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Why Be Data Driven?

• Diagnoses Needs
• Enhances efficiency
• Promotes optimal resource allocation
• Guides improvements
• Evaluates changes
• Gets you money
University Partnerships

• Expertise
  – Knowledge of data and statistics

• Efficiency
  – Often cheaper than hiring staff

• Effectiveness
  – Easier to sustain with local partners
Example 1: System Mapping

- Collect data on key decision points in Jefferson and Rapides Parish juvenile justice system in 2007 and 2011

- Purpose:
  - Guide reform efforts
  - Make the decision-making procedures at each point transparent to foster communication among stakeholders
  - Evaluate effectiveness of reform
  - Maintain data for funding opportunities
Specific Goals of Mapping

- Describe youth at key decision points
- Describe the most common and important decisions that are made for youth at each point
- Describe how these decisions are made
- Assess satisfaction with decision-making process
- Describe what data are obtained, stored, and shared related to these decisions.
The Mapping Process

• Meet with key stakeholders:
  – To obtain buy-in
  – Define key decision points
  – Define “useful” information
  – Identify local partners

• Develop and disseminate survey

• Conduct follow-up interviews to collect additional information

• Prepare report summarizing results

• Review results with local partners

• Determine methods for widespread dissemination

• Discuss uses of data

• Repeat process in 2010
# Jefferson Parish: Initial Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Point</th>
<th>Source of Entry</th>
<th>Number of Youth (2006)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Delinquency petitions by DA</td>
<td>1,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal FINS</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal FINS</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>1,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caretaker</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Key Decision Points and Methods: Jefferson Parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Point</th>
<th>Important Decisions</th>
<th>Standardized Tools</th>
<th>Other Tools</th>
<th>Persons Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>Detain/release</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Arrest reports/ offending history  Intake interview</td>
<td>On duty intake supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Accept/reject charge  FINS petitions  Diversion</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Available physical and testimonial evidence  Arrest reports/offending history  Academic history</td>
<td>Assistant DA  DA investigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Guilt/innocence  Detain/release  Informal Adjustment Agreement (IAA)  Post – disposition services</td>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td>Arrest reports/offending history  Mental health history  Academic history  Interviews with youth and parent  FINS history  OCS investigations</td>
<td>Judge  Court probation officer  Case manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINS</td>
<td>Accept/reject complaint  Needed services for child/family  Refer for formal FINS</td>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td>Arrest reports  Interviews with youth and parent  School reports</td>
<td>Hearing officers  Attorney  Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>Dangerousness to self/others</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Arrest reports  Suicide interview  Previous psychological evaluations</td>
<td>Probation officers  OYD officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LSU Health New Orleans:** Institute for Public Health and Justice
Jefferson Parish: Looking Deeper and Reforming

- Detention decisions made by law enforcement without set criteria and a large number of youth were detained for minor offenses
  - Implemented standard detention screening instrument

- Many first-time FINS cases were formally processed
  - First-time FINS referrals to DA are diverted to Informal FINS office

- Disproportionate number of Informal FINS referrals came from a minority of schools and it was unclear if schools were considering other options prior to FINS referral
  - Implemented training of school resource officers
# Jefferson Parish: Follow-up Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Delinquency petitions by DA</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>1,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal FINS</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>1,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal FINS</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caretaker</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,794</td>
<td>897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>1,278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 2: SAVRY Implementation

• Jefferson Parish Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) implemented the SAVRY in 2009

• Goals:
  – Objectively measure risk for future violent and nonviolent behavior
  – Assist dispositional decision-making
  – Tool for treatment planning

• Has the implementation of the SAVRY effectively met these goals?
Study Development

• Collaborative effort:
  – UNO and LSUHSC
  – DJS

• Several sources of information
  – Outcome monitoring sheet (Green Sheet)
  – Treatment tracking file
  – Automated Records Management and Mapping System (ARMMS)
  – Probation paper files

• Data collection occurred over a three-month period
Goal 1: Test whether the implementation of the SAVRY resulted in an increase in treatment referral and positive youth outcomes.

Results:

✓ Significant increase in referrals to EBPs following SAVRY implementation

✓ Youth with one or more SAVRY administrations were on probation an average of 7 months shorter than the originally ordered probation
Implementation of SAVRY & Treatment Referral

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>% Referred to Tx</th>
<th>% Referred to Brand EBP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-SAVRY (n=57)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No SAVRY (n=205)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One SAVRY (n=138)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both SAVRYs (n=104)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of the Study: Goal 2

Goal 2: Both within and across types of treatments, compare SAVRY scores pre and post-treatment.

Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># of Cases</th>
<th>% Stable Low</th>
<th>% Decrease</th>
<th>% Increase/Stable High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delinquency Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Brand EBP</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not referred to Brand EBP</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violence Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred to Brand EBP</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not referred to Brand EBP</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Results of the Study: Goal 3**

**Goal 3:** Compare probation outcomes and recidivism across changes in SAVRY risk scores.

**Results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Probation Release</th>
<th>Delinquency Risk</th>
<th>Violence Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Complete % Unsuccessful % Revoked % Arrested</td>
<td>% Complete % Unsuccessful % Revoked % Arrested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Low</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable High/Increase</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

LSU Health New Orleans
Institute for Public Health and Justice
Example 3: Evaluation of the Detention Screening Instrument (DSI)

• DSI was created in 2008
  – In response to Mapping Survey Results

• Goals:
  – Public safety
  – Identify need for secure placement
  – Reduce DMC in Rapides Parish

• Collaborative effort between UNO, CCLP, and Rapides Parish stakeholders
Rapides Parish Detention Screening Instrument

- Assigns numerical values:
  - Most serious current offense
  - Additional offenses
  - Prior criminal history
  - History of failing to appear
  - History of escape or runaway
  - Aggravating factors
  - Mitigating factors

- List of mandatory and administrative overrides

- Decision guidelines:
  - 13+ or an override = secure detention
  - 8 - 12 = detention alternative
  - < 8 = release
Development of the Study

• Data collection occurred over a 3-month period
• Three law enforcement agencies
• Information obtained from:
  – DSI
  – Contact sheet
  – Impression questionnaire
• Juvenile detectives, renaissance detention center, and juvenile probation officers submitted data to UNO monthly
Question 1: Is the DSI a better predictor of a youth’s threat to public safety and need for secure placement than the subjective decision-making procedures that were previously employed by law enforcement?

Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No on Both</th>
<th>Yes on Both</th>
<th>No DSI, Yes Imp</th>
<th>Yes DSI, No Imp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males*</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime*</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Crime**</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01
Results of the Study: Question 2

Question 2: Does the use of the DSI reduce secure placements?

Results:
Question 3: Does the use of the DSI reduce DMC?

Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony Crime</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only cases with a DSI are included. In total, there were 24 detention admission from 8/15/08 – 10/31/2008.
Example 4: Developing a Database to Track DA Decisions

• Occurred in Rapides Parish District Attorney’s Office in 2009-2010

• Process:
  – What do you want to know?
  – Where can we find this information?
  – What type of system is best suited for the agency’s needs and available resources?
  – How should this information reported?
What do you want to know?

Demographics
Arrest data
Case processing information
Offense data
Charge amendments
Pre-adjudication status
DA decisions
Referrals to outside agencies
Court orders
Disposition
Victim information
Prior charges
Next Steps

• Where can we find this information?
  – AS400
  – Paper files
  – Treatment agencies

• What type of system is best suited for the agency’s needs and resources?
  – Electronic data base
    • Excel
    • IJJIS
Standard DA Reports

**Standard Reports**
- Offender residence by police zone
- Days from arrest to referral
- DA Referrals to Court
- New Referrals
- New Referrals by Offense
- Transfers to adult court

**Selection Criteria**
- Age
- Race
- Ethnicity
- Offense
- Referred by agency
- DA decision
- Complaint start/end date
- Received start/end date
- Screened start/end date
Benefits of University/Agency Partnerships

• Role of the university
  – Helped identify the “questions” that stakeholders wanted to answer
    *Conceptualization
  – Data collection, analysis, and reporting results
  – Worked as the liaison between different agencies
  – Local, state, and national dissemination

• Benefit to stakeholders:
  – Empirical evidence of effectiveness
  – Increased objectivity in decision-making
  – Provides a baseline for future evaluations
  – Identified areas in need of revision
Quick Resources

University Partnerships as a Strategy for Promoting Data-Driven Decision Making in Juvenile Justice


Indicators of Success: Developing System and Youth Outcome Measures for Juvenile Justice Agencies

- [http://sph.lsuhsc.edu/Websites/lsupublichealth/images/pdf/iphj/LaMfC_Innovations_Brief_Indicators_Youth_Outcome_Measures_for_JJ_FINAL.pdf](http://sph.lsuhsc.edu/Websites/lsupublichealth/images/pdf/iphj/LaMfC_Innovations_Brief_Indicators_Youth_Outcome_Measures_for_JJ_FINAL.pdf)
Contact Information

• Stephen Phillippi, PhD sphill2@lsuhsc.edu

• Institute for Public Health & Justice http://sph.lsuhsc.edu/iphj