suspicious online activity involving sexual exploitation of children.

During FY 2002, NCMEC took the lead in a national campaign to implement AMBER Alerts (see page 8). The center also assisted OJJDP in sponsoring National Missing Children’s Day (see page 13) and the White House Conference on Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children (see page 14).

NCMEC, in partnership with Toys “R” Us, launched the National Photo ID Program. Introduced in all Toys “R” Us stores, the program provides parents with an up-to-date photo of their child. The photo is
taken with a digital camera and logged onto a floppy disk, which contains other pertinent information that can be used if the child becomes missing.

In addition, NCMEC’s International Division updated its Web site with a new section, “Resources for Attorneys Handling International Child Abduction Cases.” The new section provides information to support attorneys working on cases involving the Hague Convention, a treaty designed to deter international child abduction.

National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children

The words “missing child” call to mind tragic and frightening kidnappings reported in the national news. But a child can be missing for many reasons, and the problem of missing children is far more complex than the headlines suggest. Getting a clear picture of how many children become missing—and why—is an important step in addressing the problem. OJJDP released important new findings from a major research study about this issue at the White House Conference on Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children in October 2002 (see page 14). The findings from the Second National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children (NISMART–2) provide national estimates of missing children based on surveys of households, juvenile residential facilities, and law enforcement agencies. The study also presents statistical profiles of these children, including their demographic characteristics and the circumstances of their disappearances. The first NISMART study was conducted in 1988; NISMART–2 spanned the years 1997 to 1999.

To help disseminate findings from the surveys, OJJDP designed and released a special series of NISMART Bulletins and NISMART Questions and Answers. The four Bulletins present selected survey findings, analyze the findings, and discuss their policy implications. Key findings from the Bulletins are highlighted below.

♦ National Estimates of Missing Children: An Overview. The total number of children who were missing from their caretakers in 1999 (i.e., their caretakers did not know their whereabouts and were alarmed for at least an hour while trying to locate them) is estimated to be 1,315,600. Nearly all of these children (1,312,800 or 99.8 percent) had returned home or had been located by the time the study data were collected.

♦ Nonfamily Abducted Children: National Estimates and Characteristics. In 1999, there were an estimated 115 stereotypical kidnappings, defined as abductions perpetrated by a stranger or slight acquaintance and involving a child who was transported 50 or more miles, detained overnight, held for ransom or with intent to keep the child permanently, or killed. In 40 percent of stereotypical kidnappings, the child was killed.

♦ Children Abducted by Family Members: National Estimates and Characteristics. An estimated 203,900 children were victims of a family abduction in 1999. Among these, 117,200 were missing from their caretakers, and of these, an estimated 56,500 were reported to authorities for assistance in locating the children.

♦ Runaway/Thrownaway Children: National Estimates and Characteristics. In 1999, an estimated 1,682,900 youth had a runaway/thrownaway episode (i.e., either ran away from home or were thrown out by their caregivers). Of these youth, 37 percent were missing from their caretakers and 21 percent were reported to authorities for purposes of locating the youth.
National Missing Children’s Day

On May 23, 2002, OJJDP and NCMEC marked the 20th anniversary of the Missing Children’s Act at the annual National Missing Children’s Day ceremony, held at the DOJ Great Hall of Justice in Washington, DC. The theme was “20 Years of Searching To Bring Our Missing Children Home.”

Guests included children who had been missing but were found and reunited with their families, parents of children who were still missing, law enforcement officers who investigate these cases, child advocates, and individuals and corporate sponsors dedicated to reuniting families. During the ceremony, former U.S. Senator Paula Hawkins of Florida, one of the leading proponents of the Missing Children’s Act, recalled the challenges encountered in passing the Act.

The prestigious Law Enforcement Officers of the Year Award was shared by four officers, who were recognized for their combined, multijurisdictional efforts to find a 17-year-old girl who was abducted from a shopping mall parking lot in Kearney, NE. The girl was recovered 7 days later in Montana and reunited with her family. Honorees were Undersheriff Michael Sargeant and Sheriff William Barron from the Lake County Sheriff’s Office in Polson, MT; Special Agent Douglas Schreurs from the FBI Field Office in Grand Island, NE; and Investigator Tony Cordova from the Kearney Police Department. Eight other law enforcement officers and two organizations were also honored for their efforts on behalf of abducted and abused children.

The Volunteer Award for 2002 went to Steven Cullen, Esq., of the Miles & Stockbridge law firm in Baltimore, MD, in recognition of the thousands of hours of services he has donated to parents whose children have been abducted to other countries. ChoicePoint, Inc., of Alpharetta, GA, received the 2002 Corporate Leadership Award.

Several youth were also recognized at the ceremony, illustrating that children play a crucial role in the safety and recovery of other youth. Keisha Reigert of Cape Girardeau, MO, and Lorelie Trujillo of Irving, TX, received 2002 Courage Awards for helping to bring missing children home to their families. Kelsey Sauerer, a middle school student from Sartell, MN, received a certificate for creating the winning poster in the 2002 Missing Children’s Day Art Contest.

Safe Start Initiative

OJJDP began the Safe Start Initiative in FY 1999 to help communities prevent and reduce the impact of family and community violence on young children. The program is based in part on the Child Development-Community Policing (CD–CP) pilot program developed by Yale University and the New Haven (CT) Police Department with OJJDP support. The CD–CP program brings together police officers and mental health professionals to provide constructive intervention for children who have witnessed or been victims of violent crime.

OJJDP awarded more than $6 million in grants in FY 2001 to nine sites to develop comprehensive programs to help children exposed to violence. The sites are Baltimore, MD; Bridgeport, CT; Chatham County, NC; Chicago, IL; Pinellas County, FL; Rochester, NY; San Francisco, CA; Spokane, WA; and Washington County, ME. In FY 2002, OJJDP added two tribal sites to the initiative: Pueblo of Zuni, NM; and Sitka Tribe, AK.

The grantees used their first-year funding to review existing community services and identify gaps. Based on these reviews, each site has developed and is now implementing a 6-year comprehensive plan that emphasizes coordination among law enforcement, mental health and medical professionals, and child protective services providers. These plans...
include efforts such as child advocacy centers, home visitation programs, and domestic violence services for battered mothers whose children are at high risk of exposure to violence.

In addition to funding these 11 Safe Start sites, OJJDP continued support for 18 more months to two sites—Miami, FL, and Newark, NJ—that are focusing on specific improvements to services for children exposed to violence. The National Civic League of Denver, CO, through its office in Washington, DC, is working with OJJDP to coordinate and provide broad-based training and technical support to the Safe Start sites. In addition, a national team led by Caliber Associates of Fairfax, VA, is collaborating with the National Center for Children Exposed to Violence, located in New Haven, CT, to provide training and technical support to help sites develop partnerships between police and mental health professionals.

White House Conference on Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children

A major achievement for OJJDP in 2002 was its participation in the first White House Conference on Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children, which was held October 2, 2002, in Washington, DC. President Bush presented keynote remarks at the conference, and several top-ranking federal officials—Attorney General John Ashcroft, Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson, Education Secretary Rod Paige, FBI Director Robert Mueller, and Secretary of State Colin Powell—took part in the conference. OJJDP and NCMEC joined the White House in sponsoring the event. The all-day conference drew more than 600 attendees, including officials from all levels of government, law enforcement personnel, families of child victims, researchers, and corporate leaders.

The President told participants:

[This conference] is the beginning of a refocused effort at the federal level to help save people’s lives. . . . This is the beginning of a successful strategy implemented at all levels of government and all parts of our society to recognize a real threat and to deal with it; to recognize there are some so evil in our society that they’re willing to harm our most precious and most vulnerable citizens; to be prepared to respond quickly when that happens; to help people prevent it from happening in the first place; and to make it clear, if you do it and we catch you, there’s going to be serious consequences for you.

Both the Attorney General and the FBI Director stressed that efforts to address the problem of missing and exploited children remain a DOJ priority, even as the Department focuses on homeland security issues.

The conference included seven panel sessions, which centered on recent research findings, prevention of child victimization, and effective law enforcement policies for handling crimes against children. One session addressed concerns, prompted by a number of nationally publicized abductions during the summer of 2002, that law enforcement cannot always prevent abductions or return children unharmed to their families. OJJDP Administrator J. Robert Flores moderated this panel session on “What Works,” which highlighted technologies, law enforcement efforts, and community responses that demonstrate how much progress has been made in developing tools to help keep children safe from abduction and exploitation. Other topics discussed in the panel sessions included child abduction, domestic and international parental kidnapping, sex trafficking of children, child pornography, runaway and homeless youth, Internet safety, and corporate and community involvement.

When a child’s liberty and innocence are taken, it is a terrible, terrible loss. And those responsible have committed a terrible crime. Our society has a solemn duty to shield children from exploitation and danger.

President George W. Bush, October 2, 2002


Additional information about the conference, including remarks by the President and other high-ranking federal officials, is available at www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/white_house_conf.

New Publications

OJJDP published several documents in FY 2002 to help researchers, law enforcement, parents, and the public respond to child victimization. These included the NISMART–2 publications described on page 12 and the publications described below.

The Criminal Justice System’s Response to Parental Abduction. OJJDP funded a study to determine whether and how the criminal justice system intervenes when parents abduct their children. The study reviewed all stages of the criminal justice system’s response to parental abduction, including the reporting of the abduction, investigation of the case, finding and recovery of the child, and criminal prosecution of the perpetrator or perpetrators. This 16-page Bulletin summarizes findings from the study, which was conducted for OJJDP by the American Bar Association’s Center on Children and the Law, located in Rockville, MD.

A Family Resource Guide on International Parental Kidnapping. Every year, hundreds of children in the United States are victims of international parental kidnapping, defined as an abduction to a foreign country by a noncustodial parent. This 148-page publication provides detailed and practical advice about preventing international kidnapping and increasing the chance that children who are kidnapped or wrongfully retained will be returned. The guide discusses what can be done to prevent an international parental kidnapping, stop a kidnapping in progress, locate a kidnapped or wrongfully retained child in another country, bring an abductor to justice, recover a kidnapped or wrongfully retained child from another country, and reestablish access to a child in another country. The guide also presents descriptions and realistic assessments of the civil and criminal remedies available in international parental kidnapping cases. It explains applicable laws, offers practical advice on overcoming frequently encountered obstacles, and prepares parents for the legal and emotional difficulties they may experience.

Issues in Resolving Cases of International Child Abduction by Parents. This 20-page Bulletin describes key findings from a study funded by OJJDP to identify barriers encountered by those seeking to resolve cases of international child abduction by parents. The Bulletin features highlights from the study, including survey results, best practices, and recommendations. The study is one of the first attempts to develop extensive research findings about the experiences of left-behind parents, practices of the Hague Convention Central Authorities, and strategies that can be used by attorneys, judges, law enforcement personnel, and other professionals in recovering abducted children quickly and safely. The study was conducted for OJJDP by the American Bar Association’s Center on Children and the Law.

A Law Enforcement Guide on International Parental Kidnapping. A companion publication to A Family Resource Guide on International Parental Kidnapping, described above, this 116-page guide is designed for local, state, and federal law enforcement officers.
called upon to respond to cases of international parental kidnapping. Although these cases present formidable challenges, the challenges can be overcome when law enforcement actions are timely and informed. This guide presents information that officers need to work effectively with custodial parents to locate and reclaim their children. The guide suggests ways to prevent international abductions; discusses applicable laws, legal remedies, and potential liabilities; describes the role of law enforcement as the initial responder and investigator; and offers strategies for extradition, reunification, and recovery. (Note that this publication is not available online.)

_The Uniform Child-Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act._ This 16-page Bulletin describes the most recent in a series of laws designed to deter interstate parental kidnapping and promote uniform jurisdiction and enforcement provisions in interstate child-custody and visitation cases. The law was approved by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in 1997.

_When Your Child Is Missing: A Family Survival Guide._ OJJDP released a second edition of this popular 94-page guide in October 2002. Written in 1998 by parents for parents, the guide provides firsthand insights into what families can expect and should do when their children are missing. The updated guide includes new contact information and Web sites. The guide is divided into seven chapters, each structured to help parents find information quickly and easily. The chapters explain both short- and long-term issues and provide checklists and chapter summaries for later reference. A Spanish translation—_Cuando su Niño Desaparece: Una Guía para la Supervivencia de la Familia_—is also available.

**On the Horizon**

**Responding to Prostitution of Children**

Recognizing that exploitation through prostitution and pornography is an extremely damaging form of child victimization, OJJDP began laying the groundwork in FY 2002 to make this critical issue a priority in FY 2003. As an important first step, the agency held a summit to address the problem of commercial sexual exploitation of children and youth. More than 150 individuals from across the nation attended the 2-day event. The theme was “Protecting Our Children: Working Together To End Child Prostitution.” Participants developed recommendations for policy considerations and action steps at the federal, state, and local levels and identified a number of needs. Larry D. Thompson, Deputy Attorney General, and Deborah J. Daniels, Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs, addressed summit participants. Participants also heard from individuals who had experienced sexual exploitation as children. Next steps for OJJDP include implementing its initiative to address commercial sexual exploitation of children and youth and holding a satellite teleconference on the issue.

**Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Courts in America**

During FY 2002, OJJDP developed a new project to help courts that handle child abuse and neglect cases manage and track data. A competitive solicitation for the Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Courts in America: Management Information Systems Project (SANCA MIS) was released in March 2003. This project will help abuse and neglect courts develop, implement, and maintain automated information systems, which will enhance court compliance with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 by automating national functional data standards and tracking national performance measures. The solicitation is based on the Strengthening Abuse and Neglect Courts Act (Public Law 106–314, authorized in October 2000).
Chapter 3
Preventing and Intervening in Delinquency

OJJDP recognizes the importance of taking aggressive steps to stop delinquency before it happens and of intervening swiftly and appropriately when it does. During FY 2002, the Office continued to support a variety of activities that help communities and states develop and implement effective prevention and intervention programs.

Many of these programs stress the importance of coordinating community and agency services and resources. Coordination not only helps eliminate duplication of efforts, it also helps governments and organizations stretch their dollars as budgets shrink. The federal government has its own tool to help coordinate federal delinquency prevention programs—the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. During FY 2002, OJJDP took steps to ensure that the federal agencies that make up the Council work in tandem on programs to more efficiently help the nation’s children.

Several of the Office’s prevention programs also involve community support. Examples include the Drug-Free Communities Support Program, the Juvenile Mentoring Program, and the Title V Community Prevention Grants Program. Each draws heavily on community involvement and strives to implement programs that help keep young people out of the juvenile justice system. Another initiative, Safe Schools/Healthy Students, helps school districts link prevention activities with community-based services.

Young people themselves can play an important role in intervention activities. OJJDP’s youth court program, in which nonviolent offenders are judged by their peers, is one example of youth involvement. The youth court program had many accomplishments in FY 2002, including international recognition at the United Nations’ Special Session on Children.

Although it is important to help communities implement prevention and intervention strategies, it is just as important to make sure that these strategies work. That is why OJJDP continued to fund national evaluations of several of the programs highlighted here.

The research, demonstration, and training and technical assistance activities described in this chapter reflect OJJDP’s commitment to helping communities intervene early and effectively in children’s lives, before delinquency becomes a pattern of behavior that leads to involvement in the juvenile justice system.

Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Numerous federal agencies have programs and policies in place to serve the nation’s youth. Who keeps track of all these programs and policies? Who ensures that they are responsive to the nation’s needs? Given the number of agencies, activities, and individuals involved, a mechanism is needed to monitor the scope and policy implications of these efforts. The Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (the Council) is that mechanism.

Established by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, as amended, the Council is an independent body within the executive branch of the federal government. The Council comprises ex officio members from nine federal agencies and nine practitioner members appointed by the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House. The Attorney General serves as chairperson of the
Council, and the Administrator of OJJDP serves as vice chairperson.

The Council meets regularly to exchange information, ideas, and research findings. The meetings, which are open to the public, are announced in the Federal Register and on OJJDP’s Web site. An agenda and a meeting summary are posted on the Web site following each meeting.

Developing faith- and community-based initiatives was the topic of the Council meeting held on November 30, 2001. Speakers included James Davids, Deputy Director of DOJ’s Faith-Based Task Force, and Stanley Carlson-Thies, Associate Director, White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

Topics of the Council meeting held on May 17, 2002, were OJP’s Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (see page 30) and the Weed and Seed program. Weed and Seed is a community-based grant program that encourages local and state governments, citizens, and nonprofit agencies to work with law enforcement to “weed” neighborhoods of criminals and “seed” these communities with human services programs.

A Council meeting held on November 8, 2002, spotlighted an antidrug initiative and also reviewed research findings from an OJJDP study of child delinquency. The Marijuana Initiative: Call to Action, developed by the Office of National Drug Control Policy’s Demand Reduction Office, educates the public about the negative consequences of marijuana use. OJJDP’s Study Group on Very Young Offenders investigated child delinquency, in particular the development, intervention, and service needs of very young offenders.

To enhance the Council’s ability to investigate youth issues and make recommendations about youth to the President and Congress, the OJJDP Administrator has created subcommittees that will provide opportunities for progress between the Council’s quarterly meetings. These subcommittees will help the Council assess member agencies’ existing programs and expand the use of technology (such as mapping tools) to identify service gaps and target limited resources where they are needed most. The first subcommittees will focus on five areas: drugs/alcohol, education, family health, technology and research, and tribal youth.

Drug-Free Communities Support Program

The Drug-Free Communities Support Program (DFCSP) helps local community coalitions develop and implement programs to prevent and reduce the illegal use of alcohol, drugs, and tobacco by youth. During FY 2002, OJJDP awarded 70 new DFCSP grants totaling $6,809,909. In addition, 462 programs received continuation grants totaling nearly $38.5 million. Now in its fifth year of funding, this program is supporting 532 community coalitions in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. OJJDP administers DFCSP through an interagency agreement with the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy.

The 70 new DFCSP sites were selected through a competitive review process from a pool of 448 applicants. Award amounts range from $61,989 to $100,000. Participating coalitions are made up of youth and parents; business and media representatives; school and law enforcement officials; youth services, religious, and civic or volunteer organizations; health professionals and government agencies with expertise in the field of substance abuse; and others involved in reducing substance abuse. Award amounts, contact information, and individual project summaries are available on the DFCSP section of OJJDP’s Web site.

OJJDP also is funding a national evaluation of DFCSP. The longitudinal study is assessing the coalitions’ efforts to improve prevention infrastructure and community conditions and to address youth risk and resiliency factors and substance abuse patterns. A total of 214 grantees make up the national evaluation sample; 21 of these sites
serve as intensive study sites. Now in its fifth year, the evaluation is being conducted by Caliber Associates of Fairfax, VA.

During FY 2002, researchers analyzed grantees’ progress reports, data obtained during site visits with the 21 intensive study grantees, and other information—such as school-based survey data and public access databases—provided by individual grantees. Findings indicate that successful coalition development often includes the involvement of major community sectors in prevention efforts, a strategy that promotes both commitment and the efficient use of available resources. Researchers also found that DFCSP grantees have been highly successful in involving multiple community sectors. Nearly all (99 percent) of the grantees partner with schools, and most (94 percent) collaborate with more than 12 community partners. Government agencies participate in 92 percent of the coalitions. More than half (56 percent) of grantees reported an increase in the number of active individuals involved in their coalition between 2000 and 2002. Many (60 percent) of the intensive study sites reported that collaboration reduced duplication of effort. However, only 20 percent reported avoiding duplication of existing services.

Juvenile Mentoring Program

Juvenile mentoring programs provide adult support and positive role models to help at-risk youth overcome the challenges they face. During FY 2002, OJJDP’s Juvenile Mentoring Program (JUMP) awarded more than $14 million in grants to juvenile mentoring programs across the nation. These grants are helping more than 5,000 at-risk youth in 38 states and the District of Columbia receive one-to-one mentoring aimed at keeping them in school and away from drugs and crime. The 3-year grants range from $156,000 to $220,000. OJJDP has been awarding JUMP grants since 1995. The new awards in FY 2002 bring the total number of JUMP-funded sites to 269 in 48 states and 2 territories.

OJJDP selected the new sites through a competitive review process from a pool of 863 applicants. The selected mentoring sites are focusing on three

In Memory of Lauren Ziegler

OJJDP staff members were saddened by the sudden death of Lauren S. Ziegler, 34, from a pulmonary embolism on November 7, 2002. Ms. Ziegler managed the Drug-Free Communities Support Program for more than 4 years.

Ms. Ziegler, whose career was committed to helping others, was a devoted community volunteer, donating much of her free time as a grief/bereavement aide for Hospice Care of DC. She received numerous awards, including recognition from OJJDP for exemplary leadership and from the Hospices of the National Capital Region for her outstanding dedication.

J. Robert Flores, Administrator of OJJDP, Greg Dixon, Administrator of the Drug-Free Communities Support Program, Office of National Drug Control Policy, and Deborah J. Daniels, Assistant Attorney General, OJP, spoke at a memorial service held at OJP. During the service, Cynthia Ziegler of Chatham, NJ, accepted posthumous recognitions of her daughter’s professional accomplishments, including an award from the White House Advisory Commission on Drug-Free Communities acknowledging Lauren’s efforts to prevent drug abuse among youth.

3Under the 2002 reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, mentoring and several other programs soon will be consolidated into a single Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Block Grant Program.

4The pool of applicants for FY 2002 was the largest in the history of JUMP. In FY 2003, rather than issuing a new solicitation, OJJDP is selecting grantees from unfunded, highly rated applications received in FY 2002. The Office anticipates making 30 additional JUMP grant awards in FY 2003.
goals: improving academic performance, reducing school dropout rates, and preventing delinquent behavior. All sites are required to coordinate their activities with local education agencies. The new mentoring projects are working with children who have an incarcerated parent, minority youth, American Indians, children in foster care, youth in special education, and homeless youth. The projects have recruited a wide range of mentors, including military personnel, college students, representatives of faith-based organizations, business professionals, tribal leaders, and law enforcement personnel.

The grantees are equally distributed throughout the nation, with about a quarter of the FY 2002 grants going to each of the four geographical regions. More than 54 percent of the sites are in urban areas, almost 38 percent are in rural areas, and close to 8 percent are in suburban areas. Twelve percent of the grants were awarded to faith-based organizations.

To help strengthen the quality of JUMP, OJJDP created and supports the National Mentoring Center at the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in Portland, OR. The center provides training and technical assistance to JUMP grantees and other mentoring programs, produces publications and newsletters, and offers an online lending library of mentoring resources. The center’s FY 2002 activities included a workshop on how to collaborate with faith-based organizations in developing mentoring programs. Information from the workshop will be used to develop materials on managing mentoring programs in faith-based settings.

The center also conducted an orientation meeting for and needs assessment of new JUMP grantees, published and distributed more than 5,000 copies of two technical assistance packets, and produced three newsletters. The newsletters focused on the use of technology, diversity in mentoring, and capacity strengthening. The center maintains a Web site (www.nwrel.org/mentoring), which received approximately 120,000 visits during FY 2002. In addition, the center responded to more than 500 requests for technical assistance.

Since 1997, OJJDP has funded an evaluation of JUMP. The evaluation, which is being conducted by Information Technology International (ITI) of Potomac, MD, is scheduled to run through 2003. During FY 2002, researchers reviewed the approved evaluation design and used this review to develop and expand evaluation activities. One continuing activity, development of a publication to help local projects conduct their own evaluations, has as its goals improving the sustainability of the projects and generating additional lessons learned. ITI also expanded a special study of local education agencies and their role in JUMP projects. In addition, researchers continued to implement a study of the impact of mentoring on youth. This study, which is gathering post-mentoring assessment data on selected youth for 12-month periods, is designed to measure the effectiveness of mentoring programs in preventing delinquency, gang involvement, and school-related problems (academic failure and dropping out). Final findings are expected to be released in 2005.

**Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative**

OJJDP, in collaboration with several other federal agencies, continues to support the Safe Schools/Healthy Students (SS/HS) initiative, which helps urban, rural, suburban, and tribal school districts link prevention activities with community-based services. The SS/HS initiative is an unprecedented collaborative effort of the U.S. Departments of Education (ED), Justice (DOJ), and Health and Human Services (HHS). During FY 2002, these agencies awarded grants totaling more than $80 million to 46 communities, bringing to 97 the number of SS/HS projects funded over the past 3 years. A list of grantees is available from the U.S. Department of Education Web site (www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/sshsdg.html).

The SS/HS initiative encourages school districts to develop comprehensive plans to prevent violence and encourage positive child development. To receive funding, the districts are required to work...
with law enforcement officials, local mental health authorities, juvenile justice officials, and community-based organizations in developing the plans.

To support SS/HS projects, ED, OJJDP, and HHS awarded a cooperative agreement in 1999 to the National Mental Health Association of Alexandria, VA, to establish the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Action Center (www.sshsac.org). The center provides training and technical assistance to SS/HS grantees and is managed by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration of HHS.

To help determine the effectiveness of the SS/HS initiative, OJJDP, in collaboration with ED and HHS, awarded a cooperative agreement in 1999 for a national evaluation to be conducted by Research Triangle Institute of Research Triangle, NC, and RMC Research Corporation of Portland, OR. The evaluation is designed to provide information on how coalitions and collaborations at the community level developed strategies to address the six required elements of the SS/HS initiative. Specifically, the evaluation is examining two overarching questions:

✦ How, and at what costs, did the SS/HS initiative affect the local planning and implementation of comprehensive, integrated strategies to provide for healthy child and adolescent development and a safe school environment?

✦ What is the impact of the SS/HS initiative on healthy child and adolescent development and a safe school environment?

Researchers are conducting a national cross-site evaluation, which will demonstrate how community collaborative efforts develop, function, and facilitate change within community institutions and within individuals. The evaluation has two components: process and outcome. The process evaluation will provide information on how the initiative was implemented in the participating states. Findings will generate insights about site attributes and procedures that can enhance or impede successful implementation. The outcome evaluation will investigate the impact of the initiative on issues such as alcohol and substance use, violence, and “school climate.” Integrating findings from the two evaluation components will result in a fuller understanding of the impact of the initiative. Evaluation data are being gathered in four waves, during spring 2001–2004. An interim report is expected in 2003, a final report in 2005.

**Title V Community Prevention Grants Program**

The Title V Community Prevention Grants Program, established by the 1992 reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, helps communities develop and implement collaborative, community-based delinquency prevention plans. The plans focus on risk and protective factors related to aspects of children’s lives that research has shown are critical to the onset of delinquent behavior. OJJDP awards Title V grants to states based on the relative size of their populations subject to original juvenile court jurisdiction. The states, in turn, award the funds to communities to implement delinquency prevention plans that meet their local needs. OJJDP also provides training and technical assistance to grantees and is funding a national evaluation of the program.

From 1994 through 2002, approximately 1,400 communities in 49 states, the District of Columbia, and 5 territories (referred to collectively herein as “states”) have received Title V funding. In FY 2002, OJJDP awarded more than $26.7 million under the program, with allocations ranging from a minimum of $100,000 to a maximum of $3,403,000. (Four of the five territories were eligible to receive $33,000; Puerto Rico received $402,000, based on the size of its juvenile population.)

As part of the Title V Program, OJJDP provides training and technical assistance to help states and communities build their capacity to plan and implement effective research-based prevention strategies. Development Services Group, Inc. (DSG), of Bethesda, MD, has provided this support to Title V grantees since April 2000. During 2002, DSG
instructed more than 200 communities in a training curriculum that emphasizes theory and evidence-based planning. The curriculum includes three training sessions: Community Team Orientation, Community Data Collection and Analysis, and Community Plan and Program Development. DSG also maintains a Title V listserv and produces a Title V newsletter, Community Prevention: Title V Update, for states and local subgrantees. Other OJJDP-sponsored training activities in 2002 were designed to increase the capacity of states in three areas: understanding Title V requirements and evaluating Title V applications, developing training curriculums to help local prevention policy boards evaluate and monitor subgrantees’ activities, and developing scripts for training videos. Technical assistance activities focused on increasing delivery of assistance by telephone and on helping states review applications and strengthen requests for proposals.

During FY 2002, OJJDP continued to support communities in their efforts to identify promising and effective prevention programs. The Promising and Effective Programs (PEP) Guide was developed in 2001 to help communities select research-based prevention programs. In 2002, OJJDP began expanding the guide with new program categories and also began developing a searchable database of model programs. The updated guide and the database are expected to be available in 2003.

To help improve the Title V Program model and encourage its implementation in more communities, OJJDP has been evaluating the program’s effectiveness since 1998. The national evaluation is being conducted by Caliber Associates of Fairfax, VA. Researchers are examining the viability and effectiveness of comprehensive, locally developed prevention programs, based on risk and protective factors, in 12 communities in 6 states (2 in each state): Hawaii, Michigan, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Vermont, and Virginia. Evaluators are examining two broad research questions:

- What is the impact of the Title V Program on risk and protective factors and on juvenile problem behaviors?
- What factors and activities lead to effective implementation of the Title V Program model and to positive outcomes?

Preliminary findings suggest that certain factors seem to make a difference in the effectiveness of risk-focused delinquency prevention programs. The findings also suggest that states and communities with access to certain resources and support systems may better understand the Title V model and, therefore, implement it with greater success. These findings are outlined in an OJJDP Fact Sheet, National Evaluation of the Title V Community Prevention Grants Program.

Researchers have made a special effort to balance evaluation activities between collecting data (including onsite interviews and observations) and providing evaluation training and technical assistance. Because of their frequency and intensity, training and technical assistance activities have played an integral role in building both the evaluation capacity of local communities and positive and lasting relationships between community members and the national evaluation team. As community members became more fully engaged in data collection efforts, they also began to identify areas in which they needed evaluation support and training. As a result, technical assistance and training activities have evolved throughout the evaluation effort from basic workshops on the Title V Community Self-Evaluation Workbook, to local evaluation planning, to training on topics such as developing local logic models and data collection methods, plans, and instruments. These activities have allowed the communities to participate fully in national evaluation data collection activities.

During FY 2002, the final year of the national evaluation, researchers visited three national evaluation sites, implemented a data analysis plan, and developed a publications plan for disseminating evaluation findings in 2002 and 2003. Findings are
being disseminated through published articles, conference presentations, and a final evaluation report.

In 2003, Caliber will submit its final evaluation report to OJJDP. The report will highlight case study and cross-site findings from the national evaluation and both program- and evaluation-related "lessons learned."

As an additional component of the Title V national evaluation in each year since 1994, the Caliber team has prepared OJJDP's annual Title V Community Prevention Grants Program Report to Congress. The report describes the activities and accomplishments of Title V grantees nationwide and has been particularly useful in identifying successful approaches and making recommendations for future activities under the program. The 2001 Report to Congress was released in spring 2003.

Truancy Reduction Activities

In 1998, OJJDP, DOJ's Executive Office for Weed and Seed, and the U.S. Department of Education's Safe and Drug-Free Schools Office initiated the Truancy Reduction Demonstration Program (TRDP). The goal of the program is to encourage communities to develop comprehensive approaches to identifying and tracking truant youth and reducing truancy. Collaboration among community members is important in addressing truancy problems because it produces a shared vision, maximizes existing resources, and results in a blend of services that can address a variety of issues related to truancy. In TRDP, programs are overseen at the community level by a multiagency collaborative group that includes representatives from schools, social services agencies, health organizations, law enforcement, courts, probation, businesses, and faith-based organizations.

TRDP includes seven sites in six states: California (Department of Employment and Human Services, Contra Costa County); Florida (State Attorney's Office, Jacksonville); Hawaii (University of Hawaii, Honolulu); New York (Suffolk County Probation Department, Yaphank); Texas (Mayor's Anti-Gang Office, Houston); and Washington (King County Superior Court, Seattle, and Safe Streets Campaign, Tacoma). The sites vary in size—serving anywhere from 30 to 1,500 youth—and are diverse in geographic location, ethnic and sociodemographic makeup, and community-based leadership. TRDP has served more than 2,000 youth and more than 1,100 families.

Communities in the TRDP sites are implementing programs that link truant youth with community-based services and programs. Services vary among projects and include court diversions such as community truancy boards, truancy workshops, community awareness campaigns, and collaboration among community agencies. Truancy case managers usually work directly with youth and families, making home visits, monitoring school attendance, providing tutoring, and referring youth and families to community agencies as needed. All of the programs have strong family collaboration as a component.
OJJDP also is funding an evaluation of TRDP, conducted by the Colorado Foundation for Families and Children of Denver, CO, in collaboration with the demonstration sites. In FY 2002, all sites showed an improvement in the context, structure, and accomplishments of the community collaborative. The evaluation has found that maintaining the stability of the collaborative is critical to the success of truancy reduction efforts.

OJJDP has learned that a continuum of services (incentives, prevention, early intervention, intensive intervention, and “deep-end” consequences or sanctions) is important for successful program implementation and for program effectiveness. Early evidence suggests that programs offering a full continuum of services for children and their parents (in particular, the consequences component) are most effective.

The evaluation has identified the following key components for truancy reduction programs:

✦ Consistent policy and practice.
✦ Meaningful parental involvement.
✦ Public awareness.
✦ Continuum of supports, services, incentives, and consequences.
✦ Collaboration across the community.
✦ Programs to address related health issues.
✦ Effective and ongoing evaluation.

The data collected by the sites and the evaluator are also helping to describe the population of truant youth (and their families) targeted by the demonstration programs. Thousands of youth have had contact with these programs. Some received minimal intervention (such as education about attendance laws), some received tickets and attended truancy hearings, and some received home visits or attended workshops. Others were tracked and monitored with more intensive case management. The most common needs identified by the sites had to do with academic, mental health, and family problems.

During FY 2002, researchers reported early findings from the outcome component of the evaluation,

**Promising Results From Truancy Reduction Demonstration Programs**

Researchers have been tracking students in **King County, WA**, at 6-month intervals for up to 2 years. At 6 months, more than 50 percent of the students had shown some improvement or significant improvement in all areas evaluated (academic performance, attendance, school discipline, and juvenile justice system involvement). By the 18th month, nearly all of the students had shown improvement (and the initial 50 percent had shown further improvement).

Truancy reduction programs may not have an immediate impact, but a long-term commitment to working with students who have attendance problems has shown promise. At 6 months, the **Suffolk County, NY**, TRDP site saw little change in most (80–90 percent) of the students: they had neither worsened nor improved in key areas. At 1 year, improvements began to show (35 percent had improved in academic performance, 25 percent in attendance). By 18 months, 40 percent had improved in academic performance, more than 50 percent in attendance, and nearly 40 percent in school discipline.

In **Jacksonville, FL**, TRDP appears to have substantially increased attendance for students in elementary and middle schools. Between the 1998/99 and 1999/2000 school years, the percentage of students missing more than 21 days of school dropped from 19.4 percent to 8.9 percent for elementary schools and from 14.7 percent to 7.8 percent for middle schools.
in which students at TRDP sites are being tracked every 3 months for school attendance and academic performance. These findings indicate that after just 3 months of participation in programs, 60 percent of the students had fewer unexcused absences from school, about one-third had fewer excused absences, and about half improved their academic performance. (Findings for selected sites are highlighted in “Promising Results From Truancy Reduction Demonstration Programs,” page 24.)

In FY 2002, the ongoing demonstration program and evaluation produced a number of useful tools and resources for agencies and schools interested in confronting truancy in their own communities. Many of these tools and resources are available on the truancy Web site, “Promoting Truancy Prevention and School Success” (www.truancyprevention.org).

OJJDP plans to expand its truancy efforts in FY 2003 by strengthening the evaluation design (to collect more outcome data) and developing more tools and resources for communities planning to target truancy.

Youth Court Activities

Youth courts are one of the fastest growing crime intervention programs in the nation. In 1994, the United States had 78 youth courts. Today, more than 950 youth courts operate in 47 states and the District of Columbia. These courts, also known as teen courts and peer courts, offer an adjudicatory venue in which nonviolent juvenile offenders are sentenced by their peers. By involving the community and family members of offenders and victims, youth courts influence the lives of juveniles in a unique and positive way.

OJJDP established the National Youth Court Center (NYCC) in 1999. The center is managed by the American Probation and Parole Association of Lexington, KY, and is funded through OJJDP’s Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants Program (see page 47) in collaboration with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. NYCC serves as an information clearinghouse, provides training and technical assistance, develops resource materials on how to establish and enhance youth court programs, and maintains a Web site (www.youthcourt.net).

The year 2002 was a banner year for OJJDP’s youth court project as the program received international recognition from the United Nations and NYCC sponsored several major activities. In May 2002, youth courts were recognized at the United Nations’ Special Session on Children. Every 10 years, UN member countries meet to establish a global blueprint for the next decade. During the special session, which was modeled as a youth court hearing, OJJDP’s Administrator and two young youth court volunteers—Robyn Gausman-Barnett (Montgomery County, MD, Teen Court) and Bryan Selchick (Colonie Youth Court, NY)—shared the positive effects that youth court activities are having on juveniles in the United States. A transcript of the Administrator’s remarks is available on OJJDP’s Web site.

To help promote youth courts and their achievements, activities, and volunteers, OJJDP and NYCC designated September 2002 as the first National Youth Court Month. The theme, “Positive Peer Pressure, Teens Helping Teens,” was developed by Toby Steinmetz, a youth member of the Pottstown Area Teen Court in Stowe, PA. As part of the promotion, NYCC developed an action kit to help youth court programs publicize local community projects and activities through public education and community outreach.
Earlier in the year, more than 1,000 individuals, almost half of them youth, attended the National Youth Court Conference held April 14–16, 2002, in Arlington, VA. The conference included more than 63 workshops, which covered topics such as finding and retaining volunteers, involving victims in the youth court process, and incorporating restorative justice principles in youth court programs.

NYCC also developed several new resources, including the Youth Court Training Package, which received the Distinguished Achievement Award for Multimedia Instructional Materials, Young Adult Category, from the Association of Educational Publishers. The training package contains student training manuals for the different youth court models, an instructor’s guide, a promotional video, and a CD–ROM.

NYCC also developed a new Web site (www.youthnet.net) designed exclusively for youth court youth volunteers. The site includes online training on jury deliberation and case preparation, a youth volunteer newsletter, information on starting a youth court, answers to frequently asked questions about youth courts, and other resources.

**On the Horizon**

During FY 2002, OJJDP solicited competitive applications for a program to test the effectiveness of two school-based substance abuse programs: Project ALERT and Project SUCCESS. Through the Promising Programs for Substance Abuse Prevention: Replication and Evaluation Initiative, OJJDP hopes to determine whether the positive outcomes found in earlier evaluations of these programs can be replicated in other sites. OJJDP plans to fund the replication evaluation for 5 years.
Chapter 4
Enhancing Public Safety and Law Enforcement

Just as it is important for communities to strive to prevent and intervene in juvenile delinquency, it is equally important for the juvenile justice system to protect the public and hold offenders accountable. Juvenile arrests for violent crime increased through the mid-1980s and early 1990s, peaked in 1994, and then maintained a steady decline through 2001 (the latest year for which arrest data are available). Although encouraged by recent trends, OJJDP remained committed during FY 2002 to helping law enforcement enhance its response to juvenile crime.

At the core of this commitment are several training and technical assistance initiatives. One of these initiatives helps schools, law enforcement, communities, and juvenile justice agencies implement School Resource Officer programs, which enhance school safety. Another helps state, local, and tribal law enforcement professionals address juvenile victimization, delinquency, and crime from a holistic perspective.

Combating underage drinking also continued to be an OJJDP priority. The Office’s multipronged approach to this serious issue included block and discretionary grants, training and technical assistance, and a national evaluation. Together, these activities are helping communities increase law enforcement responsiveness to the illegal sale of alcohol to minors and educate adults and youth about the consequences of underage drinking.

Serious, violent juvenile offenders remain a concern to the nation and OJJDP. Recognizing the importance of reducing recidivism among these offenders, OJJDP is participating in a major OJP reentry initiative. Through this program, OJJDP is working to ensure that serious, violent juvenile offenders who have been released from correctional facilities can successfully reenter their communities and become productive, law-abiding citizens.

The programs described in this chapter represent the types of activities OJJDP believes have the greatest potential for enhancing public safety and strengthening law enforcement. OJJDP hopes that these and similar programs can help ensure that the juvenile justice system, while welcoming the continuing decline in juvenile crime, remains vigilant in sustaining the progress that has been made.

Comprehensive School Safety Leadership Initiative

OJJDP developed the Comprehensive School Safety Leadership Initiative in FY 2000 to help communities focus leadership and resources on issues related to creating and maintaining safe school environments. The initiative, which was developed in collaboration with OJJDP grantees Fox Valley Technical College of Appleton, WI, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, is supported by funds transferred from OJP’s Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

The Comprehensive School Safety Leadership Initiative provides training and technical assistance to help schools, law enforcement personnel, communities, and juvenile justice agencies take a leadership role in implementing and sustaining effective School Resource Officer (SRO) programs. The activities are designed to build organizational capacity and competency at all levels, from the individual SRO through the chief executive, and to help create sound policy and procedures. The program consists of the following main education components:

- The Chief Executive Officer Safe School Forum, designed for superintendents, police chiefs, probation officers, social services administrators, and chief prosecutors, discusses critical roles and
responsibilities, information sharing, and policy issues related to school safety and juvenile justice.

✦ The School Resource Officer Leadership Program focuses on standards of excellence and best practices and is designed for police officers designated as SROs, their supervisors, school district and university police officers, and other school staff.

✦ The Safe Schools Interagency Team Planning Program brings together chief executives of schools and community, social services, and juvenile justice organizations to discuss information sharing, cooperation, and coordination efforts.

The initiative includes a series of supplementary training activities designed to ensure that SROs have the skills they need to protect children and address school crime, victimization, and safety issues. The initiative also offers technical assistance to help teams and participants who have completed the above training sustain and support the programs they have developed.

The Comprehensive School Safety Leadership Initiative has provided training and technical assistance to thousands of SROs and law enforcement, school, and juvenile justice professionals in all 50 states. The initiative is having an impact. For example, many school districts and communities have developed new programs and policies following the Safe Schools Interagency Team Planning Program seminars. Galveston, TX, hosted a truancy summit to focus greater attention on the problem of chronic truancy. As a result, the school board, law enforcement, and various community agencies signed a memorandum of understanding to implement a comprehensive communitywide truancy reduction plan. A school district in South Carolina revised its school safety and crisis plans, developed an emergency response CD–ROM, and prepared a districtwide emergency management guide available in print and on CD–ROM.

Enforcing the Underage Drinking Laws Program

Congress has appropriated $25 million each year since 1998 to support the Enforcing the Underage Drinking Laws (EUDL) Program. The objectives of the program are to establish statewide task forces of state and local law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies, develop public advertising campaigns, and support innovative programs aimed at reducing underage drinking. Administered by OJJDP, the program awards block and discretionary grants to states and provides training and technical assistance. In addition, OJJDP is funding a national evaluation of the program.

The accomplishments of the EUDL Program have exceeded expectations. With the help of the funding and leadership provided by OJJDP, states have made measurable progress in reducing both the availability of alcoholic beverages to minors and the consumption of alcoholic beverages by minors.

During FY 2002, OJJDP awarded block grants of $560,000 to every state and the District of Columbia. The funds are administered by a lead state agency—in most cases a criminal justice/law enforcement agency. Although EUDL funding supports a wide range of activities, most states focus on enforcement activities. These states report a strong emphasis on compliance checks of retail alcohol outlets to reduce sales to minors. Other enforcement activities include crackdowns on false identification, programs to reduce the provision of alcohol to minors by older youth or by adults, “party patrols” to prevent access to alcohol at large youth gatherings, “cops in shops” programs to deter attempts by minors to purchase alcohol, and youth-focused campaigns to enforce impaired driving laws. Many states also report implementing or strengthening laws and policies that can reduce underage drinking, such as establishing keg registration ordinances to deter the purchase of beer kegs for underage use.
EUDL funding also has helped states promote community awareness of underage drinking, encourage changes in norms regarding underage drinking, and develop organizational structures and relationships to support coordinated efforts.

Whereas EUDL block grants are intended to enhance state-level responses to underage drinking, EUDL discretionary grants are designed to address the problem through state-local partnerships. Since 1998, OJJDP has competitively awarded discretionary grants to a total of 26 states to implement the EUDL Program at the local level. These states, in turn, have provided subgrants to more than 200 local communities to implement a variety of programs in concert with state agencies. In FY 2002, OJJDP selected five states—Maine, Nebraska, Nevada, South Carolina, and Washington—to receive discretionary EUDL grants, which ranged from $366,246 to $400,000.

In general, local EUDL programs are making progress in several areas: increasing law enforcement capacity to enforce underage drinking laws, engaging and training youth to be leaders in combating underage drinking, increasing prevention and public awareness efforts, and tackling the challenging issues of alcohol consumption on college campuses.

Since 1998, OJJDP has supported intensive training and technical assistance services provided through the Underage Drinking Enforcement Training Center (UDETC), which is managed by the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (PIRE) of Calverton, MD. Selection of topics and activities for training and technical assistance has been guided by UDETC's needs assessments and by findings from the national evaluation of the EUDL Program (discussed on page 30).

UDETC had a number of accomplishments during FY 2002. The center’s third Annual Leadership Conference, held September 19–22, 2002, in Dallas, TX, drew almost 900 participants, considerably more than the attendance (249) at the first conference in 1999.5 The 2002 conference included a series of workshops that focused on Indian country issues.

The center distributed nearly 95,000 documents, including the revised Drinking in America: Myths, Realities, and Prevention Policy, which was updated to reflect newly available data from the 1999 National Household Survey on Drug Use. The center also began work on a new publication, Indian Country Law Enforcement and the Challenges of Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws. This document will be available in 2005.

UDETC trained more than 7,500 individuals through 122 training events held in 34 states and territories. In addition, the training curriculum was expanded to include youth, media advocacy, advanced law enforcement and policy trainings, and specialized training for American Indians.

The center coordinates a series of OJJDP audio teleconferences about underage drinking. During FY 2002, the series attracted 3,450 connections, many of which had more than one person listening. In addition to the regular audio teleconferences, the center offered four calls that specifically addressed issues confronting tribal communities. These calls attracted more than 200 connections. A similar series is being offered in 2003.

UDETC maintains a Web site (www.udetc.org), which recorded 638,065 visits during 2002—more than twice the number received in 2001. The Web site includes a section titled “Success Stories,” which highlights examples of state activities. During FY 2002, the center developed 15 new success stories and added them to the site.

To help bring diverse perspectives and expertise to training and technical assistance activities, PIRE and OJJDP have enlisted a number of organizations as partners in UDETC. Major partners include American Indian Development Associates of Albuquerque, NM; Mothers Against Drunk

5The 2001 conference was cancelled because of the events of September 11.
Driving (MADD) of Dallas, TX; the National Crime Prevention Council of Washington, DC; the National Judicial College of Reno, NV; the National Liquor Law Enforcement Association of Raleigh, NC; and the Police Executive Research Forum of Washington, DC.

OJJDP is funding a national evaluation of the EUDL Program, conducted by researchers at Wake Forest University School of Medicine in Winston-Salem, NC. The study has two major goals: to determine how states and communities are using EUDL Program funds and to evaluate the impact of the program in a sample of communities. Preliminary findings from the evaluation are discussed in OJJDP Annual Report 2001. OJJDP expects final findings in 2005.

Law Enforcement Training and Technical Assistance Program

OJJDP’s Law Enforcement Training and Technical Assistance Program offers training and specialized assistance to state, local, and tribal law enforcement professionals. The training is provided by the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) of Alexandria, VA. This program addresses juvenile victimization, delinquency, and crime from a holistic perspective. Curriculum development, training implementation, and technical assistance activities have been designed to strengthen existing multi-agency teams and facilitate the creation of new partnerships.

Using methods that are consistent with effective police practices, the program addresses core issues related to youth violence. It gives leaders throughout the juvenile justice system—including law enforcement, prosecution, the courts, corrections, and probation—strategic information, materials, and training and technical assistance intended to solve managerial problems that hinder implementation of effective strategies for preventing youth crime. Issues addressed include school violence and safety; youth-oriented community policing; gang and drug involvement; serious, violent, and habitual juvenile offenders; multidisciplinary youth violence strategies; police management of youthful offenders; and juvenile justice partnerships with tribal law enforcement agencies.

During FY 2002, nearly 1,400 individuals attended 21 workshops conducted by IACP on 5 topics: Building Juvenile Justice Partnerships With Tribal Law Enforcement Agencies, Managing Juvenile Operations, Partnerships for Safe Schools, Serious Habitual Offender Comprehensive Action Program, and Youth Gangs. IACP revises training designs on the basis of feedback from law enforcement advisory groups and workshop participants.

Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative

The return of serious, high-risk offenders to communities has long been a factor in violent crime in the United States. More than 630,000 offenders are released from prison every year, and recidivism among these offenders has become a pervasive problem in many communities. A program that addresses this crisis was a major focus for OJP and OJJDP in FY 2002. Developed by OJP in conjunction with several other federal partners, the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (Reentry
Initiative) is a collaborative effort of multiple federal entities, including the U.S. Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Education, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, Labor, and Veterans Affairs; the Social Security Administration; and the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

In January 2002, OJP released a solicitation seeking applications for funding to develop model reentry strategies that serve offenders housed in correctional institutions and support offenders’ transition to and stabilization in the community. Subsequently, 68 programs in 49 states, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands were selected to share more than $100 million in funding to develop such strategies. OJJDP manages 23 of the programs that target a juvenile population (ages 14–17).

The Reentry Initiative challenges each funded program to develop an effective service delivery plan that includes coordinated case management and monitoring and to establish a continuum of services that incorporates screening and assessment and individualized treatment and reentry plans.

Programs support offenders throughout three phases of reentry:

✦ Institution-based programs are designed to prepare offenders to reenter society. Services in this phase include education, mental health and substance abuse treatment, job training and preparation, mentoring, and diagnostic and risk assessment.

✦ Community-based transition programs work with offenders before and immediately after release. Services include, as appropriate, education, monitoring, mentoring, life skills training, job skills development, ongoing assessment, and mental health and substance abuse treatment.

✦ Community-based long-term support programs are designed to connect individuals who have left the supervision of the justice system with a network of social services agencies and community-based organizations that provide ongoing support.

As part of the Reentry Initiative, OJJDP has played a significant role in the development of OJP’s reentry Web site (www.ojp.usdoj.gov/reentry). The Web site provides an overview of the initiative, information about each of the 68 grantees, and additional resources on promising programs that address the reintegration of returning offenders into the community. It includes the following sections:

✦ Federal & National Resources, which links viewers to Web sites of OJP’s partners in the Reentry Initiative, making it easy to find pertinent information. This section also contains information about grant-writing resources.

✦ Publications, which provides a bibliography of reentry-related publications (organized by topic area) and links to online documents.

✦ State Activities & Resources, which contains information about each of OJP’s reentry grantees, accessible by state. The section lists state agency contacts, including state departments of corrections and education, and provides descriptions of and links to local reentry organizations and resources.

✦ Training & Technical Assistance, which guides grantees to sources of assistance in implementing their workplans.

The Web site also includes a “What’s New” section and a calendar of upcoming reentry-related events.

OJJDP’s National Training and Technical Assistance Center provides assistance to Reentry Initiative grantees. For details, see page 48.

New Publications

Most of OJJDP’s publications are of interest to a wide range of audiences. However, some publications developed during FY 2002 contain information of special interest to law enforcement agencies. These include several publications related to missing and abused children, discussed on pages 15–16, and the statistical Bulletin described on page 32.
Law Enforcement and Juvenile Crime. Every 4 years, OJJDP publishes a national report that contains a wealth of information about juvenile offenders and victims. The report was last published in September 1999. To provide access to the latest information in interim years, OJJDP developed a National Report Series of Bulletins. Law Enforcement and Juvenile Crime is part of this series. This 32-page Bulletin describes the extent and characteristics of juvenile arrests in 1999. It provides arrest rates for violent and property crimes, drug and weapon offenses, and violations of alcohol, curfew, and loitering laws. It also compares arrests and arrest trends for males and females and for various racial groups.
Chapter 5
Addressing Youth Gangs

OJJDP has been tracking the prevalence of youth gangs since 1996. Findings from the National Youth Gang Survey—an annual survey of a nationally representative sample of law enforcement agencies—clearly demonstrate the importance of supporting youth gang prevention, intervention, suppression, and reintegration efforts. For example, survey data available in FY 2002 showed that all cities with populations of 250,000 or more reported gang activity in every year from 1996 to 2000. Eighty-six percent of cities with populations between 100,000 and 249,999 reported gangs in each of these 5 years, as did 61 percent of cities with populations between 50,000 and 99,999. Youth gang activity is not confined to cities, however. Many suburban and rural areas also experience significant gang activity. Survey results led researchers to estimate that more than 24,500 gangs and 772,500 gang members were active in 2000. Of the more than 1,000 jurisdictions that reported youth gang activity in 2000, 84 percent reported at least one incident involving gang use of a firearm in an assault crime, and most reported gang activity in at least one school (95 percent had activity in high schools, 91 percent in middle schools).

Related research further underscores the importance of effective gang prevention, intervention, suppression, and reintegration efforts. Longitudinal research supported by OJJDP has found that gang members account for twice as many delinquent acts as would be expected given their share of the population; the disproportionate contribution of gang members to delinquency is even greater for more serious offenses.

Recognizing that youth gangs are a serious national issue, OJJDP has long supported the development and implementation of demonstration programs that address gang prevention, intervention, and suppression, as well as gang-related research and evaluation activities, training and technical assistance, and information dissemination. This chapter describes examples of these activities. Special accomplishments in FY 2002 included a National Youth Gang Symposium and the production of six new publications. These efforts reflect OJJDP’s commitment to helping communities respond to the problem of gangs and the violence associated with them.

Boys & Girls Clubs of America: Targeted Outreach Programs

During FY 2002, OJJDP continued to support Boys & Girls Clubs of America (BGCA) Targeted Outreach programs that address three aspects of youth gangs: prevention, intervention, and reentry after confinement. Gang Prevention Through Targeted Outreach works with youth at risk of gang involvement. Gang Intervention Through Targeted Outreach works with gang-involved youth. These programs operate in the club setting and include elements of community mobilization, active recruitment of and outreach to appropriate youth, promotion of positive developmental experiences, and individualized case management. Gang Reentry Through Targeted Outreach is a new program that works with confinement facilities and uses both facility-based and community-based components to help gang-involved youth successfully return to their communities after release from confinement. During FY 2002, OJJDP provided funding to support 25 new prevention sites, 3 new intervention sites, and 5 new reentry sites.

OJJDP also continues to provide funds to the national BGCA organization in Atlanta, GA, to help local affiliate clubs prevent youth from entering gangs, intervene with gang members in the early stages of gang involvement, and divert youth from gangs into more constructive activities. Partnership with OJJDP enhances the ability of BGCA to
serve more than 3.6 million youth annually in more than 3,300 clubs nationwide. BGCA has more than 25 national programs available to teach young people the skills they need to succeed. In addition to gang prevention, programs include education, health, alcohol/drug abuse prevention, pregnancy prevention, leadership development, and athletics.

**Gang-Free Schools and Communities Initiative**

OJJDP developed the Gang-Free Schools and Communities Initiative in 2001 to help schools and communities address their youth gang problems. In FY 2002, the Office continued to support 10 demonstration sites. The initiative has two components: the Comprehensive Gang Model: An Enhanced School/Community Approach to Reducing Youth Gang Crime (Gang-Free Schools Program) and the Gang-Free Communities Program. Both components are based on OJJDP’s Comprehensive Gang Model, which includes five key strategies: mobilizing communities, providing social intervention services and street outreach, providing opportunities for youth, suppressing gang violence, and facilitating organizational change. These strategies are combined through a local multi-disciplinary steering committee and intervention team to implement gang prevention, intervention, and suppression activities. Before implementation can begin, grantees are required to complete a detailed assessment of their community’s gang problem and a strategic planning process. OJJDP’s National Youth Gang Center (see below) provides training and technical assistance to the grantees.

The Gang-Free Schools Program is a demonstration program that incorporates school-focused enhancements to the OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model. The four participating sites are East Cleveland, OH; Houston, TX; Miami, FL; and Pittsburgh, PA. These sites have completed the assessment and planning process and have begun implementation. OJJDP also continues to support an evaluation of this effort, conducted by the COSMOS Corporation of Bethesda, MD.

Six sites—Broward County, FL; Lakewood, WA; Los Angeles, CA; Louisville, KY; San Francisco, CA; and Washington, DC—are participating in the Gang-Free Communities Program, which is intended as a replication of earlier OJJDP-funded efforts. These grantees received minimal federal funding to start their programs and have leveraged other local resources. Using their leveraged funding, they have completed the assessment and planning process and have begun implementation.

**National Youth Gang Center**

In 1994, OJJDP established the National Youth Gang Center (NYGC) at the Institute for Intergovernmental Research of Tallahassee, FL, to maintain and expand the body of knowledge about youth

**Evaluating Gang-Related Targeted Outreach**

In partnership with OJJDP and others, Boys & Girls Clubs of America has demonstrated the effectiveness of its Targeted Outreach programs, designed to prevent gang involvement among at-risk youth and intervene positively in the lives of gang-involved youth. Evaluations showed the following results among program participants:

- **Gang Prevention Through Targeted Outreach:** delayed onset of gang behavior, less contact with the justice system, fewer delinquent behaviors, improved school outcomes, and more positive social relationships.
- **Gang Intervention Through Targeted Outreach:** disengagement from gang-associated behaviors, less contact with the justice system, and more positive engagement with school.

gangs and effective responses to them. NYGC’s many functions include conducting surveys; providing reliable information to researchers, law enforcement personnel, practitioners, and others; maintaining a Web site; and providing training and technical assistance to OJJDP grantees.

Highlights of NYGC activities during FY 2002 included partnering with OJJDP to sponsor the third National Youth Gang Symposium (see page 36), releasing findings from two youth gang surveys, and developing several publications.

NYGC has been conducting the National Youth Gang Survey since 1995. This annual survey of police and sheriff’s departments helps researchers determine the extent of the nation’s gang problem. Highlights from the surveys are published as OJJDP Fact Sheets. Findings from the 2000 National Youth Gang Survey, which were released by OJJDP in February 2002, suggest that the youth gang problem in the United States continues to be widespread and substantial.

Detailed results from each of the annual youth gang surveys conducted from 1995 to 1998 were presented in annual summary reports. Detailed results from subsequent surveys will be published every 3 years in a large report that combines findings from the three most recent surveys. The first combined report, which will include findings from the 1999, 2000, and 2001 surveys, is scheduled for publication in 2004.

In response to a growing number of reports of gang activity on American Indian lands, NYGC conducted a survey in 2001 of youth gang activities in Indian country during 2000. Highlights of findings from this survey were published in June 2002 (see page 37).

Findings from the annual surveys have led NYGC researchers to track the changing boundaries of youth gangs. For example, two NYGC research studies have examined the characteristics of modern-day youth gangs—those that have emerged since 1985, particularly during the 1990s. Half of the localities that currently report gang activity say their gangs first emerged in the 1990s. Compared with earlier gangs, modern-day gangs have a far higher proportion of younger gang members, females, and middle-class teens. Recent years have also seen the growth of hybrid gangs. Because these groups do not fit the mold of earlier gangs, NYGC uses the term “hybrid gang culture” to describe them. Characterized by a mixture of gang cultures, they often “cut and paste” bits of Hollywood images and big-city gang lore into their local versions of gangs. They often have unclear rules or codes of conduct, and they may use mixed symbols (e.g., colors and graffiti) to identify themselves. Their members may belong to multiple gangs, or they may have symbolic associations with more than one well-established gang. Hybrid gangs may not follow the established rules or methods of operation carried out by their predecessors from Los Angeles or Chicago. These homegrown gangs consider themselves to be distinct gangster entities with no alliance to groups such as the Bloods/Crips or Folk/People. Because the resulting hodgepodge of features makes classifying these gangs difficult, communities should make a comprehensive assessment of their local gang problems before determining appropriate responses. (Two OJJDP Bulletins, Hybrid and Other Modern Gangs and Modern-Day Youth Gangs, discussed on pages 36–37, summarize this research.)

NYGC maintains a Web site (www.iir.com/nygc/), which provides information about gang programs, research, and legislation, including full-text publications, bibliographies of publications related to gang research, and lists of gang legislation organized by state and subject. The center also manages GANGINFO, an electronic mailing list, which provides a forum for professionals to exchange information about youth gangs.

NYGC continues to provide training and technical assistance to the 10 demonstration sites participating in the Gang-Free Schools and Communities Initiative (see page 34). NYGC is assisting these communities by developing training and support materials, providing cross-site “cluster” training,
and offering onsite and remote training and technical assistance.

NYGC also provides technical support to the Youth Gang Consortium, which is convened by OJJDP three times a year to bring together federal departments and agencies engaged in antigang activities. The consortium builds partnerships and coordinates federal resources to help communities develop comprehensive local approaches to gang prevention, intervention, and suppression.

**National Youth Gang Symposium**

More than 1,200 individuals attended OJJDP’s third National Youth Gang Symposium, held June 11–13, 2002, in Orlando, FL. The theme of the event was “Together We Can: Comprehensive Approaches to Youth Gangs.” The symposium was sponsored by OJJDP in partnership with NYGC and the Boys & Girls Clubs of America. Attendees included law enforcement and corrections professionals who work with gang members daily, community-based youth outreach workers, social services and education professionals, and representatives from the faith-based community.

The symposium’s keynote speaker was Father Greg Boyle, executive director of Homeboy Industries, Los Angeles, CA, which provides job opportunities and support for young gang members. U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft welcomed attendees via video message. Drawing on the symposium’s theme, OJJDP Administrator J. Robert Flores challenged each symposium participant, upon returning home, to meet with three individuals, agencies, or organizations; explain why they should be concerned about youth gangs; and suggest positive ways to address the local gang problem.

The symposium featured plenary sessions led by national experts and workshops that highlighted recent gang trends and provided information about innovative and effective programs to combat gang problems. Workshop topics ranged from prison gangs and their influence on the street to faith-based approaches to gangs.

OJJDP’s first gang symposium was held in 1996 in Dallas, TX, followed by a second in 1999 in Las Vegas, NV. Whereas most gang-related conferences focus on intelligence information and are intended only for law enforcement professionals, OJJDP’s conferences have addressed a range of topics related to youth gang prevention, intervention, and suppression and reintegration of gang members into the community. The OJJDP conferences are open to all professionals whose work brings them into contact with youth gangs, individual gang members, and members’ families.

**New Publications**

OJJDP developed and published several new gang-related publications during FY 2002. These publications, briefly described below, provide statistics and analyses about youth gang problems.

**Early Precursors of Gang Membership: A Study of Seattle Youth.** This 6-page Bulletin presents data from the Seattle Social Development Project (SSDP), an OJJDP-sponsored longitudinal study of youth living in high-crime neighborhoods. Focusing on youth who join gangs, the Bulletin analyzes SSDP data on the relationship between risk factors present at ages 10 to 12 and the likelihood of joining a gang between ages 13 and 18. The Bulletin also explores implications of the risk factor analysis for the design of prevention strategies.

**Highlights of the 2000 National Youth Gang Survey.** Major findings from the 2000 National Youth Gang Survey are highlighted in this 2-page Fact Sheet. Included are statistics on prevalence of gangs, gang-related violent crime, gang activity in schools, gang members returning to the community from prison, and other topics. (A Fact Sheet presenting highlights from the 2001 survey was released in April 2003.)

**Hybrid and Other Modern Gangs.** This 8-page Bulletin focuses on the nature of hybrid gangs, drawing on survey data, research findings, and field reports.
to detail the critical differences between these groups and more traditional gangs. The Bulletin also discusses related issues such as gang stereotypes and gang migration.

**Modern-Day Youth Gangs.** Drawing on data from National Youth Gang Surveys, this 12-page Bulletin compares the characteristics of gangs in jurisdictions where gang problems began prior to 1991 with those in jurisdictions where gang problems began more recently.

**National Youth Gang Survey Trends From 1996 to 2000.** Findings from the five National Youth Gang Surveys conducted since 1996 are highlighted in this 2-page Fact Sheet. Topics include patterns of gang activity, number of gangs and gang members, gang-related homicides, and demographics of gang members.

**2000 Survey of Youth Gangs in Indian Country.** This 2-page Fact Sheet published by NYGC presents findings from a survey undertaken to determine the prevalence, composition, and activities of youth gangs in federally recognized tribes that are not traditionally included in the National Youth Gang Survey of law enforcement officials. This Fact Sheet, which is discussed in more detail on page 58, is available online from the Tribal Youth Program page of OJJDP’s Web site or from the NYGC Web site.
Chapter 6
Strengthening the Juvenile Justice System

Many juvenile justice policymakers, practitioners, and systems find themselves struggling to keep up with the changing needs of the juveniles and communities they serve at the same time they are dealing with reduced budgets and programs. These challenges make it essential for local and state governments to have reliable information about innovative, effective new programs and for them to have the opportunity to participate in specialized training and technical assistance activities. OJJDP works closely with local and state governments to provide them with the types of programs and services they need to strengthen their juvenile justice systems.

At the core of these efforts is the Formula Grants program, which provides formula and block grants to states to assist in the development of activities based specifically on the needs of the states and their communities. As part of this effort, the Office works with states to help them reduce the overrepresentation of minority youth in the juvenile justice system.

Encouraging states to develop programs that hold young offenders accountable for their actions also remained a priority for OJJDP in FY 2002, as did providing incentives for states to respond to specific challenge areas. In addition, the Office has instituted a new program, Targeted Community Action Planning (TCAP), to help communities identify and respond to their most pressing juvenile justice needs. This program stresses the importance of developing targeted community responses that focus on results, not process.

OJJDP also provides juvenile justice advocacy leaders and practitioners with the tools they need to develop and implement effective programs by offering an intensive program of training and technical assistance. To make it easier for practitioners to access this information, the Office supports a national center, which coordinates the services of more than 70 OJJDP training and technical assistance providers.

The programs discussed in this chapter illustrate OJJDP’s efforts to help states and local communities reduce juvenile delinquency and strengthen their juvenile justice systems. These efforts seek to ensure that offenders are held accountable and treated fairly, the public is protected, and appropriate prevention, intervention, and rehabilitative services are available to meet the needs of victims, families, and offenders.

Addressing Disproportionate Minority Confinement

For more than a decade, OJJDP has been a leader in efforts to reduce the overrepresentation of minority youth in the nation’s juvenile justice system. The 1988 amendments to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974 required states participating in OJJDP’s Formula Grants program (see page 41) to make efforts to reduce the disproportionate confinement of minority youth in secure facilities. In 1992, Congress elevated the issue of addressing disproportionate minority confinement (DMC) to a core requirement of the JJDP Act, meaning that states failing to demonstrate efforts to reduce the overrepresentation of minority youth in confinement would risk losing 25 percent of their annual Formula Grant allocation. OJJDP is helping states fulfill this requirement by providing training and technical assistance and by disseminating resources through a DMC section on its Web site.

Research and Evaluation Associates, Inc. (REA), of Chapel Hill, NC, is one of four OJJDP grantees and contractors responsible for providing states...
with technical assistance in their efforts to reduce DMC. In FY 2001, REA developed a set of strategic tools and materials to help jurisdictions address this issue and provided intensive technical assistance to several states. While working with these states, REA developed a protocol for delivering technical assistance in response to DMC issues. The protocol was designed to help states identify and prioritize interventions that have both immediate and long-term effects. During FY 2002, REA provided intensive technical assistance services to Alaska, California, Kentucky, Massachusetts, New Mexico, and South Carolina and to two or three local jurisdictions within each of these states. REA also conducted a review of the status of all states’ efforts to reduce DMC. OJJDP and REA will use findings from the review to develop a technical assistance plan to help states address DMC. In addition, REA has established listservs to facilitate the sharing of information and skills and has identified and trained approximately 50 potential consultants to provide technical assistance on DMC-related issues.

REA also developed an OJJDP Bulletin, *Disproportionate Minority Confinement: A Review of the Research Literature From 1989 Through 2001*. The purpose of this Bulletin, which is available as an online pre-publication on OJJDP’s DMC Web page (see next column), is to extend earlier analysis of DMC by examining research found in professional academic journals and edited books during the 12-year period.

OJJDP also provides funding to the Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (JJEC) to help states enhance their capacity to evaluate their efforts to reduce DMC. Operated by the Justice Research and Statistical Association of Washington, DC, JJEC develops publications and assists states in incorporating evaluation into program development and planning processes and in forming evaluation partnerships with state and local juvenile justice agencies and professionals.

OJJDP’s training and technical assistance provider for the Formula Grants program, Development Services Group, Inc. (DSG), of Bethesda, MD, also works with states to address DMC. In FY 2002, DSG responded to nearly 25 requests from states.

OJJDP, along with seven foundations and the Bureau of Justice Assistance, also funded the Building Blocks for Youth initiative, a partnership of organizations led by the Youth Law Center. The Building Blocks for Youth initiative is dedicated to protecting minority youth in the justice system and to promoting rational and effective justice system policies. Activities included conducting research, analyzing decisionmaking, advocating for minority youth, building constituencies for change, and developing communication strategies.

In addition, OJJDP expanded its DMC research consultant pool, which is made available to local and state governments, by inviting 45 social science researchers to an orientation meeting about DMC research. A list of 22 qualified research consultants resulted from this effort. The Office also sponsored a DMC researchers’ focus group, which provided guidance to OJJDP in developing a research agenda. On an ongoing basis, the Office provides training to OJJDP staff and other juvenile justice professionals to help strengthen their understanding of DMC and compliance issues.

As mentioned above, OJJDP maintains a DMC section on its Web site. The section provides information about related tools and resources, including a catalog of state research reports and a technical assistance manual to help states address DMC. The catalog of state reports, which provides a central repository for historical records of DMC efforts in each state, has proven valuable to the field. The section also contains relevant publications and information about OJJDP’s DMC Working Group, which coordinates the Office’s efforts to reduce DMC and shares information about these efforts with OJJDP and other DOJ staff.

The 2002 reauthorization of the JJDP Act broadened the requirement of addressing disproportionate minority confinement to address the disproportionate numbers of minority youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system at any point. During FY 2003, OJJDP will focus on enhancing its efforts.
to address this issue, including helping states adopt a comprehensive, balanced, and multidisciplinary approach to reducing DMC.

**Formula Grants Program**

The Formula Grants program, established by the JJDP Act of 1974, provides funds directly to states, U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia to help them implement comprehensive state juvenile justice plans based on detailed studies of needs in their jurisdictions. (The term “states,” as used throughout this section, refers to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and 5 U.S. territories: American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.) Forty-eight states, the District of Columbia, and all five territories are participating in the Formula Grants program. (South Dakota and Wyoming are not participating.)

During FY 2002, OJJDP awarded more than $76 million to the states under the Formula Grants program to support a variety of juvenile justice activities, from prevention efforts to secure confinement. Allocations are based on the number of juveniles under age 18 in a state. In FY 2002, the allocations (other than those for territories) ranged from $641,000 (Washington, DC) to $8.431 million (California). The Governor of each state designates a state agency to implement the Formula Grants program. Although the awards go to the designated agency, the JJDP Act requires that two-thirds of all Formula Grant funds be passed through to units of general local government, local private agencies, and Indian tribes that perform law enforcement functions.

To participate in the Formula Grants program, a state must address 25 state planning requirements set forth in the JJDP Act and comply with 4 core protections for juveniles involved in the justice system:

- Deinstitutionalizing status offenders and non-offenders (DSO).
- Separating adult and juvenile offenders in secure institutions (separation).
- Eliminating the practice of detaining or confining juveniles in adult jails and lockups (jail and lockup removal).
- Addressing the disproportionate confinement of minority juveniles in secure juvenile justice system facilities and in jails and lockups where such overrepresentation exists (DMC).

With OJJDP’s leadership, states continue to make significant progress in achieving or maintaining compliance with these core protections. The majority of the 54 participants in the Formula Grants program are now in full compliance (or in full compliance with de minimis exceptions) with the first 3 requirements and are making satisfactory progress in meeting the DMC requirement, which was added as a core protection in 1992. Most states have completed the initial identification and assessment phases for the DMC provision and are implementing the intervention and/or monitoring phases. Four territories have completed the identification phase and found that no DMC problem exists. Because of the homogeneity of Puerto Rico’s population, the U.S. Bureau of the Census has exempted the territory from reporting racial statistics; therefore, Puerto Rico is exempt from the DMC requirement. For more detailed information on individual states’ compliance with the core protections of the JJDP Act, see the tables on pages 42–46. OJJDP’s efforts to help states and communities address DMC are described earlier, on pages 39–41.

---

6On November 2, 2002, the President signed into law the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, 2002. This new public law reauthorized the Formula Grants and Juvenile Accountability Block Grants (formerly the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants) programs and authorized a new Crime Prevention Block Grant. Changes to these programs will not become effective until FY 2004.

7Contact information for each state’s administering agency for Formula Grants and other grants can be found at www.ojp.usdoj.gov/state.htm.
Core Protections Compliance Summary Totals  
(as of December 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO)</th>
<th>Number of Jurisdictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full compliance—zero violations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full compliance—<em>de minimis</em> exceptions</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in compliance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not participating in FY 2002 Formula Grants program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Separation of Juvenile and Adult Offenders</th>
<th>Number of Jurisdictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full compliance—zero violations</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full compliance—exception provision</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in compliance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not participating in FY 2002 Formula Grants program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jail and Lockup Removal</th>
<th>Number of Jurisdictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full compliance—zero violations</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full compliance—<em>de minimis</em> exceptions</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in compliance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not participating in FY 2002 Formula Grants program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC)</th>
<th>Number of Jurisdictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed identification and assessment/</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementing intervention, monitoring, and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed identification and assessment/</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementing intervention and conducting or planning monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed identification and assessment/</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementing intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed/conducting identification or assessment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt from DMC requirement or no DMC problem found</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMC status under review</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not participating in FY 2002 Formula Grants program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: States’ eligibility to receive FY 2002 formula grants was initially determined on the basis of 1999 monitoring reports for compliance with JJDP Act core protections regarding DSO, separation, and jail and lockup removal and on the basis of information in FY 2002 Formula Grants program comprehensive plans for compliance with the DMC core protection.
## State Compliance Based on 2000 Reports: Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO), Sec. 223(a)(12)(A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Formula Grant Participants (as of September 30, 2002)</th>
<th>Full compliance—zero violations</th>
<th>Full compliance—de minimis exceptions</th>
<th>Not in compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Columbia</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Samoa</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Is.</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Is.</td>
<td>✦</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aFewer than 29.4 violations per 100,000 persons under age 18 in the state.

*bSouth Dakota and Wyoming did not participate in the FY 2002 Formula Grants program.
State Compliance Based on 2000 Reports: Separation of Juvenile and Adult Offenders, Sec. 223(a)(13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Full compliance—zero violations</th>
<th>Full compliance—exception provision</th>
<th>Not in compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Columbia</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. Samoa</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mariana Is.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virg. Is.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OJJDP regulatory criteria set forth in Section 31.303(f)(6)(ii) of the OJJDP Formula Grants Regulation (28 C.F.R. 31), and published in the May 31, 1995, Federal Register, allow states reporting noncompliant incidents to continue in the program provided the incidents are not in violation of state law and no pattern or practice exists.

*South Dakota and Wyoming did not participate in the FY 2002 Formula Grants program.
State Compliance Based on 2000 Reports: Jail and Lockup Removal, Sec. 223(a)(14)

| State Compliance Based on 2000 Reports: Jail and Lockup Removal, Sec. 223(a)(14) |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Formula Grant Grant Participants (as of September 30, 2002) | Full compliance—de minimis exceptions | Not in compliance |
| Formula Grant Grant Participants (as of September 30, 2002) | Full compliance—zero violations | Not in compliance |
| Alabama | ✦ | New Hampshire | ✦ |
| Alaska | ✦ | New Jersey | ✦ |
| Arizona | ✦ | New Mexico | ✦ |
| Arkansas | ✦ | New York | ✦ |
| California | ✦ | North Carolina | ✦ |
| Colorado | ✦ | North Dakota | ✦ |
| Connecticut | ✦ | Ohio | ✦ |
| Delaware | ✦ | Oklahoma | ✦ |
| Dist. of Columbia | ✦ | Oregon | ✦ |
| Florida | ✦ | Pennsylvania | ✦ |
| Georgia | ✦ | Rhode Island | ✦ |
| Hawaii | ✦ | South Carolina | ✦ |
| Idaho | ✦ | South Dakota | ✦ |
| Illinois | ✦ | Tennessee | ✦ |
| Indiana | ✦ | Texas | ✦ |
| Iowa | ✦ | Utah | ✦ |
| Kansas | ✦ | Vermont | ✦ |
| Kentucky | ✦ | Virginia | ✦ |
| Louisiana | ✦ | Washington | ✦ |
| Maine | ✦ | West Virginia | ✦ |
| Maryland | ✦ | Wisconsin | ✦ |
| Massachusetts | ✦ | Wyoming | ✦ |
| Michigan | ✦ | Amer. Samoa | ✦ |
| Minnesota | ✦ | Guam | ✦ |
| Mississippi | ✦ | N. Mariana Is. | ✦ |
| Missouri | ✦ | Puerto Rico | ✦ |
| Montana | ✦ | Virgin Is. | ✦ |
| Nebraska | ✦ | TOTALS | 12 40 2 |
| Nevada | ✦ |

\(^a\)State was found in compliance based on the numerical or substantive de minimis standard criteria set forth in Section 31.303(b)(6)(iii)(B) of the OJJDP Formula Grants Regulation (28 C.F.R. 31) and published in the May 31, 1995, Federal Register.

\(^b\)South Dakota and Wyoming did not participate in the FY 2002 Formula Grants program.
State Compliance Based on FY 2002 Formula Grants Program Comprehensive Plan: Disproportionate Minority Confinement (DMC), Sec. 223(a)(23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formula Grant Participants (as of December 2002)</th>
<th>Disproportionate Minority Confinement, Sec. 223(a)(23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Columbia</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| New Hampshire                                 | +                                                 |
| New Jersey                                    | +                                                 |
| New Mexico                                    | +                                                 |
| New York                                      | +                                                 |
| North Carolina                                | +                                                 |
| North Dakota                                  | +                                                 |
| Ohio                                          | +                                                 |
| Oklahoma                                      | +                                                 |
| Oregon                                        | +                                                 |
| Pennsylvania                                  | +                                                 |
| Rhode Island                                  | +                                                 |
| South Carolina                                | +                                                 |
| South Dakota                                  | +                                                 |
| Tennessee                                     | +                                                 |
| Texas                                         | +                                                 |
| Utah                                          | +                                                 |
| Vermont                                       | +                                                 |
| Virginia                                      | +                                                 |
| Washington                                    | +                                                 |
| West Virginia                                 | +                                                 |
| Wisconsin                                     | +                                                 |
| Wyoming                                       | +                                                 |
| Amer. Samoa                                   | +                                                 |
| Guam                                          | +                                                 |
| N. Mariana Is.                               | +                                                 |
| Puerto Rico                                   | +                                                 |
| Virgin Is.                                    | +                                                 |
| Amer. Samoa                                   | +                                                 |
| N. Mariana Is.                               | +                                                 |
| Puerto Rico                                   | +                                                 |
| Virgin Is.                                    | +                                                 |
| TOTALS                                        | 3 25 11 5 3 5 2 |
Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants Program

OJJDP’s Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants (JAIBG) program strengthens the juvenile justice system by encouraging states and local jurisdictions to implement accountability-based reforms. Under the program, OJJDP awards block grants to states, which in turn distribute funds to local jurisdictions. JAIBG also supports program-related research, demonstration, evaluation, training, and technical assistance activities.

During FY 2002, 56 eligible jurisdictions (including all 50 states, territories, and the District of Columbia) received JAIBG awards totaling $215 million. The awards can be used to fund programs in 12 purpose areas, including construction of juvenile detention and corrections facilities; development of accountability-based sanctions programs; hiring of prosecutors, public defenders, judges, and probation officers to address drug, gang, and youth violence; and establishment and maintenance of interagency information-sharing programs to promote more informed decisionmaking in the control, supervision, and treatment of juvenile offenders.

To help states and local jurisdictions implement JAIBG programs, OJJDP provides training and technical assistance through a grant to the OJJDP National Training and Technical Assistance Center (described on page 48) and 11 other training and technical assistance providers. Since the program’s inception, OJJDP, via its various grantees, has responded to more than 5,000 technical assistance requests. Training events, workshops, presentations, and videoconferences have been provided to juvenile justice practitioners, including juvenile justice specialists, judges, probation officers, law enforcement officers, court and school personnel, prosecutors, and detention staff. During FY 2002, the training program featured five topical training sessions (held in different regions of the nation) for state and local JAIBG grantees and several Web-based training sessions. By directly training state and local practitioners on best practices in juvenile accountability and graduated sanctions, OJJDP helps state and local governments improve their juvenile justice systems’ capacity to enhance accountability. Additionally, OJJDP and OJP’s Bureau of Justice Statistics established the JAIBG Technical Support Center to help states calculate the amount of JAIBG funds to be allocated to local jurisdictions.

To provide practitioners with information about JAIBG, OJJDP has published a series of JAIBG Best Practices Bulletins, which present up-to-date information about specific JAIBG program purpose areas. The final Bulletin in the JAIBG Best Practices series, Best Practices in Juvenile Accountability: Overview, was published in April 2003.

In FY 1999, Abt Associates, Inc., of Cambridge, MA, began a 48-month national evaluation of the JAIBG program that focused on its administration, including how grants are used by state and local recipients and what types of programs are funded. The study also documented state and local programs’ access to and use of training and technical assistance, practitioners’ and policymakers’ attitudes toward the JAIBG.
program, and states’ responses to the JAIBG purpose areas. In addition, evaluators conducted a mail survey of state and local practitioners and policymakers to assess their attitudes about the JAIBG program and their perceptions of how it was implemented in their jurisdictions. The national evaluation has been completed and the final report is available on the OJJDP Web site’s JAIBG section.

National Training and Technical Assistance Center

Juvenile justice practitioners face enormous challenges in their efforts to change existing delinquency prevention and intervention practices in ways that will improve outcomes. Recognizing that effective training and technical assistance (T&TA) can boost such efforts, OJJDP established the National Training and Technical Assistance Center (NTTAC) in 1995. Specifically, NTTAC was established to increase responsiveness to consumer needs, promote the use of best practices when providing T&TA, and assist in the overall enhancement of OJJDP’s delivery of T&TA services. Operated by Caliber Associates of Fairfax, VA, the center coordinates the services of more than 70 OJJDP T&TA providers. The center also identifies and assesses T&TA resources in the field, collects and provides access to the best available T&TA materials, develops new T&TA materials, and disseminates model T&TA protocols and guides.

During FY 2002, NTTAC began providing T&TA to grantees of OJP’s Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative, described on pages 30–31. In collaboration with the federal partners participating in the Reentry Initiative, NTTAC convened a meeting in Washington, DC, for grantees. The theme of the 3-day meeting was “From Policy to Practice: Keys to Opening the Doors to Reentry.” Some 600 state and local decisionmakers and federal agency representatives attended the meeting and participated in events designed to strengthen grantees’ efforts to develop effective reentry programs.

During FY 2003, NTTAC plans to update and disseminate the OJJDP Training and Technical Assistance Resource Catalog, which provides contact information and descriptions of the organizations funded by OJJDP to provide T&TA. The center also will help state juvenile corrections training academies facilitate revisions and updates of basic job descriptions and will serve as a repository of training materials developed by these academies.

State Challenge Activities

OJJDP’s State Challenge Activities Program was established by the 1992 reauthorization of the JJDP Act of 1974. This program provides incentives for the states participating in the Formula Grants program (see page 41) to improve their juvenile justice systems by developing, adopting, or improving policies and programs in 1 or more of 10 specific State Challenge activities (see page 49). Only states participating in the Formula Grants program are eligible to receive State Challenge grants.

During FY 2002, OJJDP awarded nearly $8.8 million in State Challenge grants to 48 states, the District of Columbia, and 5 territories. The State Challenge activities most often addressed during FY 2002 were aftercare—or reentry—services (24 states), gender bias policies and programs
State Challenge Activities

Challenge Activity A: Developing and adopting policies and programs to provide basic health, mental health, and education services to youth in the juvenile justice system.

Challenge Activity B: Developing and adopting policies and programs to provide all juveniles in the justice system access to counsel.

Challenge Activity C: Increasing community-based alternatives to incarceration by establishing programs (such as expanded use of probation, mediation, restitution, community service, treatment, home detention, intensive supervision, and electronic monitoring) and developing and adopting a set of objective criteria for the appropriate placement of juveniles in detention and secure confinement.

Challenge Activity D: Developing and adopting policies and programs to provide secure settings for violent juvenile offenders by closing down traditional training schools and replacing them with secure settings that have capacities of no more than 50 youth and staff-youth ratios sufficient to permit close supervision and effective treatment.

Challenge Activity E: Developing and adopting policies to prohibit gender bias in juvenile placement and treatment and establishing programs to ensure female youth access to the full range of health and mental health services (including treatment for physical or sexual assault or abuse), educational opportunities, training and vocational services, instruction in self-defense, and instruction in parenting.

Challenge Activity F: Establishing and operating, either directly or by contract, a State Ombudsman office for children, youth, and families to investigate and resolve complaints relating to actions, inactions, or decisions of those providing out-of-home care to children and youth.

Challenge Activity G: Developing and adopting policies and programs to remove status offenders from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court, when appropriate.

Challenge Activity H: Developing and adopting policies and programs designed to serve as alternatives to suspension and expulsion.

Challenge Activity I: Increasing aftercare services by establishing programs and developing and adopting policies to provide comprehensive health, mental health, education, family, and vocational services to youth upon their release from the juvenile justice system.

Challenge Activity J: Developing and adopting policies to establish a state administrative structure to develop program and fiscal policies for children with emotional or behavioral problems and their families. The structure would coordinate the activities of major child-serving systems and implement a statewide case review system.

(22 states), basic system services and alternatives to suspension and expulsion (19 states each), and community-based alternatives (18 states). Activities least often addressed by states were violent juvenile offender facilities (no states), state agency coordination/case review system (2 states), state ombudsman and access to counsel (5 states each), and deinstitutionalization of status offenders and nonoffenders (6 states). State-by-state details of State Challenge activities are presented on page 50.
FY 2002 Challenge Activities by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>H,I</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>A,C,I</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>E,H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>G,I</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>C,H,I</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>C,H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>A,I</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>E,I</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>C,E,G,H,I</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>E,I</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>B,F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>A,H</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>E,I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>A,C</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>A,I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>C,I</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>C,I</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>E,H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>A,E</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>A,E</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>A,G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>E,H</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>E,I</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>A,E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>E,F</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>E,H</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>C,I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>E,G</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>A,C,F,I</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>E,I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>A,H</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>C,E</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>E,C</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>A,H,I</td>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>A,C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>A,H</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>E,I</td>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>C,I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>E,J</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>H,I</td>
<td>N. Mariana Islands</td>
<td>A,C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>A,H</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>C,J</td>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>E,I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>H,I</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>E,H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: South Dakota and Wyoming are ineligible because they are not participating in the Formula Grants program.

FY 2002 Challenge Activity Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Number of States Selecting Each Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Basic System Services</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Access to Counsel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Community-Based Alternatives</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Violent Juvenile Offender Facilities</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: Gender Bias Policies and Programs</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: State Ombudsman</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G: Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders and Nonoffenders</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H: Alternatives to Suspension and Expulsion</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: Aftercare Services</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: State Agency Coordination/Case Review System</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the State Challenge program began in 1992, states have used program funds to bring about far-reaching systemic changes in their juvenile justice systems. These changes have generated many publications and other useful products that help jurisdictions across the nation improve their juvenile justice systems. To further help states implement systems change, OJJDP is developing an online Juvenile Justice Practices Series of Bulletins. The online series, which will begin with the 10 State Challenge activity areas, will be a useful resource for juvenile justice practitioners, regardless of their funding source. The Bulletins will summarize the latest research, describe existing best practices that have been demonstrated as effective or promising, highlight common characteristics of these practices, and identify useful tools. Publication of these online Bulletins will be announced in OJJDP’s bimonthly newsletter, OJJDP News @ a Glance (see page 63), and on the Office’s Web site.

**Targeted Community Action Planning**

OJJDP’s TCAP initiative is a new program that will help communities identify and respond to their most critical juvenile justice and delinquency prevention needs. Since 1995, OJJDP, in partnership with states, has provided long-term training and technical assistance to help communities across the nation develop local comprehensive strategic planning efforts. Building on the lessons learned from this experience, OJJDP developed the TCAP program, which stresses the importance of a strategy that focuses on results, not process. The initiative uses a four-phase approach—diagnostic assessment, interviews of key community leaders, summit meeting of key leaders, and development and implementation of a targeted response. OJJDP began pilot testing the TCAP initiative in Washington, DC, in October 2002. During FY 2003, the Office will select additional communities for pilot tests. To be eligible to participate, communities must have the following characteristics:

- An identified high rate of juvenile crime and delinquency.
- A community population of no more than 250,000. (In larger cities, the community population may be defined as that of a specific quadrant or zip code area.)
- An existing local decisionmaking component or community champion who can convene key community leaders.

OJJDP developed and released a solicitation in FY 2002 seeking an organization to provide intensive training and technical assistance to help the

**Key Elements of TCAP**

- Involvement and commitment of community leaders.
- Identification of communities’ existing resources and capacity to collect and map data on problem behaviors, crime, and risk factors.
- Identification of local infrastructure that can support community planning.
- Access to resources and tools that support community planning.
- Community responses based on the most effective program models.
- Multifaceted responses that involve the continuum of youth services.
- Reallocation of existing resources to address problems.
communities selected as TCAP pilot sites develop and deliver a targeted response to their most pressing juvenile justice issues. The assistance will be community based, results oriented, and the product of best practices and promising programs. Development Services Group, Inc., of Bethesda, MD, was competitively selected to provide the technical assistance for this project.

OJJDP has launched a TCAP page on its Web site. The page provides comprehensive information on the initiative and offers links to a wealth of related resources. It explains the initiative’s background, key elements, and activities; describes community eligibility requirements for receiving TCAP technical assistance; and provides links to organizations, agencies, and publications that can help communities address needs related to prevention, intervention, immediate sanctions, corrections, and reentry. During FY 2003, OJJDP will continue to enhance online resources for communities that are involved or interested in community planning. A step-by-step tutorial on community planning, tools for community planners, and resources for program development and system improvement activities will be added to the Web page.
Chapter 7
Implementing Tribal Youth Initiatives

Tribal communities across the nation face many formidable challenges. Although the difficulties that affect American Indian and Alaska Native (AI/AN) communities are similar to those in many other areas, some problems are especially pervasive among tribal populations.10 These problems include disproportionately high levels of violent victimization, child abuse and neglect, youth gang involvement, and co-occurrence of alcohol use and offending. In addition, tribal youth are exposed to a variety of risk factors that increase their chances of becoming involved in delinquency and violent offending. Furthermore, many tribal communities lack adequate resources for families and youth and for the social services and law enforcement agencies that serve them. For the past several years, OJJDP has made addressing these problems a priority and has been working with tribes to enhance Indian country law enforcement and improve the quality of life in tribal communities.

For many years, OJJDP assisted AI/AN tribes through the passthrough of Formula Grants program funds by the states to Indian tribes, discretionary grant funds, and training and technical assistance. In 1999, Congress established the Tribal Youth Program (TYP), the first federal program dedicated solely to the overall goals of preventing and controlling juvenile crime in AI/AN communities and improving tribal juvenile justice systems. Administered by OJJDP, TYP was created through the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–77) and is part of the Indian Country Law Enforcement Improvement Initiative. This 4-year federal initiative was established in 1999 by DOJ and the U.S. Department of the Interior to address the need for improved law enforcement and administration of criminal and juvenile justice in Indian country.

During FY 2002, OJJDP supported five broad program areas designed to help tribes address juvenile crime:

- Tribal Youth Program.
- Tribal Youth Program Mental Health Initiative.
- Federal Comprehensive Indian Resources for Community and Law Enforcement (CIRCLE).
- Training and Technical Assistance.
- Research and Evaluation.

In addition to these specific program areas, which are discussed in detail in this chapter, many other OJJDP activities include tribal components. For example, OJJDP funding is helping three tribal communities establish Children's Advocacy Centers (see page 9), which develop multidisciplinary programs to address child abuse and neglect cases. Two tribal sites are participating in the Safe Start Initiative (see page 13), which is helping communities develop comprehensive programs to assist children exposed to violence.

OJJDP also is helping tribal communities address disproportionately high levels of alcohol abuse through its Underage Drinking Enforcement Training Center (UDETC), discussed on page 29. UDETC’s 2002 leadership conference included a series of workshops that focused on Indian country issues. The center also expanded its training curriculum to include specialized training for American Indians, held four audio teleconferences that

---

10Federally recognized Indian tribes include Alaska Native tribal governments. Under current law (consolidated Appropriations Act, 2002), the terms “Indian tribe,” “tribal,” or “tribe(s)” in OJP statutes mean: “any Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community, including Alaska Native village or regional or village corporation as defined in or established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act . . . which is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.”
addressed tribal issues, and began developing a document about Indian country law enforcement and the challenges of enforcing underage drinking laws.

In addition, OJJDP works with local, state, and tribal law enforcement professionals through the Law Enforcement Training and Technical Assistance Program (see page 30). Another important accomplishment during FY 2002 was a new survey conducted by the National Youth Gang Center to provide reliable information about youth gangs in Indian country (see page 58).

The programs highlighted in this chapter represent the range of issues facing many tribal communities and OJJDP’s multifaceted approach to providing federal resources and assistance. Together, these initiatives have the potential to help build a better future for AI/AN youth and their families.

**Tribal Youth Program**

Congress established the Tribal Youth Program (TYP) in 1999 to help tribal communities address their rising rates of juvenile delinquency and crime. OJJDP manages TYP, which provides funds directly to tribal communities to develop juvenile delinquency prevention and control programs, reduce violent crime by and against tribal youth, and improve juvenile justice systems.

In FY 2002, OJJDP awarded 43 TYP grants to tribes in 20 states (see list on page 55). Grant awards ranged from $136,057 to $500,000, depending on the size of the total AI/AN service population living on or near a particular reservation. The FY 2002 grants bring to 145 the total number of TYP grants awarded since 1999. The new FY 2002 grantees were competitively selected from 68 applications. Eligible applicants included federally recognized tribes, consortiums of tribes, and corporations that represent Alaska Native villages.

Tribes are using their grants for a variety of activities. For example:

- The Navajo Nation, Window Rock, AZ, through its Haznojhi Youth Diversion project, is incorporating traditional and western education and therapy in an intensive 3-week diversion program for court-involved youth and their families. Participants receive information and training on topics such as communication, drug and alcohol abuse, juvenile crime and its consequences, the impact of crime on victims and the community, and the Navajo view of offenses against the community.

- The Wampanoag Tribe, located in rural Aquinah, MA, on the island of Martha’s Vineyard, is establishing the Wampanoag Youth Program to engage at-risk youth in culturally appropriate activities. The program has targeted 41 tribal youth who have been referred by the juvenile court or who are considered to be at risk of entering the juvenile justice system. Activities will include alcohol and drug abuse prevention education and cultural events such as tribal powwows, nature walks, storytelling, and drumming and dance shows.

- The Poarch Band of Creek Indians, Atmore, AL, a rural reservation that encompasses four southern Alabama counties and Florida’s Escambia County, is developing a project to address the needs of a target population of approximately 660 at-risk youth. The project will emphasize the incorporation of traditional tribal cultural teachings and will include delinquency prevention activities, an afterschool program, and intervention and prevention services in local schools.

**TYP Mental Health Initiative**

The TYP Mental Health Initiative was implemented in 2000 to promote mental health and substance abuse (alcohol and drug abuse) services for AI/AN youth involved in, or at risk of becoming involved in, tribal and/or state juvenile justice systems. The initiative also supports juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention efforts that help tribes develop and implement culturally sensitive mental health programs. The initiative is part of the Mental Health and Community Safety Initiative for American Indian/Alaska Native Children, Youth, and Families,
### Tribal Youth Program FY 2002 Grantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acoma Pueblo Boys &amp; Girls Club, Pueblo of Acoma, NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Mission Indian Housing Authority, Valley Center, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campo Band of Mission Indians, Campo, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cher-Ae Heights Indian Community of the Trinidad Rancheria, Trinidad, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewa Cree Tribe, Box Elder, MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeur d’Alene Tribe, Plummer, ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, Grand Ronde, OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, Siletz, OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation, Pendleton, OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote Band of Pomo Indians, Redwood Valley, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crow Tribal Housing Authority, Crow Agency, MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, Cherokee, NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Sandoval Indian Pueblos, Inc., Bernalillo, NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaw Nation of Oklahoma, Kaw City, OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenaitze Indian Tribe, I.R.A., Kenai, AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketchikan Indian Corporation, Health Administrator, Ketchikan, AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, Hayward, WI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makah Tribe, Neah Bay, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mescalero Apache Tribe, Mescalero, NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Sanford Tribal Consortium, Gakona, AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nisqually Indian Tribe, Olympia, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nooksack Indian Tribe, Deming, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osage Nation, Pawhuska, OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, Tucson, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poarch Band of Creek Indians, Atmore, AL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponca Tribe of Nebraska, Niobrara, NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo of Laguna Youth Cultural Enrichment Program, Old Laguna, NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, Red Lake, MN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson Rancheria, Nice, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe, Mt. Pleasant, MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos Housing Authority, Peridot, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Pueblo, Espanola, NM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueno Indians, Santa Ysabel, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldovia Village Tribe, Seldovia, AK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca Nation of Indians, Salamanca, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe, Tokeland, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe, Agency Village, SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Tribe, Wellpinit, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suquamish Tribe, Suquamish, WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah), Aquinnah, MA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita and Affiliated Tribes, Anadarko, OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe, Prescott, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yurok Tribe, Eureka, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
developed by the U.S. Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, the Interior, and Justice.

Funding from the TYP Mental Health Initiative helps tribes provide programs and services that address the mental health and related needs of AI/AN youth and their families in various community settings, such as schools, violence prevention programs, healthcare programs, and the juvenile justice system. Grant funds can be used to:

✦ Reduce, control, and prevent crime and delinquency committed by and against AI/AN youth.
✦ Provide interventions for court-involved tribal youth.
✦ Improve juvenile justice systems.
✦ Provide programs that focus on alcohol and drugs.

In FY 2002, OJJDP awarded 5 new TYP Mental Health Initiative grants, bringing to 16 the number of grants awarded since FY 2000. The new grants total $950,000; individual awards range from $125,000 to $300,000, depending on the size of the total AI/AN service population living on or near a particular reservation.

The new grantees were competitively selected from 16 applications received from tribes in 8 states. The FY 2002 Mental Health Initiative grants were awarded to Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Siletz, OR; Eastern Aleutian Tribes, Inc., of Anchorage, AK; Mount Sanford Tribal Consortium of Gakona, AK; Osage Nation of Pawhuska, OK; and Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation of Mayetta, KS.

Grantees are using their funds for a variety of programs. Grant activities include combating juvenile drug and alcohol use, improving access to appropriate interventions for court-involved youth, expanding mental health services to address delinquency risk factors, providing a continuum of prevention and residential treatment services for at-risk males, and developing a mental health service program to address delinquency among tribal youth residing on a reservation and in nearby rural and urban areas.

**Comprehensive Indian Resources for Community and Law Enforcement Project**

OJJDP participates in the Comprehensive Indian Resources for Community and Law Enforcement (CIRCLE) Project, a multiagency federal initiative that helps tribal communities develop comprehensive planning and funding infrastructures to fight crime, violence, and substance abuse. The CIRCLE Project stresses the importance of involving local leaders and using a comprehensive approach (i.e., coordinated, multidisciplinary efforts).

Through the CIRCLE Project, OJJDP awarded TYP grants in FY 1999 and FY 2000 to tribes in three pilot sites—the Northern Cheyenne Tribe in Lame Deer, MT; Oglala Sioux Tribe in Pine Ridge, SD; and Pueblo of Zuni in Zuni, NM. These tribes receive special consideration for technical assistance and training related to strategy development and implementation and are eligible to apply for funding for law enforcement, tribal courts, detention facilities, and youth programs.

Several DOJ agencies work together to make technical assistance and funding available for the CIRCLE Project. Partner agencies include the Office of the Attorney General, the Office of Tribal Justice, OJP, and the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. The U.S. Attorney also plays a role in the project, and the FBI and the Department of the Interior’s Bureau of Indian Affairs contribute through the Indian Country Law Enforcement Improvement Initiative. DOJ’s National Institute of Justice is overseeing an evaluation of the CIRCLE Project, which is being conducted by the Harvard Project on American Indian Development at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government in Cambridge, MA. A draft report for Phase I of the evaluation,
which covers the first 18 months of the project, is under review. Phase II began in December 2002 and will address the subsequent 30 months.

Training and Technical Assistance

OJJDP provides a comprehensive program of training and technical assistance (T&TA) to help TYP grantees implement their programs. These services are designed to be culturally relevant and appropriate for tribal communities.

OJJDP’s technical assistance addresses a number of issues, including needs assessment, comprehensive planning, data management, data collection instruments, and evaluation design. Training topics include strategies for conducting juvenile justice needs assessments, juvenile justice systems in Indian country, indigenous justice systems, early intervention strategies, steps for incorporating culturally relevant strategies into programs, and resource development and grant writing strategies.

American Indian Development Associates (AIDA) of Albuquerque, NM, provided this T&TA during FY 2002. Major activities included conducting a research and evaluation focus group, sponsoring a series of grant-writing seminars, and holding a national orientation meeting for new TYP grantees.

During 2002, AIDA offered 40 T&TA events, which involved nearly 800 participants and instructors. The events focused on a variety of topics, including:

- Program evaluation and data management: use of data collection instruments and computerized databases in collecting, entering, and analyzing program data for reports.

- Collaboration: development of effective working relationships with other tribal programs and external agencies.

- Policy development: use of existing tribal and state laws to develop intergovernmental and interagency agreements to support program implementation or systems.

Training in other areas, such as mentoring, grant writing, juvenile court management, probation, and detention, provided competency-building opportunities for TYP staff, other tribal program staff, and tribal community leaders and citizens. AIDA also developed a number of curriculum materials and helped TYP grantees develop their own materials.

OJJDP competitively solicited applicants in FY 2002 to continue providing training and technical assistance to TYP grantees and other tribal communities. The Native American Alliance Foundation of Albuquerque, NM, was selected to provide this service.

Research and Evaluation

OJJDP uses TYP funds to support a number of research and evaluation activities designed to provide empirical evidence about juvenile justice and delinquency prevention policies and practices and their impact on tribal youth. During FY 2002, the Office began a major new study, which will examine risk and protective factors for juvenile delinquency within the unique cultural and historical context of a tribal community. The Longitudinal Study of Tribal Youth Risk and Resiliency Using the Community Readiness Model (Longitudinal Study) will be conducted by Colorado State University’s Tri-Ethnic Center for Prevention Research of Boulder, CO.

By emphasizing cultural and historical factors, the Longitudinal Study will significantly improve knowledge about individual, family, community, school, and peer factors that affect delinquency and resiliency among tribal youth. It will also promote the development of culturally appropriate research methods for use with tribal communities. The first 2 years of the Longitudinal Study will consist of a feasibility study to plan the research.

The Office also supports a number of field-initiated research and evaluation programs. It funded two new programs in FY 2001. Sandoval Indian Pueblos, Inc.,
a consortium of five pueblos in Sandoval County, NM, received funds to explore the causes of and responses to youth substance abuse and crime. The study will use secondary and archival data sources, youth surveys, and interviews of tribe members to assess the nature of juvenile delinquency in the pueblos. Another new study, by the Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa of Bayfield, WI, will conduct an evaluation of the juvenile justice system on the Red Cliff Reservation. The evaluation will focus on the reservation’s tribal court, tribal substance abuse programs, and Indian Child Welfare program.

OJJDP also continued to support several existing research studies. These studies are examining a wide range of topics, including culturally appropriate prevention programs, delinquency and legal processing of American Indian juveniles, and gang activity of tribal youth. These studies are described in an OJJDP Fact Sheet, OJJDP’s Program of Research for Tribal Youth.

Survey of Youth Gangs in Indian Country

OJJDP’s National Youth Gang Center (NYGC), described on pages 34–36, conducted a survey of youth gangs in Indian country in 2001. NYGC surveyed 577 federally recognized tribal communities to measure the presence, size, and activity of youth gangs in these communities. The survey was designed to assess the prevalence, composition, and activities of youth gangs in federally recognized tribes, which are not traditionally included in NYGC’s annual National Youth Gang Survey of law enforcement officials. The tribal survey was developed in consultation with a number of tribal members, officials, and representatives from the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Although the full report for this study is under development, some key findings are already available. Of the 300 tribal communities that provided data, 23 percent (69 tribes) reported active gangs during 2000. This proportion is similar to proportions in rural counties that report active youth gangs on the national survey. The majority of tribal respondents indicated that they had five or fewer gangs. The average time of onset for gang problems in tribal communities was 1994. Property crimes and drug sales were commonly reported activities of these gangs. When asked about the severity of a variety of social problems, respondents ranked gang activity well below more general problems associated with drug abuse and domestic violence. Further analysis of the survey data will focus on gang member offending, weapons use, and the influence of nearby cities and border towns on tribal youth.

An OJJDP/NYGC Fact Sheet, 2000 Survey of Youth Gangs in Indian Country, summarizes the survey findings. This Fact Sheet is available online from the Tribal Youth Program page of OJJDP’s Web site or from the NYGC Web site.

New Publication

The National Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) Association began a Tribal Court CASA Project in 1994 to support programs in which volunteers act as advocates for abused or neglected AI/AN children. CASA volunteers are lay people assigned by judges to represent the best interests of children with cases before the court. (TYP grant funds can be used to support tribal courts and other activities, such as afterschool programs and mentoring programs.) An OJJDP Fact Sheet, Tribal Court CASA: A Guide to Program Development, describes the project and offers guidance on program planning, management, and working with volunteers. The Fact Sheet summarizes a tribal court CASA guide published by the National Court Appointed Special Advocate Association and the Tribal Law and Policy Institute in 2000.
Chapter 8
Collecting Information on Juveniles in Custody

OJJDP has been collecting information for nearly 30 years on the number of juveniles held in detention and other facilities. Until 1995, these data were gathered through the biennial Census of Public and Private Juvenile Detention, Correctional, and Shelter Facilities, better known as the Children in Custody (CIC) Census. In the late 1990s, OJJDP initiated two new data collection programs to gather comprehensive and detailed information about juvenile offenders in custody and about the facilities themselves. The first of these, the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (CJRP), has been conducted three times—in 1997, 1999, and 2001—and will be administered again in October 2003. The Juvenile Residential Facility Census (JRFC) was conducted in 2000 and 2002. JRFC collects information about the facilities (rather than the residents) and includes questions regarding available beds, security, and education, mental health, medical, and substance abuse services. JRFC also asks about deaths of residents in custody. OJJDP administers CJRP and JRFC in alternating years.

This chapter summarizes data derived mainly from CJRP and JRFC. It also discusses two recent OJJDP survey projects that will shed light on the personal background and experience of juveniles in custody and provide comprehensive data about juveniles on probation.

Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement

CJRP covers all secure and nonsecure residential facilities that house juvenile offenders, defined as persons younger than 21 who are held in a residential setting because of an offense and as a result of some contact with the justice system. The census encompasses both status offenders and delinquent offenders, including those who are either detained or committed for an offense.

In 1997, more than 96 percent of the 3,431 surveyed facilities responded. In 1999, all 3,712 surveyed facilities provided at least some information. Based on survey data, an estimated 105,790 juvenile offenders were in residential placement in 1997. In 1999, the number was 108,931—a 3-percent increase from 1997. In 1997, juvenile offenders were held in 2,844 residential facilities: 1,108 public and 1,736 private. In 1999, juveniles were held in 2,939 residential facilities: 1,136 public, 1,794 private, and 9 tribal. In 1999, public facilities held 71 percent of all juvenile offenders in residential placement, private facilities held 29 percent, and tribal facilities held less than 1 percent.

As a resource for those who want to learn more about youth in custody, OJJDP makes CJRP data available online in the “Statistical Briefing Book” section of the OJJDP Web site. Data from the 2001 CJRP are being processed and are expected to be available in 2004.

Juvenile Residential Facility Census

The first JRFC, conducted in October 2000, collected information from 3,690 juvenile residential facilities. Of these facilities, 3,061 held a total of 110,284 offenders younger than 21 on the census date. Four in ten of the surveyed facilities were publicly operated, and these public facilities held 70 percent of all juvenile offenders in custody.

11JRFC does not capture data on adult prisons or jails, nor does it include facilities used exclusively for mental health or substance abuse treatment or for dependent children. Thus, JRFC includes most, but not all, facilities that hold juvenile offenders.
Nearly all (94 percent) of the facilities surveyed in the 2000 JRFC reported the number of standard beds available on the census date and whether they had any currently occupied makeshift beds. Many—about 4 in 10—said they did not have enough standard beds for all of their residents. These “crowded” facilities held about 40 percent of all residents and 40 percent of offenders younger than 21.

Crowding occurs when the number of residents occupying all or part of a facility exceeds some predetermined limit based on square footage, utility use, or fire codes. Comparing the number of residents to the number of available standard beds, although not a perfect measure of crowding, gives a sense of the problem. However, a facility may be crowded even if it is not relying on makeshift beds. For example, using standard beds in an infirmary for youth who are not sick or beds in seclusion for youth who have not committed infractions may indicate crowding problems.

JRFC found a national average of nearly five empty standard beds per facility. However, this average masks a wide range: one facility with 567 residents had 124 residents for whom it did not have standard beds, and one facility with 1,207 residents reported 1,181 empty standard beds. JRFC also found that facilities reporting fewer standard beds than residents were significantly more likely than other facilities (45 percent versus 38 percent) to say they transported youth to emergency rooms because of injuries resulting from interpersonal conflict in the month prior to the census.

Findings from the 2000 JRFC are discussed in an OJJDP Bulletin, Juvenile Residential Facility Census, 2000: Selected Findings. Data from the October 2002 JRFC are being processed and are expected to be available in 2004.

Deaths in Custody

In 1994, juvenile facilities reported that 45 juveniles died while in custody. In 2000, the number (based on JRFC findings) was 30. There has been concern about the risk of death to youth in custody and whether that risk is greater than the risk faced by youth in general. In 1999, there was 1 death for every 2,230 youth ages 13–17 in the general population. For youth in custody, there was 1 death for every 3,990 beds occupied. Thus, the death rate for youth in custody was a little more than half the rate for youth in the general population.

More than half (17) of the 30 deaths of youth in custody occurred outside the facility. Private facilities accounted for most deaths outside the facility. Public facilities accounted for most deaths inside the facility. Public facilities reported 14 deaths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause of death</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Inside the facility</th>
<th>Outside the facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>All Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13 9 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 0 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness/natural</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 4 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6 5 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide by nonresident</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data are reported deaths of youth in custody from 10/1/1999 through 9/30/2000. Death information was reported by 94% of facilities that held 96% of all residents.

Private facilities reported 16 deaths (4 inside, 12 outside).

All facilities reporting suicides said they evaluate residents within 24 hours of arrival to determine whether they are at risk for suicide. All but one facility said they evaluate all residents for suicide risk. The one facility that did not evaluate all residents said it evaluated youth who attempt suicide, who display or communicate suicide risk, or for whom no mental health record is available. Of the 135 facilities that reported transporting at least one juvenile to a hospital emergency room because of a suicide attempt, none reported a suicide death.

**Survey of Youth in Residential Placement**

In addition to supporting the collection of important information through CJRP and JRFC, OJJDP recognizes the value of interviewing youth in juvenile justice system facilities. Such interviews provide a wealth of information on past offending behavior, pathways to delinquency, family and social environments, and experiences in custody. Using Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants (JAIBG) funds, OJJDP awarded a cooperative agreement in 1998 to Westat, Inc., of Rockville, MD, to develop the Survey of Youth in Residential Placement (SYRP). This survey collects self-report data from 10,000 juveniles residing in juvenile facilities, including youth with long-term placements in training schools and residential treatment facilities and those with short-term placements in detention centers, shelters, and group homes.

SYRP addresses the experiences of youth before they enter custodial facilities and during their stays. It includes questions on topics such as education, home environment, and substance abuse; number and types of offenses committed; and types of sanctions received for previous offenses. OJJDP will use SYRP data to complement other research on delinquency careers and offending behavior and to monitor the range of residential placements used for juvenile offenders. In addition, SYRP supports the JAIBG program goal of holding juveniles accountable for their delinquent acts. Westat conducted the first SYRP in spring 2003. Results are expected in 2004.

**Census and Survey of Juvenile Probation**

To help determine both the number of juveniles under community supervision and the nature of that supervision, OJJDP is funding the Census and Survey of Juvenile Probation. The project, which is being conducted jointly by George Mason University of Fairfax, VA, and the U.S. Bureau of the Census, consists of two surveys: the Census of Juvenile Probation Supervision Offices (CJPSO) and the Census of Juveniles on Probation (CJP). CJPSO, which gathers information on juvenile probation counts, processing, and programming, will be field tested in 2003 and administered in spring 2004. CJP, which collects aggregate counts of juveniles on probation by geographic area and information about their demographic characteristics and offenses, is expected to be field tested in 2004 and administered in spring 2005.
Chapter 9
Getting the Word Out

Sharing information with juvenile justice practitioners, policymakers, and the public—information about research, statistics, and programs that work—is a longstanding priority at OJJDP. During 2002, the Office began shifting its focus from primarily printed documents to electronic ones. In connection with this shift, OJJDP moved forward with major redesign work on the Office’s Web site and on an ancillary page, the “Statistical Briefing Book.” The year also marked the introduction of a popular new bimonthly newsletter.

Other dissemination activities included inauguration of a series of Bulletins on youth violence research and continuation of a series that addresses crimes against children and another series that updates statistics about juvenile offenders and victims. OJJDP also began work on Spanish translations of two major guides for families of missing children and victims of international parental kidnapping.

These and the other activities discussed in this chapter were all designed to help keep the juvenile justice field informed about research findings, juvenile justice statistics, and promising programs.

New Approach to Information Dissemination

Although still committed to sharing critical juvenile justice information with the field, OJJDP began updating and streamlining its approach to dissemination in FY 2002 by relying more on its Web site and exploring electronic publishing activities. As part of this effort, the Office started targeting its mailings of publications and grant announcements to more carefully defined audiences, limiting the number of printed copies. Electronic versions of all publications and solicitations may be viewed and downloaded from the Office’s Web site.

OJJDP also began looking to online publication as an alternative to print for disseminating certain information. For example, statistics and other time-sensitive materials are a natural for the Web, where they can be published more quickly, updated more easily (and therefore more frequently), and presented without the physical constraints of print media. As a result of the Office’s new approach to dissemination, the juvenile justice field is benefiting from quicker, more focused access to the information it needs, and the federal government is making better use of taxpayer dollars.

I . . . would like to applaud you on your move from mostly paper to mostly online. I have “subscribed” to and received hundreds of wonderful study and statistical summaries, but feel your new method of distribution is a great way to reduce printing and mailing costs, in addition to other distribution costs.

Professor
Rutgers University

Bimonthly Newsletter

One of OJJDP’s major accomplishments in FY 2002 was the development of OJJDP News @ a Glance, a bimonthly newsletter—disseminated in print and electronic versions—that provides up-to-date notices of OJJDP’s activities, recent publications, funding opportunities,
and upcoming events. The newsletter is a cornerstone in OJJDP's growing emphasis on electronic dissemination.

In addition to regular features, the newsletter issues produced during FY 2002 included special articles on a number of topics, including OJJDP's new administrator, major OJJDP conferences, missing children's issues and related activities, and youth court programs. The newsletter garnered 1,000 subscribers in the first 5 months after its launch, and that number grew to almost 2,000 within a year. Both electronic and print subscriptions are available. Instructions for subscribing are available on OJJDP's Web site.

Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse

OJJDP's Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse (JJC) is a one-stop shop that provides toll-free telephone and online access to a wealth of information about juvenile justice, delinquency prevention, and child protection. Clearinghouse clients include policymakers, practitioners, researchers, parents, youth, members of the media, and representatives of community organizations. Operated by Aspen Systems Corporation of Rockville, MD, JJC offers easy access to up-to-date research and statistics, program descriptions, publications, practical guides and manuals, information about grants and funding opportunities, and many other useful resources. The Clearinghouse is a component of the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

The Clearinghouse produces many of OJJDP's publications, including research and statistical reports and training and technical assistance manuals. JJC also maintains a toll-free number (800–851–3420). During 2002, JJC distributed more than 1 million documents and responded to 35,523 telephone, fax, and e-mail requests.

Juvenile justice publications, videotapes, and other materials can be ordered 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, through the NCJRS Online Ordering System (puborder.ncjrs.org). In FY 2002, JJC received 6,502 orders for juvenile justice products through the NCJRS system. NCJRS also maintains a comprehensive database of approximately 180,000 titles, 55,000 of which are devoted to juvenile justice, delinquency prevention, and child protection issues.

The Clearinghouse administers JUVJUST, OJJDP's popular electronic mailing list that provides timely information about OJJDP and other youth-service-related publications, events, and funding opportunities. The number of JUVJUST subscribers continues to grow, increasing from 7,881 to 9,069 between October 2001 and September 2002. (The mailing list had approximately 2,000 subscribers in 1997.) OJJDP posted 79 JUVJUST announcements during FY 2002. Archived JUVJUSTs for the most recent 12 months and instructions for subscribing to JUVJUST are available on OJJDP's Web site.

From a request for information and publications about recidivism:

Thank you very much for your time and your help. I did not expect such a quick and complete response. I really appreciated it.

Assistant Attorney General of Ohio
Columbus, OH

Web Site

JJC designed and maintains OJJDP's Web site (www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ojjdp). The site provides detailed information on OJJDP-sponsored programs, announces new publications, allows users to download nearly all OJJDP-produced publications, lists information about current and past funding opportunities, includes a calendar of events on upcoming OJJDP-sponsored conferences, and provides access to speeches given by the OJJDP Administrator. The site's “askjj@ncjrs.org” feature allows users to ask questions via e-mail and receive individualized responses from JJC staff.
One of OJJDP’s and JJC’s major Web site activities during FY 2002 was working with OJP in designing OJP’s comprehensive reentry Web site for the Serious and Violent Offender Initiative, discussed on pages 30–31. The reentry site provides a wealth of information, ranging from state and federal resources to publications to training and technical assistance.

OJJDP also began developing mini Web pages highlighting major conferences and other events. These pages allow OJJDP to inform the field promptly about speeches and activities that take place at these events. One example is the page developed after the White House Conference on Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children (see page 14).

Other highlights of the Web site include a “JJ Facts & Figures” section that provides information on juvenile justice, delinquency prevention, and violence and victimization. This section offers a diagram showing how cases proceed through the juvenile justice system. It also includes the “Statistical Briefing Book,” which presents timely and reliable statistical answers to frequently asked questions about juvenile crime and victimization and the juvenile justice system. During FY 2002, OJJDP moved forward with a comprehensive redesign of the “Briefing Book,” adding new topics (e.g., juvenile justice system structure and process, probation, and reentry/aftercare) and features (e.g., a compendium of national data sets, links to other statistical resources, and a statistical glossary) that will make the site even easier and quicker to use.

The OJJDP Web site also maintains separate pages for many of the programs the Office funds or administers. These include, among others, the Drug-Free Communities Support Program, Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants program, and Juvenile Mentoring Program.

During 2002, the OJJDP Web site home page had more than 2 million visits, and the overall site had approximately 45 million visits (a 10-percent increase over 2001). OJJDP began redesigning the Web site in FY 2002 and plans to unveil the new site in 2003.

New Publications

During FY 2002, OJJDP developed and produced new Fact Sheets, Bulletins, and Reports addressing a wide range of issues (see appendix list). All of these publications are available from JJC. Nearly all may be downloaded from OJJDP’s Web site.

Many of these new publications have been noted throughout this Report, including important documents related to missing and exploited children (Chapter 2) and a series of Bulletins about youth gang issues (Chapter 5). In addition, the Office developed three new series of documents, described below.

Crimes Against Children Bulletin Series

The Crimes Against Children Series of Bulletins presents the latest information about child victimization, based on information from the FBI’s National Incident-Based Reporting System. OJJDP released three new Bulletins in this series during FY 2002: The Criminal Justice System’s Response to Parental Abduction, Homicides of Children and Youth, and Offenders Incarcerated for Crimes Against Juveniles. Topics of upcoming Bulletins in this series include child pornography, juvenile victims of intimate partner violence, explanations for the decline in child sexual abuse during the 1990s, and prostitution of juveniles.

National Report Bulletin Series

Approximately every 4–5 years, OJJDP publishes the Juvenile Offenders and Victims National Report. This popular document provides a comprehensive statistical picture of the problems of juvenile crime, violence, and victimization and the response of the juvenile justice system. The most recent Report was published in 1999. During the years between Reports, OJJDP publishes a series of updates (Fact Sheets and Bulletins) that provide the latest

FY 2002
available information about juvenile offenders and victims. During FY 2002, the agency published two documents in this series:

✦ The Bulletin Law Enforcement and Juvenile Crime presents statistics on the extent and characteristics of juvenile arrests in 1999 and also includes trends from the 1980s.

✦ The Fact Sheet Juvenile Offenders in Residential Placement, 1997–1999, discusses findings from the second wave of data collection for the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement (see page 59).

Youth Violence Research Series

OJJDP and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s National Center for Injury Prevention and Control are working together to reduce youth violence. One component of their partnership is a series of Youth Violence Research Bulletins, which present the most recent research findings on topics related to youth violence. The first Bulletin in the series, Short- and Long-Term Consequences of Adolescent Victimization, was published in FY 2002. This Bulletin analyzes National Youth Survey data to explore how being a victim of crime during adolescence affects the likelihood of certain negative outcomes in adulthood, including offending and victimization (both violent and property crimes), domestic violence perpetration and victimization, drug use, and mental health problems.

Satellite Videoconferencing

Satellite videoconferencing is a cost-effective way to help practitioners, policymakers, and researchers keep abreast of developments in the field without having to travel far from home. OJJDP has sponsored satellite videoconferences since 1995 through its grantee, Eastern Kentucky University (EKU) of Richmond, KY. A typical videoconference reaches some 500 sites and approximately 15,000 individuals at downlink sites and computers. During FY 2002, OJJDP sponsored the videoconferences described below.

✦ “School Safety by Management and Design,” presented on October 25, 2001, was the third in a series of satellite videoconferences on school safety from the Hamilton Fish Institute of Washington, DC. The videoconference featured demonstrations of school safety programs coordinated by EKU, the Morehouse School of Medicine, and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

✦ “OJJDP: Direction and Focus for 2002 and Beyond” was broadcast on December 6, 2001. This videoconference provided an overview of the Office’s direction and focus for the coming year.

✦ “Schoolwide Education for Violence Prevention,” presented on April 11, 2002, was another in the Hamilton Fish Institute series on school safety. This videoconference highlighted several strategies used in programs the Institute has found to be effective for violence prevention. The videoconference also featured discussions of effective schoolwide strategies, including anger management, conflict resolution, social skills training, communications skills training, and use of mediation, police, and legal services.

In addition, OJP highlighted its Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (see page 30) in a satellite videoconference on February 28, 2002. The broadcast was designed for criminal and juvenile justice practitioners, judges and court staff, policymakers, community leaders, prosecutors, defense attorneys, probation and parole officers, social service agencies, law enforcement agencies, and others interested in promoting public safety and helping former offenders live as law-abiding and contributing members of society.

Information about past and future videoconferences and instructions for purchasing tapes of past conferences are available on OJJDP’s Web site. Archived broadcasts may be viewed free of charge at EKU’s Web site (www.trc.eku.edu/jj/archive.html).
On the Horizon

Electronic Bulletins and Fact Sheets

In keeping with its growing emphasis on electronic dissemination of information, OJJDP began development work in FY 2002 for a series of online Juvenile Justice Practices Bulletins (see page 51), which will facilitate systems change by providing the juvenile justice field with the latest information on research and best practices in a variety of areas. The first Bulletin in the series, Aftercare Services, was posted on the Office’s Web site in fall 2003. OJJDP also put in place plans to substitute online publications for many of its statistical Fact Sheets. The first online statistical Fact Sheets, summarizing the latest available juvenile court data, were also posted in fall 2003.

Major New Print Publications

Although OJJDP welcomes the efficiencies and cost savings associated with electronic publishing, it will continue to make many of its most popular publications available in print as well as electronic formats, to ensure that these important resources reach the widest possible audience. In FY 2002, planning and development work began for the next edition of Juvenile Offenders and Victims: National Report, which offers comprehensive information about juvenile crime, violence, and victimization and the response of the juvenile justice system to these problems. The Office also initiated plans to add several new titles to its series of Portable Guides for law enforcement and other professionals involved in investigating cases of child abuse and neglect. New topics will include basic information about child development, response to child abduction, commercial sexual exploitation of children, and investigation of child fatalities. An update of the guide on investigation of cases involving the use of computers in sexual exploitation of children is also planned.

Spanish Translations of Family Guides

As FY 2002 came to a close, OJJDP faced several challenges in planning for the next fiscal year. These challenges included a delay in FY 2003 funding availability and a legislative restructuring of program activities.

The 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act (DOJ reauthorization), signed into law on November 2, 2002, while supporting the established mission of OJJDP, introduced important changes that streamline the Office’s operations and bring a sharper focus to its role. The provisions of the reauthorization originally were to take effect in FY 2003, but a subsequent appropriations act postponed the effective date to FY 2004 (which begins on October 1, 2003). Although OJJDP was able to establish priorities for FY 2003, it was not able to begin program planning for FY 2003 until a bill allocating funding for the Office was signed into law in February 2003.

This chapter provides a brief overview of the agency’s program priorities and planning for 2003. It also summarizes the program changes mandated by the DOJ reauthorization.

**OJJDP Priorities for FY 2003**

Children are the nation’s greatest resource, and ensuring that every child has the opportunity to become a productive member of society is at the heart of OJJDP’s mission. Reflecting a renewed focus on children who are most at risk of missing out on that opportunity, OJJDP established the following four program priorities for FY 2003:

- **Prostitution of children.** OJJDP will collaborate with other agencies and the law enforcement and social services communities to address this problem. As a first step, the agency held a national summit on child prostitution in December 2002 (see page 16).

- **Truancy.** The effects of truancy are pervasive. The problem takes its toll not only on students (who are more likely to fall behind in school, drop out, and become involved with the juvenile justice system), but also on schools and communities. Building on lessons learned at seven truancy reduction demonstration sites (discussed on pages 23–25), OJJDP will work to ensure that communities have access to strategies that work.

- **Disproportionate minority contact (DMC).** The 2002 reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act broadened the concept of disproportionate minority confinement to address the disproportionate numbers of minority youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system at any point—from arrest to reentry. Recognizing that addressing DMC will require long-term coordinated efforts at the federal, state, and local levels, OJJDP will continue to support research and targeted training and technical assistance to help states and communities meet the challenges of DMC.

- **Tribal youth assistance.** Recognizing the unique needs of tribal communities, OJJDP will continue its direct support of delinquency prevention and juvenile justice projects that originate with the tribes themselves. These projects incorporate indigenous customs and draw on tribal strengths to help youth live up to their potential.

**FY 2003 Funding for OJJDP Programs**

The new DOJ reauthorization restructured much of OJJDP’s funding activity, consolidating several previously independent programs and introducing a number of other significant changes. OJJDP’s funding situation for FY 2003 (which began
October 1, 2002) was complicated by a combination of this restructuring and issues related to the continuing resolution process that governed spending by federal agencies until Congress enacted an appropriations bill. Only after February 20, 2003, when President Bush signed into law a bill that appropriated operating funds through the remainder of FY 2003, could OJJDP begin to publish program solicitation notices in the Federal Register and announcements on the OJJDP Web site. Programs for FY 2003 will be funded as they existed prior to the November DOJ reauthorization, and the provisions of the reauthorization will not take effect until FY 2004 (October 1, 2003).

**OJJDP Program Restructuring**

The DOJ reauthorization restructured and consolidated several OJJDP programs. The major program changes are summarized below.

**Program consolidation.** The JJDP Act of 2002, which is part of the DOJ reauthorization, consolidates seven previously independent juvenile justice programs of the JJDP Act of 1974 into a single prevention block grant. It repeals the following parts of Title II of the JJDP Act: Part C (National Programs), Part D (Gangs), Part E (State Challenge Activities), Part F (Treatment of Juvenile Offenders Who Are Victims of Child Abuse or Neglect), Part G (Mentoring), Part H (Boot Camps), and the first subpart of Part I (White House Conference on Juvenile Justice). In their place, it creates a new Part C that establishes the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Block Grant Program, under which states and Indian tribes may receive block grants to carry out the general purposes of the repealed programs.

**Research, training, technical assistance, demonstration, and information dissemination.** The new JJDP Act further amends Title II by creating a new Part D that authorizes research, training, technical assistance, and information dissemination regarding juvenile justice matters. The Act also adds a new Part E that authorizes awards of grants for developing, testing, and demonstrating new initiatives and programs for the prevention, control, and reduction of juvenile delinquency.

**Title V Community Delinquency Prevention.** The new JJDP Act reauthorizes the Title V Community Prevention Grants Program, expands its purpose areas, and creates a new reporting requirement on the effectiveness of funded programs.

**Juvenile Accountability Block Grants.** The reauthorization also revises the purpose areas, reporting and monitoring requirements, and other aspects of the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants (JAI BG) program, which will be called the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants (JABG) program.
Appendix

OJJDP Publications Produced in FY 2002

The following publications are available through OJJDP’s Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse (JJC). Most are available both in print and online. For additional information, see page viii.

Addressing Youth Victimization (Action Plan Series Bulletin), NCJ 186667

Burglary Cases in Juvenile Court, 1989–1998 (Fact Sheet), FS–200208

Children Abducted by Family Members: National Estimates and Characteristics (NISMART Series Bulletin), NCJ 196466

The Criminal Justice System’s Response to Parental Abduction (Bulletin), NCJ 186160

Detention in Delinquency Cases, 1989–1998 (Fact Sheet), FS–200201

Early Precursors of Gang Membership: A Study of Seattle Youth (Youth Gang Series Bulletin), NCJ 190106

The 8% Solution (Fact Sheet), FS–200139

A Family Resource Guide on International Parental Kidnapping (Report), NCJ 190448

Highlights From the NISMART Bulletins (NISMART Series Fact Sheet, available online only)

Highlights of the 2000 National Youth Gang Survey (Fact Sheet), FS–200204

Homicides of Children and Youth (Crimes Against Children Series Bulletin), NCJ 187239

Hybrid and Other Modern Gangs (Youth Gang Series Bulletin), NCJ 189916

Issues in Resolving Cases of International Child Abduction by Parents (Bulletin), NCJ 190105

Juvenile Court Placement of Adjudicated Youth, 1989–1998 (Fact Sheet), FS–200202

Juvenile Gun Courts: Promoting Accountability and Providing Treatment (JAIBG Series Bulletin), NCJ 187078


Law Enforcement and Juvenile Crime (National Report Series Bulletin), NCJ 191031

Law Enforcement Guide on International Parental Kidnapping (Report), NCJ 194639 (not available online)

Modern-Day Youth Gangs (Youth Gang Series Bulletin), NCJ 191524

National Estimates of Missing Children: An Overview (NISMART Series Bulletin), NCJ 196465

National Evaluation of the Title V Community Prevention Grants Program (Fact Sheet), FS–200137

National Juvenile Court Data Archive Web Site (Fact Sheet), FS–200140

National Youth Gang Survey Trends From 1996 to 2000 (Fact Sheet), FS–200205

NISMART Questions and Answers (NISMART Series Fact Sheet, available online only)

Nonfamily Abducted Children: National Estimates and Characteristics (NISMART Series Bulletin), NCJ 196467
Annual Report

Offenders Incarcerated for Crimes Against Juveniles (Crimes Against Children Series Bulletin), NCJ 191028

OJJDP News @ a Glance (Newsletter)

July/August 2002, Vol. I, No. 4, NCJ 195663

Protecting Children in Cyberspace: The ICAC Task Force Program (Bulletin), NCJ 191213

Public/Private Ventures’ Evaluation of Faith-Based Programs (Fact Sheet), FS–200138

Robbery Cases in Juvenile Court, 1989–1998 (Fact Sheet), FS–200205


Short- and Long-Term Consequences of Adolescent Victimization (Youth Violence Research Series Bulletin), NCJ 191210

Title V Community Prevention Grants Program: 2000 Report to Congress (Report), NCJ 190635

Tribal Court CASA: A Guide to Program Development (Fact Sheet), FS–200209

The Uniform Child-Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (Bulletin), NCJ 189181

Publications From OJJDP

OJJDP produces a wide variety of materials, including Bulletins, Fact Sheets, Reports, Summaries, videotapes, and the Juvenile Justice journal. These materials and other resources are available through OJJDP’s Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse (JJC), as described below.

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

Corrections and Detention

Courts
Employment and Training for Court-Involved Youth. 2000, NCJ 182787 (116 pp.).
Juvenile Drug Court Programs. 2001, NCJ 184744 (16 pp.).
Juvenile Transfers to Criminal Court in the Juvenile Gun Courts: Promoting Accountability and Providing Treatment. 2002, NCJ 196595 (4 pp.).

Delinquency Prevention
Law Enforcement and Juvenile Crime. 2001, NCJ 191031 (32 pp.).
Prevalence and Development of Child Delinquency. 2003, NCJ 193411 (8 pp.).
Restorative Justice Conferences as an Early Response to Young Offenders. 2001, NCJ 187769 (12 pp.).
Truancy Reduction: Keeping Students in School. 2001, NCJ 188947 (16 pp.).
The YouthARTS Development Project. 2001, NCJ 186668 (16 pp.).

Gangs
Early Precursors of Gang Membership: A Study of Seattle Youth. 2001, NCJ 190106 (6 pp.).
Hybrid and Other Modern Gangs. 2001, NCJ 189916 (8 pp.).
Modern-Day Youth Gangs. 2002, NCJ 191524 (12 pp.).

General Juvenile Justice
Changes to OJJDP’s Juvenile Accountability Program. 2003, NCJ 200220 (6 pp.).
Juvenile Justice (Mental Health Issue), Volume VI, Number 1, 2000, NCJ 178256 (44 pp.).
Latest Resources From OJJDP, 2003, BC 000115 (56 pp.).
OJJDP’s Tribal Youth Initiatives, 2003, NCJ 193763 (8 pp.).
Special Education and the Juvenile Justice System. 2000, NCJ 179359 (16 pp.).

Missing and Exploited Children
Child Abuse Reported to the Police. 2001, NCJ 187238 (8 pp.).
The Criminal Justice System’s Response to Parental Abduction. 2001, NCJ 186160 (16 pp.).
Issues in Resolving Cases of International Child Abduction by Parents, 2001, NCJ 190105 (20 pp.).
Overview of the Portable Guides to Investigating Child Abuse: Update 2000, 2000, NCJ 178893 (12 pp.).

Substance Abuse
The Coach’s Playbook Against Drugs. 1998, NCJ 173393 (24 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
Addressing Youth Victimization. 2001, NCJ 186667 (20 pp.).
Animal Abuse and Youth Violence. 2001, NCJ 188677 (16 pp.).
Community Correlates of Rural Youth Violence. 2003, NCJ 193591 (12 pp.).
Crimes Against Children by Babysitters. 2001, NCJ 189102 (8 pp.).
Gun Use by Male Juveniles: Research and Prevention. 2001, NCJ 188992 (12 pp.).
Homicides of Children and Youth. 2001, NCJ 187239 (12 pp.).
Juvenile Delinquency and Serious Injury Victimization. 2001, NCJ 188676 (8 pp.).
Juvenile Justice (School Violence Issue), Volume VIII, Number 1, 2001, NCJ 188158 (40 pp.).
Offenders Incarcerated for Crimes Against Juveniles. 2001, NCJ 191026 (12 pp.).
Race, Ethnicity, and Serious and Violent Juvenile Offending. 2000, NCJ 181202 (8 pp.).
Short- and Long-Term Consequences of Adolescent Victimization. 2002, NCJ 191210 (16 pp.).
Violent Victimization as a Risk Factor for Violent Offending Among Juveniles. 2002, NCJ 195737 (12 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.ojp.usdoj.gov/ojjdp.
To order materials online, visit JJC’s 24-hour online store: puborder.ncjrs.org.
To ask questions about materials, go to askjj.ncjrs.org.
To subscribe to JUVJUST, OJJDP’s electronic mailing list, or OJJDP News @ a Glance, the online bimonthly newsletter, go to OJJDP’s Web site and click on the appropriate “Subscribe.”

Phone:
800–851–3420 (Monday–Friday, 8:30 a.m.–7 p.m. ET)

Mail:
Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse/NCJRS, P.O. Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20849–6000

JJC, through the National Criminal Justice Reference Service, 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/search.html.
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