

DRAFT

9/9/10

The JDAI Coordinator's Handbook

A Practice Guide for Juvenile Detention Reform

Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative
A Project of the Annie E. Casey Foundation

Acknowledgements:

The JDAI Coordinator's Handbook has been authored and reviewed by many JDAI experts, including, the following contributors:

Denny Atherton, Director - Site Coordinator, 16th Circuit Missouri

Hon. Gael Deppert, Magistrate/JDAI Coordinator, Marion Superior Court, Juvenile Division

Jennifer Lebaron, Mgr. Research & Eval. / JDAI State Coordinator, NJ Juvenile Justice Commission

James Payne, JDAI Technical Assistance Team Leader

Marcia Rincon-Gallardo, Site Manager, W. Haywood Burns Institute (former JDAI/DMC Coordinator)

Stephanie Vetter, Sr. Consultant for JDAI Infrastructure, IMT

Rand Young, JDAI Technical Assistance Team Leader

The JDAI Coordinator's Handbook

A Practice Guide for Juvenile Detention Reform

The Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) is a detention reform and juvenile justice system improvement initiative that has demonstrated over 20 years, in urban and rural jurisdictions, that moving low-risk youth from secure detention into community-based alternative programs is excellent public policy. JDAI has established outstanding public safety outcomes, minimized detention over-crowding and the need to build more expensive facilities creating savings for taxpayers, improved efficiencies in the juvenile justice system operations, and produced better outcomes for youth and their families.

JDAI is a comprehensive initiative of eight strategies involving system-wide change in philosophy, practice and policy. Skillful coordination of JDAI at the local jurisdiction level, and for states replicating JDAI in multiple jurisdictions, is a vital ingredient of the initiative, requiring extensive guidance and technical assistance.

The JDAI Coordinator's Handbook was developed to provide the guidance and resources site and state JDAI coordinators and stakeholders need to replicate JDAI in new jurisdictions, and to embed JDAI principles into the jurisdiction's written policies and line-level practices.

The Handbook lays out, step-by-step, the tasks of a local jurisdiction site coordinator, and details how they interact with state coordinators and technical assistance providers from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and provides tips for success and how to avoid set-backs.

JDAI Coordinators come to their positions with certain skills necessary to coordinate JDAI, but they will also need to gain and master many new skills during the course of their work. Some of the skills that are needed to succeed in the coordinator's position are:

- Becoming an expert in the purpose and use of detention, and detention alternatives.
- Working actively and effectively with the JDAI Collaborative.
- Analyzing extensive data regarding juvenile justice processes, including detention utilization, detention alternatives and appropriate methodologies to reduce reliance on secure detention.
- Acting as liaison between the collaborative, workgroups and subcommittees.
- Preparing and presenting analytical reports and related information regarding the use, efficiency and effectiveness of the local detention system.

Table of Contents

<u>Chapter 1</u> JDAI basics – getting started, planning, reporting, technical assistance	Page 5
Working with the State Coordinator	
Working with the Technical Assistance/Team Leader (TA/TL)	
Preparing Reports for the AECF and the TA/TL	
Developing the annual JDAI Implementation Plan	
Conducting the JDAI System Assessment	
Using the JDAI Help Desk	
JDAI Technical Assistance	
<u>Chapter 2</u> Educating stakeholders and Communication skills	Page 10
The JDAI Kick-Off and Launch	
JDAI Model Site Visits	
JDAI Trainings	
The JDAI Inter-Site Conference	
Developing a Communication Plan	
JDAI Publications	
<u>Chapter 3</u> JDAI Core Strategies and Year 1, 2, and 3 coordinator tasks	Page 15
Collaboration and Leadership	
Data	
Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI)	
Alternatives to Detention (ATD)	
Expediting Case Processing	
Special Detention Cases	
Reducing Racial Disparities	
Conditions of Confinement	
<u>Definitions</u>	Page 26
<u>Attachments</u> Phase 1, 2, and 3 Developmental Milestones	Page 27

Chapter One

JDAI basics – getting started, planning, reporting, technical assistance

A). Working with the State Coordinator

In state level initiatives, the state coordinator will be the site coordinator's primary resource and support. The state coordinator's responsibility is to work with site coordinators in the state to facilitate system change. As there are, or can be, multiple jurisdictions involved in a state initiative, it is important that state and site coordinators establish a strong working relationship as quickly as possible, characterized by routine and frequent contact, in order to successfully implement JDAI and access technical assistance from the Annie E. Casey Foundation (AECF).

Each state coordinator has their own preferred schedule for routine contacts with site coordinators. It is recommended that, especially for sites in the first two years of the initiative, a once a week call to discuss sites' issues and needs occur. This allows the state coordinator to remain current on site progress, struggles and needs, so that they can provide targeted support and assistance, as well as, the right type of help from the state Technical Assistance/Team Leader (TA/TL)

Key Takeaways:

The state coordinator is the site coordinator's first level of support. Establishing routine communication is an essential first step in the site coordinator's efforts to move the jurisdiction forward in JDAI replication:

- Regularly scheduled contacts, on a frequent basis are exceedingly helpful, especially during the first two years of the initiative.
- It is recommended that the site coordinator's communication with the state coordinator be prepared and presented through the framework of the site's work plan which is largely based upon Phase 1, 2 and 3 Developmental Milestones of JDAI.

B). Working with the Technical Assistance/Team Leader (TA/TL)

Most JDAI sites are assigned a technical assistance provider (TA/TL) by the Annie E. Casey Foundation to support state and local site work. The TA/TL is an experienced juvenile justice leader, well grounded in the philosophy and work of the initiative with general knowledge and command of work needed to be accomplished in all eight of the core JDAI strategies. There may be variances from site to site on the frequency of direct contact that a site coordinator may have with the TA/TL. In state initiatives, a local site coordinator may have less direct contact with the TA/TL, than may be the case in a state with a single JDAI site.

If a JDAI site is the only jurisdiction in a state level JDAI initiative, then that site's coordinator will be working directly with the assigned TA/TL. If, however, the jurisdiction is one of multiple JDAI sites within a state level JDAI initiative, the majority of the site coordinator's contact will be with the state coordinator, and there may be less frequent contact with the TA/TL.

Regardless of whether you are involved in a state level reform initiative, or as a single jurisdiction, within a state, some direct contact with your TA/TL is essential.

Key Takeaways:

- The assigned TA/TL is the liaison between the AECF and your site; and assists in coordination of technical assistance and training.
- The TA/TL's role in relation to the AECF is to assist sites in making progress and meeting the reporting requirements of the initiative.
- Frequency of contact with the TA/TL will largely depend on whether your site is part of a state level initiative, or a single jurisdiction. In any case, schedule routine contacts with your TA/TL.
- It is recommended that regular briefings be scheduled in accord with Phase 1 and 2 milestones and the site's JDAI work plan, to clarify the site's progress and needs.
- In the beginning stages of reform, more contact with the TA/TL, is far better than less.
- When a JDAI site needs technical assistance or training, it is the site coordinator's role to contact the TA/TL with that request. Depending on the type of request, TA/TL can provide assistance over the phone or on-site, or arrange for a JDAI training.
- There are no truly bad questions. Don't be shy in your conversations with your TA/TL; they are there to provide support, guidance and assistance.

C). Preparing Reports for the AECF and the TA/TL

The site coordinator will be responsible for assisting and facilitating in the preparation of several key program and operational reports. Sites are required to report on key data indicators in a timely and consistent fashion. The following reports are to be submitted to the AECF through the site's assigned TA/TL in accordance with pre-determined dates: the JDAI Quarterly Report, the JDAI Annual Results Report and the AECF grant report.

JDAI Quarterly Reports

The quarterly reports help sites track key data indicators which are analyzed to measure the performance of sites for each quarter of the year in three critical areas: detention utilization; RAI functioning and; alternative program utilization and efficacy. These reports represent the main management reports that will be used by site coordinators and the JDAI collaborative to identify the impact of policy and practice and to measure change as it occurs.

The site coordinator is responsible for ensuring that the site can produce these reports on time and consistently, and that the JDAI collaborative and work groups are using these reports to do the work of system reform which means the data reports will help identify system issues and monitor progress as new policies and practices are implemented by system stakeholders. To ensure that these reports meet JDAI standards, the site coordinator should review for accuracy and consistency of the data presented, and then they should be forwarded to the state coordinator and the TA/TL.

The state coordinator's role in relation to these reports is to understand the site's progress and challenges, to review and ensure the reports are accurate and are being utilized appropriately, and that the reports are submitted on time to the TA/TL and the AECF.

JDAI Annual Results Report

The Annual Results Report is submitted to the state coordinator and the TA/TL annually (usually in August). This report captures data and narrative information that helps measure the impact, influence and leverage of JDAI in the site and compares baseline data (from the year prior) to JDAI start-up, through the most recent reporting period. The state coordinator and the TA/TL will provide the site coordinator with the template for this report. The Result Report instructions are usually available mid-year, and the report is due to AECF during the third quarter of the year.

In preparing the report each year, the site coordinator's responsibility is to ensure accurate and timely data reporting, (examples of JDAI Results Reports are available on the JDAI Help Desk: www.jdaihelpdesk.org).

It is the role of site and state coordinators to work with the assigned TA/TL to ensure that all reports are submitted in a timely and consistent manner. Questions regarding these reporting requirements should be directed to the TA/TL.

JDAI Annual Grants Report

The Annual Grants Report is submitted to the AECF's Grant Reporting Department. This report is largely administrative, and is required for sites and state's to receive the JDAI grant. The site's budget and work plan for the upcoming grant cycle and narrative progress reporting are included in this report. This report contains an overview of work accomplished in the current year, the scope of work for the coming year and the expenditures for the current grant year that is concluding. The report is submitted to the AECF, after it is reviewed and discussed with the state coordinator and the TA/TL.

The Annual Grants Report has two primary sections:

- 1) Scope of work completed for the grant year just ending and the coming grant year
- 2) The budget and expenses for the grant year just ending

Each year, the format and request for the Annual Grants Report will be sent by the AECF's Grants Reporting Division to your site before the end of each grant period. If there are any questions or difficulties in completing these reports, consult the TA/TL for assistance.

Key Takeaways:

- A template has been developed for each of the AECF routine reports. It is highly recommended that your site utilize them.
- It is important to work early-on with your Information Technology (IT) staff to develop the necessary queries in your information system to capture, present and analyze the information required in these reports;
- The state coordinator and the TA/TL are invaluable resources in assisting site coordinators in developing the capacity to produce these reports.
- After these reports are finalized and reviewed by the state coordinator and the TA/TL, they should also be shared with the collaborative. There is no better way to engage and energize a collaborative than by reviewing the outcome data and using the data to direct the work of detention reform and juvenile justice system improvements.

- In some circumstances, the AECF may transmit the Annual Grant Report to another unit or person in your site. If this occurs, contact the person or unit receiving the Annual Grant Report and assist them in completing the requirements of the report.

D). Developing the annual JDAI Implementation Plan

The implementation plan is the essential blueprint for the site's work and progress each year. A solid implementation plan contains specific goals linked to the JDAI eight core strategies, a timetable for their achievement, and those primarily responsible for attaining those goals.

The initial plan is constructed by the collaborative and its work groups, and revised annually, through the facilitation of the site coordinator. The site coordinator is responsible for "pushing" the conversation on what areas should be targeted in the implementation plan, and keeping the collaborative focused on the work plan during the coming year. The implementation plan is not written in stone and is designed to be flexible, so that delays or accelerations in progress can be noted, and the plan amended accordingly.

Key Takeaways:

- The implementation plan is an essential tool in monitoring progress and achieving success in detention reform which is developed initially, and annually thereafter.
- Samples of implementation plans are available through the state coordinator, the TA/TL, or the JDAI Help Desk.
- The site coordinator is responsible for facilitating the formulation of the implementation plan with the collaborative.
- Progress or lack thereof, must be closely monitored by the site coordinator and continuously updated. In addition, the site coordinator should be continually advising the collaborative on where they are with respect to the plan each quarter;
- The plan should be consistently reviewed by the collaborative, the state coordinator and the TA/TL, so that areas of need and urgency can be addressed and timely technical assistance rendered.

E). Conducting the JDAI System Assessment

One of the first priorities for new jurisdictions is conducting a system assessment. The assessment is a review of a jurisdiction's policies and practices and involves gathering information from the multiple agencies that form the state and local juvenile justice system. The summary and recommendations from the system assessment help to describe where the site stands at that point in time and can be used as a baseline for comparison as reform work progresses. Some sites repeat these system assessments annually, and generally, the system assessment findings and recommendations become the basis for determining which issues sites should tackle. Goals articulated in the system assessment can be merged into the site work plan and should reflect the JDAI developmental milestones.

The JDAI System Assessment Framework is available on the Help Desk, and also from the state coordinator and the TA/TL. For new sites, this assessment may be accomplished through the AECF's "Quick Launch" process that targets intensive technical assistance to sites at the very beginning of the initiative. Completing the system assessment requires close coordination

with the TA/TL and state coordinator in order to maximize the effect that it will have in guiding the first year of reform.

Key Takeaways:

- The system assessment should be accomplished as quickly as possible in the first year of the initiative; and can be repeated at regular intervals to monitor and record progress.
- The site coordinator plays a very active role by scheduling stakeholder interviews, facilitating distribution of information and data related to the system assessment; ensuring recommendations from the completed system assessment are distributed to key stakeholders/JDAI collaborative; and, providing the administrative support to incorporate those recommendations into the site's work plan.

F). Using the JDAI Help Desk

The Help Desk is an on-line tool providing access to JDAI publications, related system reform information and technical assistance for JDAI sites. Visit the JDAI Help Desk at: www.jdaihelpdesk.org. Navigation is based upon JDAI's eight core strategies and is catalogued by jurisdiction. Find and download national juvenile justice research, JDAI newsletters, key strategies, best practices, and innovations generated by juvenile justice reform experts and JDAI sites. You can also receive individualized technical assistance by submitting questions online.

When issues or questions arise in the site the first reference should be to the Help Desk (jdaihelpdesk.org). The state coordinator and the TA/TL can assist site coordinators in how to use the web-site, and how to search relevant information. It is highly recommended that coordinators become familiar with the Help Desk works and the type of information that it contains.

Key Takeaways:

- The Help Desk is a valuable tool in assisting coordinators in identifying the national best practices in system reform
- Coordinators should teach their collaborative and other stakeholders how to use the Help Desk
- Coordinators should examine the information on the Desk with a critical eye to ensure the policy or practice fits the site. It is always a good idea to discuss Help Desk information with the state coordinator and the TA/TL to make sure that the jurisdiction can adapt the practice successfully.

G). JDAI Technical Assistance

During the course of system reform, if your jurisdiction requires specific technical assistance the site coordinator should contact the state coordinator and the TA/TL. The AECF provides access to a large network of technical assistance providers and trainings including the fundamentals of JDAI, the development of detention risk assessment instruments (RAI's), enhancing data

capacity and reporting; detention inspection standards for improving conditions of confinement, strategies for improving system outcomes for youth of color, and more.

Planning for on-site technical assistance and/or trainings must be approved by the TA/TL and the JDAI Management Team. Travel costs incurred by your jurisdiction on behalf of training participants are generally covered by the AECF grant. These trainings should be identified in the site's work plan and appear as a line item in the budget.

Key Takeaways:

- Topic specific technical assistance and training is available from the AECF.
- To obtain technical assistance, coordinators should contact the state coordinator and the TA/TL after accessing the JDAI Help Desk for basic information on the issues.
- All trainings and on-site technical assistance must be approved by the TA/TL and JDAI Management Team (IMT), and it is the role of the coordinator to help identify the need and facilitate these activities.

Chapter Two

Educating and communicating with stakeholders

A). The JDAI Kick-Off and Launch

The JDAI Kick-Off and Launch ("Launch") is used to engage and immerse new jurisdictions in JDAI. In the Launch process, a team of JDAI technical assistance providers visit the site to conduct the system assessment, present an education session on JDAI's history and national results, answer questions and discuss next steps.

During this process, the role of the coordinator is to work with the "Launch" team to:

- Convene stakeholder meetings.
- Conduct an initial system assessment (schedule interviews with stakeholders).
- Convene partner agency "kick-off" meetings that are designed to educate agency staff regarding first year detention reform activities and identify potential challenges to implementing reforms.
- Develop a work plan for first year JDAI activities. The coordinator has primary responsibility for preparing the site and stakeholders for the Launch, and in assisting the JDAI team through all phases of the work.

Coordination and contact with the JDAI Launch team is critical to your jurisdiction's successful entry into system reform.

Key Takeaways:

- Prior to the actual commencement of the Launch, site coordinators must act as the central coordination with the JDAI team to ensure a smooth and orderly process. The more frequent the contacts and discussions with the Launch team, the more prepared the stakeholders will be to share and receive information from the AECF technical assistance providers.
- Make sure that all stakeholders are aware of, and prepared for, the series of meetings and discussions that are part of the Quick Launch process.

- Request a JDAI literature kit from the AECF by emailing: jpope@aecf.org or by submitting the request through the JDAI Help Desk.

B). JDAI Model Site Visits

There are five JDAI model sites; each is unique and has achieved impressive results, reducing unnecessary and inappropriate detention by applying the eight core strategies of detention reform. The model site curriculum examines cross-cutting issues, lessons learned, and provides the opportunity for peer-to-peer discussions and on-site observations of innovative programs and practices. Visits to JDAI model sites can be a powerful source of practical information about operationalizing JDAI and is an opportunity to learn from nationally recognized juvenile justice experts who represent all agencies of the juvenile justice system.

JDAI Model Site visits provide an excellent opportunity for stakeholders in your jurisdiction to witness firsthand how JDAI strategies have worked to reduce detention utilization and activate overall system reform. The TA/TL and state coordinator will assist the site coordinator in determining the timing of a JDAI Model Site visit, and which model will be the most appropriate.

Key Takeaways:

- When requesting a JDAI Model Site Visit, review the Model Site Visit protocol in the JDAI Starter Kit on the JDAI Help Desk and contact the state coordinator and the TA/TL.
- As soon as the date and location have been confirmed for the Model Site Visit, in coordination with the state coordinator and the TA/TL, submit the pre-site visit questionnaire to the Model Site contact and include your site's most recent quarterly reports and/or a memo outlining some of the major challenges the jurisdiction faces in the next six months.
- Reviewing the proposed site visit agenda with the model site contact, the TA/TL and state coordinator is important prior to embarking on the site visit.
- The selection of the delegation is of paramount importance. The site coordinator should determine which site members are most appropriate to attend the model site visit by consulting with the state coordinator and the TA/TL.
- A post-model site visit debriefing should be conducted as soon after the visit as is possible. This will help identify practices and policies that may be implemented in your jurisdiction. It is a sound practice to then include these innovations in your site's work plan.

C). JDAI Trainings

The AECF provides training to JDAI sites on core reform strategies and access to a large network of technical assistance providers and faculty. These trainings are based upon standardized curriculum and include topics such as: the fundamentals of JDAI, the development and monitoring of detention RAI's enhancing data capacity and reporting; detention inspection standards for improving conditions of confinement, and strategies for improving system outcomes for youth of color.

Arranging for these trainings is similar in approach to setting-up model site visits and must be coordinated through the state coordinator and the TA/TL. For each of these trainings there is a specific protocol that needs to be followed and a delegation selection process that is required. Great care should be given in selecting the respective delegations for these trainings. Once the delegation returns from the training it is important to debrief the training, map out the next steps in actualizing and incorporating what was learned in the JDAI work plan.

Key Takeaways:

- Most of the JDAI offered trainings are accomplished within the first two-three years of the engagement in the initiative.
- Coordination of the training with the TA/TL and state coordinator will ensure that the site is ready to benefit and utilize the knowledge to promote system change.
- Getting an early start on having your delegation review training materials can provide a significant advantage in understanding the subject matter and thinking of how it can be applied to the work in your jurisdiction. All training materials can be found on the JDAI Help Desk.
- Consult with the state coordinator and the TA/TL to identify site members who should be included in the training.
- Travel expenses incurred for these trainings are covered by the AECF grant and should be reflected in the site work plan and budget.

D). The JDAI Inter-Site Conference

The AECF sponsors a national conference each year, called the JDAI Inter-Site Conference. The location of the Inter-Site Conference changes from year-to-year. The conference is an excellent opportunity to network with other juvenile justice system professionals, get educated on the latest reform innovations, and influence the field of juvenile justice. Attendees will be informed on national best practices, successes, and innovations.

Because of the breadth of the conference offerings, the selection of a delegation to attend the Inter-Site Conference is exceedingly important. The TA/TL and state coordinator will develop with the site coordinator a list of selected personnel from the site who would be strategic choices to attend the conference. Coordinators may have members of their site that may be asked to present at the conference, or be part of a panel.

Coordinators should review the Conference agenda and recommend to members of the delegation which specific workshops would help them in increasing their understanding JDAI and how the workshops will enhance the work they are doing in their site.

Key Takeaways:

- The TA/TL and state coordinator will develop with the site coordinator a list of selected personnel from the site who would be strategic choices to attend the conference.

- After receiving the logistics memo for the conference, coordinators should ensure the delegation completes all necessary reservations and registrations. It may be wise to reserve the allotted delegation slots at the hotel hosting the conference under one name until the members of the delegation have been selected and to then transfer reservations to each member's name.
- Coordinators should assign members of the delegation to attend specific workshops that will help your jurisdiction or to increase their knowledge and understanding of specific strategies and aspects of JDAI;
- Debriefing the conference with the delegation is an essential component of incorporating much of what is observed at the conference into your everyday work.
- Travel expenses incurred by the site are covered by the AECF grant and should be reflected in the site work plan and budget.

D). Developing a Communication Plan

Communication, both internal and external, is a critical aspect of successful JDAI reform work. Internal communication (among the collaborative, sub-committees and staff) and external communication (media and communities) needs to be accomplished with a specific plan in mind.

A good internal communication plan takes into account that much of the work of the initiative is done through the use of workgroups or subcommittees (DMC, RAI, etc.). Sub-groups meet on a more frequent basis than the larger collaborative, which may meet only once a quarter. Keeping the collaborative routinely informed of the progress and work of the subcommittees is essential. The plan should call for specific mechanisms or procedures where regularly scheduled briefings and reports are distributed to the entire collaborative. These reports or briefings will not only advise the collaborative of the progress of the sub-committee, but also allow them to provide more direction and oversight, and assist stakeholders in providing added resources when required.

Serious consideration should be given to ongoing communication and JDAI education to all levels of staff in all stakeholder agencies. Line staff will be implementing the newly developed policies and practices of JDAI and their understanding of and support for system improvement is critical for successful system reform. This could be done through having a JDAI Newsletter for your site, periodic briefings to update line staff on JDAI progress, or local JDAI conferences.

An external communication plan focuses on getting the reform message to the community and the media. For media assistance, the JDAI Help Desk provides a great deal of information including communications tip sheets and a guide entitled *Using Media Advocacy to Promote Detention Reform*. Providing data on progress and success can help describe for the media and others, the positive impact of the initiative on youth, the system and the communities they serve. Contact the state coordinator and the TA/TL to access JDAI's communication and public relations providers for more technical assistance in working with the media.

Key Takeaways:

- One of the priorities during the first year of the initiative is to develop and implement a communication plan that will keep all stakeholders informed of the progress and challenges of the work.
- The communication plan must include “getting the message out to line staff”. This simple approach will greatly assist in the successful implementation of policies that they will ultimately be asked to practice.
- Use data to support the JDAI, both internally and externally.
- Community engagement is an essential part of JDAI, and the communication plan should include a thoughtful approach to informing the communities in your jurisdiction of your system reform efforts.
- Contact the state coordinator and the TA/TL to access JDAI’s communication and public relations providers for more technical assistance in working with the media.

F). JDAI Publications

Since the inception of the JDAI nearly twenty-years ago, the AECF has authored a number of policy statements, briefs and other literature that make the case for successful detention reform and report JDAI site results. The JDAI Help Desk provides access to the literature developed by AECF, but other related information from organizations that advocate for change in the juvenile justice system (among these the Justice Policy Institute, Campaign for Youth Justice, the National Juvenile Defender Center, and W. Haywood Burns Institute).

There are a few recommended areas that provide background information on the initiative and generate a greater understanding on the nature and value of the work. All of these can be found on the Help Desk. They include:

- JDAI Pathways and Practice Guides
- JDAI Policies and Briefs
- JDAI Featured Resources
- Juvenile Justice System Reform
- JDAI Issue Briefs

All of these publications can be found on the Help Desk at: www.jdaihelpdesk.org.

Key Takeaways:

- A critical task for the coordinator is to keep the information flow to the stakeholders, community and media as an ongoing necessity;
- Coordinators should routinely visit the Help Desk to note new JDAI materials and literature that are available and inform the collaborative group.
- The coordinator’s role is to ensure that JDAI workgroup members recognize the need to be up to date on the JDAI literature prior to meetings, and facilitate the educational process.

Chapter #3

JDAI Core Strategies and Year 1, 2, and 3 Site Coordinator tasks

A. Collaboration & Leadership

The site coordinator's role is to bring together, educate, motivate, coordinate, and support the juvenile justice system professionals and community members who lead the jurisdiction's replication of the eight JDAI core strategies. JDAI works best when an administrative infrastructure has been developed to support and direct the implementation of JDAI.

Year 1

- Appoint a JDAI site coordinator with sufficient time, support and resources to coordinate the initiative.
 - Establish contact expectations and a communication plan with the state coordinator and the TA/TL.
 - Work with the state coordinator and the TA/TL to conduct a site system assessment that reflects the site's readiness for JDAI, identified leaders, stakeholder understanding and support of JDAI, and the site's ability, strengths and liabilities to implement JDAI strategies.
 - Complete a Detention Utilization study documenting the number of youth detained, for what reasons, their risk level, gender and racial/ethnic representation. Present these data to stakeholders to illustrate how detention is currently used and for planning how to implement the strategies of JDAI.
 - Secure a Memorandum of Understanding or Resolution from local authority such as County Council to provide authority for the initiative.
 - Plan and conduct a JDAI "Kick-off" meeting and invite all stakeholders and media.
 - Educate Collaborative committee members with resource materials provided by the state coordinator and TA/TL and found at jdaihelpdesk.org so all stakeholders will have a firm understanding of the strategies, values and goals of JDAI.
 - Provide administrative support to the established JDAI Steering committees and reform process by working directly with a broad range of juvenile justice agencies.
-
- Establish and staff JDAI Work Groups comprised of juvenile justice stakeholders to plan for the implementation of each strategy.
 - Determine meeting times/dates/location, provide appropriate refreshments, audio-visual equipment, and provide meeting minutes to stakeholders.
 - Establish a consensus among stakeholders on the purpose and use of detention consistent with JDAI philosophy, agreeing on which youth need to be detained for public safety, and which youth could be released outright or to alternatives to detention.

- Develop an annual implementation plan with explicit tasks and measurable outcomes that is routinely monitored and adjusted as needed. Prioritize which JDAI strategies will be addressed first, and develop a time-frame for implementing each strategy.
- Identify “low hanging fruit” or easily accomplished changes to address first which will build momentum and confidence for the jurisdiction.
- Schedule Fundamentals Training with the state coordinator and TA/TL for the jurisdiction.
- Plan the first Model Site Visit with assistance from the state coordinator and TA/TL
- Organize and send a delegation to the JDAI Inter-Site Conference with assistance from the state coordinator and TA/TL.
- Make presentations to a broad range of juvenile justice agencies on JDAI.

Year 2

- Review and celebrate Year 1 implementation efforts and accomplishments.
 - Develop a second year implementation plan with explicit tasks and measurable outcomes that is routinely monitored and adjusted as needed.
 - Schedule site for JDAI trainings with the state coordinator and TA/TL.
 - Review detention utilization data at each stakeholder meeting which will often lead to requests for more detailed data to better understand how to make prudent policy and practice changes.
 - Assist work groups in making recommendations on how to best implement JDAI strategies and changes in policy and practice.
 - Plan a second Model Site Visit with assistance from the state coordinator and TA/TL.
 - Organize and send a delegation to the JDAI Inter-Site Conference with assistance from the state coordinator and TA/TL.
-
- Ensure stakeholders focus on racial/ethnic and gender disparities by disaggregating data by gender and racial/ethnic representation and continually seeking methods to reduce disparities.

Year 3

- Review and celebrate Year 2 implementation efforts and accomplishments.
- Develop a third year implementation plan with explicit tasks and measurable outcomes that is routinely monitored and adjusted as needed.

- Continue to assist work groups in making recommendations on how to best implement JDAI strategies and changes in policy/practice.
- Plan a third Model Site Visit with assistance from TA/Team Leader
- Organize and send a delegation to the JDAI Inter-Site Conference with assistance from the state coordinator and TA/TL.
- Develop a plan to sustain the strategies of JDAI, modify written policy to reflect JDAI principles and practices, and to maintain necessary resources and funding.
- Plan a JDAI Conference with the state coordinator and TA/TL for your state to increase awareness, support and participation in JDAI principles.

B. Data

The site coordinator's role is to develop a capacity within the jurisdiction to collect, report, and analyze data that will be used to measure how the site currently operates, to identify practices and policies that could be modified to reflect JDAI strategies, to monitor progress in implementing JDAI strategies, reduce gender and racial/ethnic disparities, and to ensure public safety has not been compromised. It is essential the site coordinator develops the site's capacity and appetite for using data early in the initiative, as little meaningful progress can occur without reliable data.

Year 1

- Assist site stakeholders in understanding the value and methods of using data.
 - Conduct discussions and trainings with stakeholders on how to use data to drive detention reform and system improvements.
 - Review data reports from other JDAI sites.
 - Survey resources available on jdaihelpdesk.org.
 - Coordinate with the state coordinator and TA/TL.
- Identify and initiate information technology (IT) modifications required to produce descriptive statistical reports that include:
 - Catalog existing site data systems and capacities.
 - Provide state coordinator and TA/TL with all available statistical reports.
 - Develop methods needed to produce a Detention Utilization report following the AECF templates. Disaggregate all data by reason for detention admission, gender and race/ethnicity.
 - Produce a "pre-JDAI baseline report" documenting detention utilization in the year before implementing JDAI. This report will serve as the comparison with preceding yearly reports that will measure progress and outcomes.
- Produce quarterly and annual detention utilization reports that include:
 - Detention admissions, average length of stay (ALOS) and average daily population (ADP)

- Track public safety indicators to include pre-adjudicated failure to appear at court hearings (FTA) and re-arrest rates.
- Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI) screening and over-ride results
- Alternatives to Secure Detention Programs documenting admissions, ALOS and ADP.
- Translate pertinent data into easily understood charts or graphs to promote stakeholder understanding and discussion.
- Develop methods of distributing data to all stakeholders regularly to encourage full stakeholder understanding and support for JDAI.

Year 2

- Assess accuracy and utility of available data and plan for needed modifications.
 - Review outcomes to assure accuracy of site's data.
 - Ensure reports are useful for stakeholders in how data is presented.
 - Determine if additional data is needed and how to develop.
- Work with the state coordinator and TA/TL in preparing the JDAI Annual Results Report which documents:
 - "Before and after" JDAI comparisons to demonstrate accomplishments and progress in implementing JDAI.
 - Site's progress in securing funding to support JDAI, media coverage, and JDAI related meetings and trainings.

Year 3

- Ensure data is accurate, relevant and useful for stakeholders.
- Plan for long-term sustainability of data production for the site.
- Continue to produce and analyze quarterly and annual reports.
- Use data results to modify site's policies and practices consistent with JDAI.

C. Detention Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI)

The role of the site coordinator is to prepare, educate, and guide the site in producing, testing and implementing a Detention Risk Assessment Instrument. Generally adopting a RAI occurs in the first year, after the site's JDAI collaborative committee and work groups are operating and data collection and analysis has occurred. The purpose for developing a RAI is to ensure the jurisdictions' detention admission decisions are objective, fair, consistent and result in detaining the right youth (risks to public safety or unlikely to appear at court hearings), and identifying youth appropriate for release to alternative programs or unsupervised release.

Year 1

- Educate stakeholders in the purpose and operation of a RAI.
 - Establish a RAI work group of stakeholders from all juvenile justice agencies.

- Schedule RAI training through the state coordinator and TA/TL and plan how the RAI will be developed in the site
- Study relevant resources for developing and implementing a RAI.
 - Juvenile Detention Risk Assessment Practice Guide.
 - Review RAIs from other sites.
 - jdaihelpdesk.org.
- Develop a “pilot” RAI to be used to test how the RAI may change current detention admissions outcomes while continuing to use current admission policies and practices.
- Evaluate the results learned in testing the pilot and share with stakeholders.
- Modify RAI as needed.
- Secure authority from JDAI Executive Committee to implement the RAI.
- Schedule training to ensure all staff can utilize the RAI in a consistent and accurate manner.
- Arrange for validation of the RAI by reviewing pre-adjudicated FTA and re-arrest rates to assure public safety is not compromised.

Year 2

- Use the JDAI RAI Screened and Override Reports to regularly review and confirm the RAI is producing desired outcomes.
- Verify pre-adjudicated FTA and re-arrest rates are acceptable.
- Strive for adoption of RAI for majority of admission decisions by reducing overrides and mandatory holds.
- Modify RAI as needed to reduce reliance on secure detention consistent with public safety outcomes.
- Analyze RAI results to monitor gender and racial/ethnicity disparities and modify as needed.
- Ensure the use of the RAI is included in jurisdiction’s written policies and regular training curricula.

Year 3

- Continue to review RAI results to refine the instrument’s effectiveness in detaining and releasing the right youth, maintaining public safety standards, and minimize gender and racial/ethnic disparities.

D. Alternatives to Detention (ATD)

The role of the site coordinator is to guide the JDAI collaborative committee in planning and implementing new alternatives to secure detention that will safely reduce the jurisdiction's reliance of detention. Data identifying the number and needs of detained youth who can be safely maintained in community-based alternative programs should guide decisions regarding the type of alternative programs to be developed. Pay particular attention to avoid "net-widening" or using detention alternative programs for youth that would not have ordinarily been detained. The desired result is to develop a continuum of ATDs within the jurisdiction that offers decision-makers a range of options from less restrictive to most restrictive.

Year 1

- Conduct an assessment of existing ATDs to ensure that appropriate youth are being served and programs are fully utilized.
 - Using the site's data, determine youth unnecessarily detained who could be safely maintained in ATDs paying attention to gender and racial/ethnic disparities.
 - Review potential ATDs by discussing data results with the state coordinator and TA/TL, scheduling Model Site Visits to learn more about ATDs, and visiting jdaihelpdesk.org.
 - Choose "low-hanging fruit" first, meaning choose implementing new ATDs that require less planning and resources, such as establishing or expanding home detention options.
 - Determine if ATDs will be operated by juvenile court staff or contracted through community-based organizations.
 - Locate ATDs geographically proximate to where target youth populations reside to minimize transportation barriers to encourage program attendance and increase community support.
 - As resources allow, continue to use data to identify populations currently detained who can be safely maintained in ATDs. Develop ATDs that provide higher-levels of supervision such as day or evening reporting programs.
 - Establish clear eligibility criteria for ATD programs, avoiding "net-widening", which would place youth who would not ordinarily be held in detention in ATDs. The goal is to reduce unnecessary detention by developing ATDs, not to create additional resources for jurisdictions while maintaining current rates of detention.
-
- Develop clear compliance and dismissal policies for ATDs that are understood by all juvenile justice system professionals and participating youth/families.
 - Ensure ATDs are racially/culturally, age, and gender appropriate.
 - Use the JDAI Alternative Programs Report template to reflect:
 - ATD admissions & exists.
 - Pre-adjudicated FTA and re-arrest rates.
 - Race, ethnicity, and gender.

- Average daily population and capacity (total number of youth served).
- Develop a mechanism to routinely notify stakeholders of ATD programs census and availability to ensure ATDs are fully utilized.

Year 2

- Conduct an assessment to ensure ATDs are fully utilized. If ATDs are under-utilized, problem-solve the reasons: lack of appropriate referrals, program outcomes unsatisfactory, high failure rate for certain demographic groups (race/ethnicity, gender, age, geographic location, etc). Develop a plan to remedy assessed causes of under-utilization.
- Continue to develop additional ATDs based upon data and resources.
- Continue to monitor pre-adjudicated FTA and rates, and modify ATDs as needed to ensure acceptable public safety outcomes.

Year 3

- Continue to assess ATDs for utilization, successful completions, and pre-adjudicated FTA and re-arrest rates. Plan modifications as needed.
- Continue to develop additional ATDs based upon data and resources.

E. Case Processing

The role of the site coordinator is to promote expedited case processing within the jurisdiction consistent with due process. Youth learn best when there is a rapid response to or consequence for their misbehavior. Slow case processing reduces the “learning opportunity” for youth in the juvenile justice system and leads to longer stays in detention. The site coordinator facilitates the jurisdiction in understanding the importance of expedited case processing and establishes data collection/reporting/analysis mechanisms to enable stakeholders to explore change in practice or policy that will reduce case processing time frames.

Year 1

- Educate stakeholders on the importance of expedited case processing and use materials provided by the state coordinator, the TA/TL and the JDAI Help Desk.
- Develop a flow chart that reflects decision-making points for the jurisdiction’s case processing procedures. Gain consensus on how the jurisdiction processes cases and develop a chart that accurately reflects the jurisdiction’s case processing policy.
- Lead a discussion on the jurisdiction’s statutory time frames and secure data to measure adherence.

- Conduct a case processing time frame analysis, documenting average time between arrest, referral, filing, adjudication and disposition for youth in detention, ATDs, and release status. Disaggregate data by race/ethnicity gender, charge, geography.
- Assist stakeholders in exploring methods to reduce case processing time frames:
 - Expeditor position.
 - Frequent/routine detention reviews.
 - Specialized dockets.
 - New court rules or laws regarding case processing time frames.
 - Accelerated calendaring of cases.
 - Revised adjournment policies.
 - Reducing continuances.
 - Combining hearings such as adjudication and disposition.
- Focus initially on reducing case processing time frames for detained youth, but do not overlook youth in ATDs and release status.
- Continue to monitor case processing reduction efforts to monitor progress.

Year 2

- Continue to review case processing reduction efforts to monitor progress and modify improvement strategies as needed.
- Adopt additional methods to reduce case processing time frames using analysis of each decision-making point and associated delays.
- Problem-solve special cases and any existing racial/ethnic disparities, such as youth in custody waiting for substance abuse or mental health assessments.

Year 3

- Continue with Year 2 activities.
- Ensure that new policies and practices are reflected in policy manuals and trainings.

F. Special Detention Cases

Special Detention Cases include youth held in detention for violations of probation, warrants, or awaiting residential placement. Special Detention Cases can account for a significant proportion of the detention population, and many of these cases are good candidates for expedited case processing policies and ATDs because they are not being detained for committing a new offense. The site coordinator's role is to gather data that will allow stakeholders to fully understand these cases and to provide information on how JDAI strategies can reduce reliance on secure detention for these special detention cases.

Year 1

- Consult with the state coordinator and the TA/TL to gain perspective on how to gather data and how to present information to the Special Detention Cases Work Group.
- Develop reports to monitor the number and reasons for special detention cases, including admissions, ADP and average length of stay disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender, and ensure that the detention RAI is applied consistently to all cases.
- Provide the Special Detention Cases Work Group with data to promote discussions to identify policy, practice or programming that could produce improved results. Identify which type of special detention cases (warrants, probation violation, awaiting placement) are in most need of attention.
- Using detention utilization and case processing data from the jurisdiction, determine which JDAI strategies for addressing Special Detention Cases are most appropriate.
- Considerations for probation violations:
 - Ensure probation violations are processed promptly. Youth in detention are scheduled for court appearance within 24 hours.
 - Develop a probation violation sanctioning grid which is a structured approach to standardize decision-making offering numerous sanction options based on the risk level of the violation.
 - Require supervisory review for all probation violation sanctions involving detention.
 - Produce a Probation Violation Report that documents the number, ALOS, reason, gender, race/ethnicity, and assigned probation officer. Monitor report regularly to identify patterns of inconsistency and disparities, and to evaluate if JDAI strategies are producing desired results.
- Considerations for Warrants
 - Implement a court hearing notification system, including telephone and in-person contact, to minimize failure-to-appear warrants.
 - Explore adopting a two-tiered warrant process whereby the judicial officer when signing an order for issuing a warrant, can authorize release on a promise to appear for certain warrant categories (such as misdemeanor warrants).
 - Consider delaying the issuance of warrants for a few days and use a concerted effort to locate youth who fail-to-appear at court hearings, and reschedule a new hearing.
 - Develop cooperation between law enforcement, probation, prosecutor, public defender and clerk to ensure current and accurate information is available when written court hearing notices are mailed to youth.
 - Produce a Warrant Report that documents the type of warrant, date issued, date served, underlying offense, racial/ethnicity and gender, etc to identify patterns that could be improved with JDAI strategies.
- Considerations for cases Awaiting Placement
 - Develop placement protocols to minimize delays and to ensure that out-of-home placements are the least restrictive alternative necessary.
 - Consider using ATDs for youth awaiting placements.

- Develop reports that document the number of cases awaiting placements, the ALOS in detention, race/ethnicity and gender, etc. to assist stakeholders in better understanding the needs of this population of youth awaiting placements.

Year 2

- Continue to review data and results in reducing unnecessary detention for Special Detention Cases, and modify/refine intervention strategies as needed to achieve desired results.
- Determine which Special Detention Cases account for the greatest use of detention and focus efforts to achieve reductions.

Year 3

- Continue to review data and results in reducing unnecessary detention for Special Detention Cases, and modify/refine intervention strategies as needed to achieve desired results.
- Determine which Special Detention Cases account for the greatest use of detention and focus efforts to achieve reductions.

G. Reducing Racial Disparities

The role of the site coordinator is to keep stakeholders constantly focused on reducing racial/ethnic disparities throughout the juvenile justice system. The site coordinator should present data highlighting disparities to assist stakeholders in understanding disparities and to guide stakeholders in efforts to reduce the racial/ethnic disparities within their jurisdiction.

Year 1

- Guide stakeholders and key-level leaders in the importance of reducing racial/ethnic disparities and encourage them to make this a priority in the jurisdiction.
- Establish a baseline of the percentage of minority youth in the general community juvenile population to be used to measure disparities at each decision-point in the juvenile justice system. Typical decision-making points in the juvenile justice system are: arrest, detention, diversion, adjudication, disposition, probation sanctioning, commitment to state institutions, and remand to the adult system.
- Ensure all record keeping and data collection gathers information on race/ethnicity, gender, age, and home address/zip code. This is a requirement as stakeholders begin to study and analyze racial/ethnic disparities.

- Establish a Disproportionate Minority Confinement/Contact (DMC) Work Group with representation from juvenile justice professionals and the community to develop a plan to reduce disparities.
- Guide stakeholders in defining what success means in terms of reducing racial/ethnic disparities, by setting clear, achievable goals; ensure that the JDAI work plan reflects a robust, intentional agenda and measure progress regularly.
- Contact the state coordinator and TA/TL to schedule Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities Training provided by the W. Haywood Burns Institute.

Year 2

- Evaluate the DMC Work Group's progress in Year 1 and develop a plan for Year 2.
- Ensure all necessary data is available for stakeholders to review and analyze disparities in the jurisdiction, and develop data capacity as needed.
- Determine if additional trainings and resources are needed for stakeholders and consult with the state coordinator and TA/TL for guidance.

Year 3

- Evaluate the DMC Work Group's progress in Year 2 and develop a plan for Year 3.
- Determine if additional training, resources or data collection/analysis is needed and consult with the state coordinator and TA/TL.

H. Conditions of Confinement

The role of the site coordinator is to educate stakeholders on the importance of the JDAI Detention Facility Assessment process and to establish an assessment team to be trained to conduct the assessment and provide a summary of findings.

Year 1

- Establish a Detention Facility Assessment Work Group that will oversee the completion of the facility assessment and reporting process.
- Facilitate the development of a plan to complete the facility assessment that details when the training will occur, when the assessment will be conducted and when the report will be completed and presented to the JDAI Steering & Executive Committees.
- The Detention Facility Assessment process should be completed every two years with the initial assessment occurring by the end of the first year or at the beginning of the second year. The year following the assessment will be used to implement any corrective actions necessary.

- Develop an assessment team by carefully following the *JDAI Detention Facility Assessment Practice Guide*. Provide the team with the Guide, sample findings reports from other jurisdictions, and other resources available from the JDAI Help Desk and the state coordinator and TA/TL.
- Contact the state coordinator and TA/TL to schedule training for the facility assessment team; the training should be closely followed by the actual facility assessment.

Year 2

- Review progress in completing recommendations made by the Detention Facility Assessment Team; note items that have been brought into compliance, and develop a progress update on other items.
- Schedule the second Detention Facility Assessment.
- Recruit and train new self inspection team members as needed.

Year 3

- Review progress that's been made in completing recommendations from the facility assessment team, noting items that have been brought into compliance, and which items still need to be addressed.
- Schedule and facilitate the second Detention Facility Assessment.
- Recruit and train new self inspection team members as needed.

Definitions

Admissions – number of youth admitted to detention

ADP – Detention average daily population

AECF – Annie E. Casey Foundation

ALOS – average length of stay for youth in detention

ATD – alternatives to detention

Collaborative – JDAI steering committee composed of the juvenile justice system & community

DMC – disproportionate minority contact and confinement

JDAI Annual Grants Report – financial & progress reports submitted to the AECF annually

JDAI Annual Results Report – JDAI sites submit an annual report documenting impact, leverage, and influence of site's work implementing JDAI

JDAI Implementation or Work Plan – annual JDAI plan done both at the state and local level

JDAI Quarterly Reports – JDAI sites submit Detention Population, Alternative Programs, RAI Screened and RAI Override reports quarterly to their TA/TL

Quick Launch – the process of supplying a state with the education and technical assistance to begin JDAI in multiple local sites and the necessary state support

RAI – detention Risk Assessment Instrument

Reform – the process of improving or implementing constructive change

Site Coordinator – JDAI Coordinator for a single local (County) JDAI site

Starter Kit – materials to assist a new JDAI site in planning and implementing JDAI

State Coordinator – JDAI Coordinator for multiple local JDAI sites within a state

System Assessment – the process of evaluating a site's success in implementing JDAI strategies and the developing a plan to accomplish specific goals

TA/TL – JDAI Technical Assistance/Team Leader

VOP – violation of probation

Work Groups – a committee tasked with implementing a specific JDAI strategy within a jurisdiction composed of members of the juvenile justice system and community

Year 1, 2, and 3 Developmental Milestones – tasks and activities each JDAI site accomplishes during the first three years of JDAI

Net widening – placing youth in alternative programs that would not have been confined in detention, a practice to avoid in using alternatives to detention

Attachments

Phase 1 JDAI Site Developmental Milestones	28
Phase 2 JDAI Site Developmental Milestones	33
Phase 3 JDAI Site Developmental Milestones	37

Phase 1 JDAI Site Developmental Milestones

The following checklist outlines general site developmental milestones. It identifies implementation activities for phase one reform work based on replication results achieved by successful sites. The key tasks generally entail the following components: immersing stakeholders in JDAI, the core strategies and the foundational values and principles of detention reform; organizational development to operationalize reform efforts including enhancing data capacity to ensure data driven decisions; assessing the current state of a sites juvenile justice system; developing a work plan to help drive JDAI; and, targeted reform activities.

The checklist is organized within the framework of the eight core strategies. Since each site is different there will predictably be differences in the sequence of work and timing of these developmental tasks. **To this end, please consider that “low hanging fruit” identified at any point in your development should take precedence in the work.** The items that follow stem directly from the milestones sites should expect to accomplish in phase one. A variety of technical assistance is available to sites to support and ensure progress in the following areas.

Collaboration

- Juvenile justice and related public system policy makers become familiar with and can articulate the values, strategies and goals of detention reform
 1. Leadership responsible for implementation of JDAI have been identified and convened.

2. A JDAI "kick off" meeting has been conducted with a diverse representation of site stakeholders.
 3. A model site visit has been accomplished.
 4. A local, regional, or state "JDAI 101" conference/training has been accomplished.
 5. Fundamental JDAI materials (e.g., *Pathways*, *DVD*, *JDAI Starter Kit*, *Help Desk*) have been studied by all active stakeholders.
 6. A meeting to review detention utilization data and deliberate the jurisdiction's consensus on use/purpose of detention is convened.
 7. A delegation was organized and sent to the JDAI national inter-site conference.
- An administrative infrastructure is developed to support and direct the reform process
 1. Relevant stakeholders who have the necessary authority to implement change are active members of the JDAI collaborative.
 2. Community representatives (i.e., non-system) are coached up and engaged as active members of the collaborative.
 3. The JDAI collaborative has the necessary staff support to coordinate and assist in the progression of detention reform.
 4. Topical work groups have been established as informed by the work plan.
 5. The site has established contact expectations and a communication plan with the TA/Team Leader.
 6. A site coordinator has been designated.
 7. The site coordinator's roles and responsibilities have been defined.
 8. New collaborative members are coached up as needed.
 - An assessment of juvenile detention policies, practices and programs to inform system reform activities has been conducted.
 1. Site worked with the TA/Team Leader to make available existing and relevant data and documents to augment the qualitative system assessment.
 2. All relevant and key stakeholders, including community representatives, participated in interviews with the team conducting the system assessment.
 3. The report generated by the system assessment was deliberated and adopted by the collaborative and utilized to develop a phase one work plan.
 - A comprehensive work plan with measurable outcomes to guide phase one detention reform has been developed and adopted by the collaborative.
 1. The work plan was informed by the recommendations made in the system assessment report, the detention utilization study, and phases one developmental milestones.
 2. The work plan was developed through a racial/ethnic lens.
 3. The work plan includes clear objectives, tasks, responsible party(s)/work groups for the tasks, and timelines.
 4. Accountability measures have been established to support progress on implementation efforts.
 5. The work plan is monitored on a quarterly basis.

Data

- The JDAI collaborative develops the human resources and technical infrastructure needed to produce routine descriptive statistics on detention utilization and to assess the impact on various reform strategies
- IT Changes Needed to Produce Statistical Reports Have Been Identified and Initiated

1. Existing site data systems and capacities have been cataloged and shared with the TA/Team Leader.
 2. All available statistical reports have been provided to the TA/Team Leader for review.
 3. Data definitions and query screens have been provided to the TA/Team leader.
 4. Changes to the production of statistical reports have been made as informed by TA.
- The Site Comprehends and Demonstrates the Value of the Use of Data in Driving Detention Reform
 1. Coach ups and “Using Data 101” trainings have been conducted with all collaborative members.
 2. Data reports from other JDAI sites have been reviewed.
 3. Data collection manuals have been reviewed, including *Planning for Juvenile Detention Reform: Data Collection Handbook*.
 4. A detention utilization study has been completed and is disaggregated by race/ethnicity/gender and cross referenced by offense and referral source.
 5. A geographical profile of detention use has been developed.
 6. Data reports are distributed in a timely manner for review and analysis at Executive/Steering Committee meetings and work groups.
 - Data to Meet Site Reporting Expectations is Defined and Collected
 1. Statistical reports that monitor fundamental indicators (e.g., admissions, ADP, ALOS) and racial/ethnic disparities and disproportionality are produced on a quarterly basis.
 2. The annual “Results Report” has been completed and submitted to the AECF.
 3. Public safety indicators (e.g., pre-adjudication FTA & re-arrest rates) are routinely monitored.

Objective Admission Policies and Practices

- In preparation for the development or enhancement of the RAI, the site has immersed themselves in the fundamentals of the principals and technology of the juvenile detention risk instrument (RAI).
 1. The site established a RAI work group composed of relevant stakeholders.
 2. The RAI work group studied relevant tools and materials including the *Juvenile Detention Risk Assessment* practice guide.
 3. The RAI work group attended and participated in the training on RAI design, testing and implementation.
- To ensure fairness, effectiveness and objectivity in the detention screening process a RAI has been developed or enhanced.
 1. The site has initiated the development or modification of the RAI.
 2. The new or modified RAI was piloted.
 3. Data on the impact of the new or modified RAI is collected and analyzed.
 4. Impact of the new or modified RAI on youth of color is analyzed and monitored.

Alternatives to Detention

- An assessment of existing alternatives to detention (ATD) has been conducted.
 1. An inventory of existing ATDs has been conducted.

- Stakeholders are poised to respond to “low hanging” fruit as informed by the system assessment, the detention utilization study or work group data informed reports.
 1. Stakeholders readily identified areas of policy, practice or programming that could produce improved results.
 2. Innovations from other JDAI sites to address the specific issue were researched by the collaborative.
 3. Recommendations for change were presented to the collaborative; reforms were implemented as circumstances permitted.
 4. Blah

Case Processing

- Stakeholders are poised to respond to “low hanging” fruit as informed by the system assessment, the detention utilization study or work group data informed reports.
 1. Stakeholders readily identified areas of policy, practice or programming that could produce improved results.
 2. Innovations from other JDAI sites to address the specific issue were researched by the collaborative.
 3. Recommendations for change were presented to the collaborative; reforms were implemented as circumstances permitted.

Special Detention Cases

- Stakeholders are poised to respond to “low hanging” fruit as informed by the system assessment, the detention utilization study or work group data informed reports.
 1. Stakeholders readily identified areas of policy, practice or programming that could produce improved results.
 2. Innovations from other JDAI sites to address the specific issue were researched by the collaborative.
 3. Recommendations for change were presented to the collaborative; reforms were implemented as circumstances permitted.

Conditions of Confinement

- The relevant and necessary stakeholders have undertaken the fundamental steps to conduct a critical self-assessment of the local detention center.
 1. A facilities self-assessment work group was established composed of diverse system and community representatives.
 2. The facilities self-inspection work group studied relevant tools and materials including the *Detention Facility Self-Assessment* practice guide.
 3. The facilities self-assessment work group attended and participated in the self-inspection training.
- A detention facility self-assessment essential to facilitate the monitoring of conditions of confinement has been conducted.
 1. A self-assessment of the detention facility has been conducted.
 2. A report on the findings of the self-assessment has been compiled and shared with the collaborative to initiate discussions about necessary corrective action plans.

Reducing Racial/Ethnic Disparities and Disproportionality

- Stakeholders have defined the baseline level of youth of color represented in the detention system.
 1. A quantitative study establishing racial and ethnic representation of youth in the general population by race and ethnicity and the representation of youth in the detention facility by race and ethnicity has been conducted.
- Stakeholders share a common understanding about what it means to achieve success in the reduction of racial and ethnic disparities and disproportionality.
 1. A meeting to review detention utilization data and the baseline data on youth of color represented in detention is convened.
 2. Stakeholders deliberated on the consensus of defining success in the reduction of racial and ethnic disparities and disproportionality.
- Stakeholders are poised to respond to “low hanging” fruit as informed by the system assessment, the detention utilization study or work group data informed reports.
 1. Stakeholders readily identified areas of policy, practice or programming that could produce improved results.
 2. Innovations from other JDAI sites to address the specific issue were researched by the collaborative.
 3. Recommendations for change were presented to the collaborative; reforms were implemented as circumstances permitted.

Phase 2 JDAI Site Developmental Milestones

The following checklist provides general site development milestones. It identifies implementation activities for reform work in year/phase two based on replication results achieved by successful sites. The checklist is organized within the framework of the eight core strategies. Since each site is different there will predictably be differences in the sequence of work. **To this end, please consider that “low hanging fruit” identified at any point in your development should take precedence in the work.** The items that follow stem directly from the milestones sites should expect to accomplish in year/phase two.

Collaboration

- Year/Phase 1 Implementation Efforts are Assessed
 1. Year/phase 1 implementation accomplishments and results have been reviewed.
 2. A work plan with measurable outcomes for year/phase 2 has been developed.
- A Diverse Group of Stakeholders Plays a Substantive Role in the Implementation of JDAI.
 1. Leadership and organization of the initiative has been reviewed.
 2. A meeting to review jurisdiction’s consensus on use of detention is convened.
 3. Overall awareness of detention reform agenda within jurisdiction has been increased, including JDAI training for line staff.
 4. Members have been added to executive committee &/or work groups as needed and informed by the work plan, including racial/ethnic justice

champions with explicit authority to address racial/ethnic disparities in the system.

5. Community members in the collaborative have been provided information and technical assistance to meaningfully contribute to detention reform.
6. New members to executive committee and work groups have been “coached” as needed.
7. At least one model site visit has been conducted.
8. A delegation was organized and sent to JDAI national conference.

Data

- Site Has Developed the Capacity to Analyze and Interpret Data
 1. Routine (at least quarterly) management statistical reports consistent with JDAI suggested formats are produced.
 2. Data reports are routinely reviewed within the executive committee and related work groups and link data to policy and practice deliberations.
 3. Public safety indicators, including FTA and re-arrest and overall juvenile crime statistics, are being tracked.
 4. Quantitative and qualitative data analyses of specific target populations and issues are conducted as needed.
 5. A complete and accurate Results Report is prepared and submitted.

Objective Admission Policies & Practices

- The site has developed and is using a juvenile detention risk assessment instrument (RAI) to maximize effectiveness, fairness and objectivity in the detention screening process.
 1. RAI implementation is complete, memorialized in policies and procedures, incorporated in training curricula, and well understood by stakeholders and related staff.
- The efficacy of the RAI has been assessed through monitoring of detention data and through a follow-up study of released children’s failure-to-appear and re-arrests rates and the instrument’s impact on racial/ethnic disparities.
 1. Routine statistical reports on detention admissions screening are prepared and disseminated.
- The admissions screening process has been assessed to ensure that implementation is consistent with best practices.
 1. Routine quality assurance procedures are in place.
 2. A review of the use of overrides has been conducted.
- Adjustments to the RAI and its application are made based upon its performance, relevance and effectiveness.
 1. A quantitative analysis of the impact of any changes to the RAI has been conducted prior to implementation of those changes.

Alternatives to Detention

- An assessment of existing ATD programs has been conducted and changes to current programs made.
 1. A plan has been developed and implemented to ensure that current programmatic resources are appropriately designed, properly implemented and effectively utilized.
- Additional programmatic needs have been identified.
 1. Plans have been developed to design, implement and fund new programs.
- A continuum of ATD programs that are race, culture and gender responsive is operating or will be in place upon implementation of the plan for additional programs.
 1. A geographic profile of detention utilization (from year/phase 1 detention utilization study) has been used to inform the development and/or enhancement of the ATD continuum.
- Mechanisms to monitor use and outcomes of ATD programs, including routine statistical reports have been implemented.

Case Processing

- A case processing work group has been established and has identified ways to make case processing more timely and efficient
 1. An analysis of case processing and related time frames, including racial, ethnic and gender comparisons, has been completed.
 2. Policy and practice changes to expedite case processing have been designed and implemented based upon as informed by the mapping
- Routine (e.g., weekly) detention reviews are conducted to minimize delays in securing release or placement
 1. Daily population sheets and statistical reports that track lengths of stay and case processing times are routinely prepared and disseminated
- Policies and procedures to process youth in ATD programs within time frames for youth in secure custody have been implemented
 1. Length of stay data for youth in ATD programs has been analyzed and compared to data for youth in custody.
- The results of changes to case processing, including impact on racial, ethnic and gender disparities, have been analyzed and further refinements identified.

Special Detention Cases

- The use of detention for VOP's, warrants, and awaiting placement cases has been analyzed by a work group and a work plan for reforms to reduce secure detention utilization has been established.
 1. Analysis of special detention cases included disaggregation of data by race, ethnicity and gender.
- Policies and procedures to reduce detention in violation of probation cases have been designed and implemented.
 1. VOPs are processed promptly, including detained VOP cases are scheduled for court appearance within 24 hours of confinement.
 2. All instances in which a VOP results in detention are subject to supervisory review and sign-off.

3. A structured approach (including a “sanctions grid”) to responding to probation violations has been established and is being followed.
 4. Detention utilization for probation violators is routinely monitored to assess efficacy and impact on racial, ethnic or gender disparities.
- Policies and procedures to reduce cases resulting in detention because of writs or warrants have been designed and implemented.
 1. A court notification system has been implemented to minimize failure-to-appear warrants.
 2. A differentiated approach to warrants that authorizes options other than secure detention has been established and implemented by the court.
 3. Detention utilization for writ/warrant cases is routinely monitored to assess efficacy and impact on racial, ethnic or gender disparities.
 - Policies and procedures to reduce awaiting placement cases resulting in detention have been designed and implemented.
 1. Placement protocols have been reviewed and revised to minimize delays and to ensure that out-of-home placements are the least restrictive alternative necessary.
 2. Dispositional options have been examined to determine if the site has appropriate and sufficient program options; related remedial plans have been developed.
 3. Detention utilization for awaiting placement cases is routinely monitored to assess progress and impact on racial, ethnic or gender disparities.

Conditions of Confinement

- A detention facility self-assessment has been conducted and resulting corrective action plan has been developed and implemented.
 1. Self-assessment report and corrective action plan have been reviewed and approved by JDAI executive committee.
- A trained and fully staffed facility self-inspection team exists and is engaged in activities to support and/or facilitate implementation of corrective action plans, review particular conditions issues as needed, and conduct annual self-assessments.
- Procedures have been established to ensure that unusual incidents or emerging patterns are brought to attention of self-assessment team in a timely manner.
 1. Detention facility is producing and sharing routine statistical reports that capture key indicators of institutional conditions.

Racial/Ethnic Disparities & DMC

- An increased focus on reducing racial/ethnic disparities in detention is reflected in a work plan with monitorable milestones and measurable results.
 1. All core strategy analyses (above) have included data disaggregation by race, ethnicity and gender and geographical analyses to identify causes and places of disproportionality.
 2. A system assessment “through a racial/ethnic lens” has been completed.
 3. If not included in 1 and 2, above, a quantitative analysis of racial disparities at major system decision points has been completed.
 4. The work plan includes explicit, detailed changes to policy, practice and programming aimed at reducing racial and ethnic disparities.

- The structure and functioning of the local JDAI collaborative ensures that there is sustained and authoritative attention to efforts to reduce racial and ethnic disparities.
 1. The work groups are charged with responsibility for addressing racial disparities as part of their work.
 2. The executive committee's agenda routinely includes discussion of how detention reform efforts are affecting racial and ethnic equity goals.
- System agencies have developed materials and programs to increase the cultural competency of their staff and to ensure that internal agency policies and procedures are equitable.
- Ties to communities are strengthened as reflected in community participation in JDAI collaborative and work groups, partnerships for improved service delivery, and increased system agency connections to neighborhood resources and leaders.
 1. Community members who participate in JDAI have been provided training and technical assistance to meaningfully contribute to detention reform.
- Progress reducing racial/ethnic disparities is routinely monitored through statistical reports and tracking of implementation of work plans.
 1. Implementation of work plan elements is routinely monitored for impact on racial/ethnic disparities.

Phase 3 JDAI Site Developmental Milestones

The following checklist outlines general site developmental milestones. It identifies implementation activities for phase three reform work based on replication results achieved by successful sites. Phase one milestones generally consisted of building the infrastructure to operationalize JDAI. Phase two entailed implementing fundamental changes to policies, practices and programs to reduce unnecessary and inappropriate detention and reduce racial/ethnic disparities. Phase three is directed at monitoring changes to ensure sustaining positive results and to dig deeper in reform efforts to achieve equity and improve outcomes for all youth

The checklist is organized within the framework of the eight core strategies. Since each site is different there will predictably be differences in the sequence of work and timing of these developmental tasks. **To this end, please consider that "low hanging fruit" identified at any point in your development should take precedence in the work.** The items that follow stem directly from the milestones sites should expect to accomplish in phase three. A variety of technical assistance is available to sites to support and ensure progress in the following areas.

Collaboration

- Year/Phase 2 Implementation Efforts are Assessed
 1. Year/phase 2 implementation accomplishments and results have been reviewed.
 2. As needed, a targeted system assessment has been conducted by local site collaborative members to help identify and overcome challenge areas.
 3. A work plan with measurable outcomes for year/phase 3 has been developed.

- The Juvenile Justice and Related Public System Decision and Policy Makers Begin Institutionalizing JDAI.
 1. Detention reform training for all systems personnel continues to be enhanced and implemented.
 2. The development of a state sustainability plan has been initiated that includes: establishing the infrastructure to sustain the initiative and expand within the state as the opportunities arise; and, measures for legislative support.
 3. The composition of the collaborative has been assessed and enhanced as needed and informed by the work plan.
 4. New members to the executive committee and work groups have been “coached” as needed.
 5. At least one model site visit has been conducted.
 6. A delegation was organized and sent to the JDAI national conference.

Data

- Site Data Capacities and Analysis are Expanded and Increasingly Capable of Responding to Queries and Discrete Analytical Tasks
 1. The human resources and infrastructure needed to produce and analyze juvenile justice data has been developed and implemented.
 2. Routine data indicators are disaggregated and cross tabulated race/ethnicity/gender/geography/offense.
 3. Changes to policies, practices and programs are routinely monitored for intended impact and impact on youth of color.
 4. Quantitative and qualitative data analysis of specific target populations and issues are conducted to help drill down as needed.
 5. Public safety indicators, including FTA & re-arrest, and overall juvenile crime statistics, continue to be accurately collected and monitored.
 6. Accurate and timely data is used to leverage funding for detention reform.
 7. A complete and accurate Results Report is prepared and submitted.

Objective Admission Policies & Practices

- Detention referral practices are consistent with detention eligibility and objective admission policies of the intake staff and the Juvenile Court.
 1. Law enforcement criteria for decisions on cite/release or other field dispositions in lieu of transport to the detention facility have been developed and implemented.
 2. The impact of arrest and referral practices on youth of color has been analyzed; strategies for change have accordingly been developed.
- The admission’s screening process is routinely assessed to ensure that implementation is consistent with best practices.
 1. Quality control measures have been developed and implemented which monitors operational issues (e.g., use of overrides, consistency, and accuracy). These measures disaggregate impact by race/ethnicity/gender.
 2. The RAI results are routinely analyzed for disparities and DMC impact; if found, disparities are documented and steps are taken to reduce the effects of the disparities.
 3. A statistical analysis of the RAI is routinely deliberated by the collaborative.

4. Responsive and recurring training has been implemented for personnel conducting risk screening tasks.
- Adjustments to the RAI and its application are made based upon performance, relevance and effectiveness.
 1. A quantitative analysis of the impact of any changes to the RAI has been conducted prior to implementation of those changes. The analysis includes changes needed to safely reduce racial/ethnic disparities and DMC.

Alternatives to Detention

- The Primary Purpose of the Sites ATD Programs Is to Provide Non-Secure Options to Youth Who Would Otherwise Be Detained.
 1. The distribution of RAI scores for ATD participants is clearly defined.
 2. The RAI is consistently utilized to guide ATD releases and referrals.
 3. The identified target population intentionally promotes racial/ethnic/gender equity in program participation and successful completion rates.
 4. Policies and practices have been implemented to facilitate release of youth to ATD in the most timely and efficient manner possible.
- Explicit and Objective Criteria for Program Enrollment and Related Policies and Procedures Have Been Implemented.
 1. Explicit criteria is readily available that reflects the alignment of the use of detention and ATDs.
- A Continuum of ATDs That Are Race/Culture/Gender Responsive Have Been Developed and Operationalized
 1. The ATD continuum actively involves partnerships with community based organizations (CBOs) that respond to high impact geographic or racial/ethnic distribution of cases.
 2. Partnerships with CBOs reflect a shared understanding of expectations including tracking and analyzing outcomes.
 3. ATD programs for pre-adjudicated youth have been designed primarily to minimize the risk of re-offending and FTA in court while the instant case is pending.
 4. The continuum of ATDs include programs that target post-dispositional cases to help reduce youth placed out of home..
- Use and Outcomes of ATDs Are Routinely Monitored
 1. Statistical reports are utilized to track and disseminate program results, including use and impact on racial/ethnic disparities, bed displacement, FTA and re-arrest rates, and length of stay in ATD.
 2. Program results are routinely disaggregated by race/ethnicity/gender
 3. Corrective actions plans have been implemented as informed by the statistical program results.

Case Processing

- Changes in Court Calendars, Dockets & Schedules Have Been Implemented to Provide for Efficiency and Timeliness.

1. Clear policies and consistent practices regarding adjournments that appropriately limit case postponements have been established by the court.
 2. Policies and procedures have been implemented to docket cases for court review when changed circumstances of youth in detention are presented.
 3. Calendaring, docketing and scheduling of cases are consistent across all court rooms.
- Changes in Administrative Practices to Support Expedited Case Processing Have Been Implemented
1. Psychological evaluations and similar reports are completed in a timely manner.
 2. Social history (dispositional reports) are prioritized for in-custody cases and efficiently produced.
 3. ATD program admissions are accomplished without delays.
 4. Youth awaiting residential programs or state commitment are placed within two weeks of disposition.
 5. Policies and procedures to expedite cases have been implemented by the court and related agencies.
- Mechanisms to Monitor Policy and Practice Changes, Including Routine Statistical Reports Have Been Implemented
1. Statistical reports that track lengths of stay and case processing times and identify points of unnecessary delay are routinely prepared and analyzed. The statistical reports are consistently disaggregated by race, ethnicity and gender.
- Policies and Practices of Prosecutors and Defenders Have Been Analyzed and Changes Made Accordingly
1. Prosecutors provide discovery material to defense in a timely manner.
 2. Prosecutors and defense counsel receive appropriate case documents (e.g., complaint/petition, RAI score sheet) prior to the detention hearing.
 3. Defense counsel is assigned to, and visits the youth, prior to the youth's initial appearance in court.
 4. Defense has conducted a self-assessment utilizing the tool developed by the National Juvenile Defender Center; strategies for change are developed and implemented as informed by the results of the assessment.
 5. The prosecution's filing practices are routinely analyzed to ensure that all youth similarly situated, regardless of race, ethnicity or gender, are treated equitably.

Special Detention Cases

- Policies and Procedures on the Use of Detention in Probation Violation Cases are Routinely Monitored
1. Statistical reports to monitor structured approaches to VOPs (including an administrative response/incentives grid) and supervisory review of VOPs are routinely prepared and analyzed. Changes are made as informed by the data.
 2. Responses to VOPs are based on level of risk and severity of the violation as informed by the RAI and the administrative grid.

3. A continuum of ATDs along with changes to discretionary policies for VOPs, which allow for movement up and down based on risk and severity of the violation, have been implemented.
 4. Detention utilization for probation violators is routinely monitored to assess efficacy and impact on racial, ethnic, or gender disparities.
- Policies and Procedures to Reduce Cases Resulting in Detention because of Writs or Warrants Have Been Enhanced
 1. All youth referred to detention on warrants are screened for risk.
 2. Any backlog of warrants have been cleared or purged.
 3. Focus groups and/or surveys with youth and families have been conducted to determine reasons for FTA. Changes have been made as informed by the results.
 4. Detention utilization for writ/warrant cases is routinely monitored to assess efficacy and impact on racial, ethnic, or gender disparities.
 - Policies and Procedures to Reduce Awaiting Placement Cases Resulting in Detention Have Been Enhanced
 1. Non-residential alternatives as part of the continuum of care are available to post-adjudicated youth at various levels of offense severity, public safety risk, and treatment need.
 2. Re-assessment of placement failures is completed within a reasonable time for re-evaluation and location of an alternate placement.
 3. Indicators of program success are collected and analyzed for program effectiveness.
 4. Impact of awaiting placement cases are routinely analyzed by type of placement, LOS, program failures, and other relevant factors including race, ethnicity and gender.
 5. Provider contract changes have been implemented requiring providers to make second efforts in keeping hard cases.
 6. Detention utilization for awaiting placement cases is routinely monitored to assess efficacy and impact on racial, ethnic, or gender disparities.

Conditions of Confinement

- Conditions in the Detention Facility Provide a Healthy and Safe Environment for the Youth and Staff
 1. The year 2 corrective action plan has been reviewed to ensure substantial implementation.
 2. Statistical reports have been developed and are utilized to monitor aspects of conditions of confinement (e.g., incident reports, health and safety issues, room confinements, use of force, etc.)
 3. As needed, new team members participate in the self inspection training.
 4. The site has conducted a second self-inspection of the detention facility.
 5. Training on best practices for detention operations occur on a consistent basis.

Racial/Ethnic Disparities & DMC

- A Work Plan with Measurable Objectives and Results Aimed at Reducing Racial/Ethnic Disparities Guides the Work of the Collaborative

1. Active agendas to promote equity have been developed by key stakeholder agencies.
 2. A process for measuring the status and progress in the reduction of racial/ethnic disparities has been established and includes: digging deeper into factors contributing to disproportionality; strategizing about policy and practice changes to reduce racial/ethnic disparities; adopting strategies; and, monitoring change for intended impact.
- The JDAI Collaborative Has a Shared Understanding of the Purpose of Detention and Success in Reducing Racial/Ethnic Disparities
 1. The purpose of detention is aligned with the sites definition of success in achieving reductions in disparities and disproportionality.
 2. Authority and leadership is firmly established and asserted in the collaborative.
 - A Community Engagement Sustainability Strategy Has Been Developed
 1. The type of engagement (e.g., policy/practice decision making, consumer input/feedback, advocacy, outreach) has been defined.
 2. Coach up of community stakeholders continues on an as needed basis.
 3. The structure to support community engagement is clearly defined.
 - System Agencies Have Developed a Staff Participatory Plan to Deepen and Sustain Progress
 1. A plan is developed to help all staff understand how daily decisions might impact racial/ethnic disparities.
 2. Training on the disparities and disproportionality occur on a consistent basis.

