

**2008 STATE OF IOWA JUVNILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY
PREVENTION ACT FORMULA GRANT UPDATE**

**Contact: Dave Kuker
Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning
Lucas State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319**

*Submission
Date: March 2008*

Table of Contents

1. UPDATED DESCRIPTION OF SYSTEM	3
2. UPDATED ANALYSIS OF JUVENILE CRIME PROBLEMS	3
3. PLANS FOR COMPLIANCE MONITORING	3
A. Plan for Removal of Status Offenders and Nonoffenders from Secure Detention and Correctional Facilities	3 3
B. Plan for Separation of Juveniles from Adults Offenders	4
C. Plan for Removal of Juveniles from Adult Jails and Lockups	4
D. Plan for Compliance Monitoring	4
4. PLANS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH DMC REQUIREMENT	6
Updated Assessment Study	6
A. Updated DMC Identification Spread Sheets	14
B. Organization of Iowa's Approach	17
C. State Level Plan	17
1. State Level Data Discussion	17
2. State Level Progress Made in 2007	20
3. DMC Reduction Plan for 2008	24
D. Local Level Plan	26
1. Black Hawk - Local Level DMC Activities	26
2. Polk - Local Level DMC Activities	29
3. Woodbury - Local Level DMC Activities	32
5. PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS	36
Issue One – Promoting Youth Development & Assisting Planning	36
Issue Two – Treatment of Mentally Ill Youth	39
Issue Three – Disproportionate Minority Contact	41
Issue Four – Gender Specific Services	43
Issue Five – Compliance Monitoring	46
Issue Six – State Advisory Group Allocation	47
Issue Seven – Planning and Administration	48

Notes Regarding Document Format and Iowa's Funding Distribution Cycle

This document is Iowa's 2008 JJDP Act formula grant three year plan update. When specific items of this plan are unchanged from the previously submitted 2007 plan, it is reflected accordingly in the respective topic areas of this document. The bulk of this 2008 plan is an "update" of the program plan completed since submission of the original 2006 plan.

The Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning (CJJP) wrote Iowa's three year plan update. CJJP is the state agency responsible for administering the JJDP Act in Iowa. The Plan was developed and approved by Iowa's Juvenile Justice Advisory Council (JJAC). That Council assists with administration of the JJDP Act, and also provides guidance and direction to CJJP, the Governor and the legislature regarding juvenile justice issues in Iowa.

This plan contains an extensive data presentation and analysis in its DMC section. That section was developed with information that has been provided to the JJAC, the JJAC's **DMC Committee**, and the newly formed Governor's Youth Race and Detention Task Force (**YRDTF**). Information regarding the DMC Committee and YRDTF background and relevant activities are provided in the DMC section.

Seven issue areas are identified in this program plan (including the JJAC allocation and Planning and Administration funds). It should be noted that issues "Two (Mental Health), "Three" (DMC), and "Five" (Compliance/Research), will not be supported with 2008 formula grant funding, but, rather, funding support has been requested utilizing 2008 JABG dollars. Unless specifically indicated, the problem statements, goals, objectives, performance indicators and activities for those issues are unchanged for this 2007 three year plan update. Provided in the issue area sections below is a discussion of the JJAC's and CJJP's efforts for the respective issues. The formatting identifies in **bold type** the language in the body of the plan regarding **funding for this year's (2008) update**.

The funding priorities reflected in this program plan were approved by the JJAC. Iowa distributes most of its funding based on the federal fiscal year (October – September). Unless otherwise indicated, the funding described in Iowa's program plan will be distributed for the period of October 1, 2008 – September 30, 2009.

1. UPDATED DESCRIPTION OF SYSTEM

There are no changes from the 2006 three year plan, and 2007 update previously submitted to OJJDP.

2. UPDATED ANALYSIS OF JUVENILE CRIME PROBLEMS AND JUVENILE JUSTICE NEEDS

There are no changes from the 2006 three year plan, and 2007 update previously submitted to OJJDP.

3. PLANS FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE FIRST THREE CORE REQUIREMENTS OF THE JJDP ACT AND THE STATE'S PLAN FOR COMPLIANCE MONITORING.

A. Plan for Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (Removal of Status Offenders and Nonoffenders From Secure Detention and Correctional Facilities) - Section 223(a)(11).

There are no changes from the 2006 three year plan, and 2007 update previously submitted to OJJDP.

B. Plan for Separation of Juveniles and Adults Offenders – Section 223(a)(12).

No changes from the 2007 update previously submitted to OJJDP. The 2007 updated detailed the significant changes from the 2006 three year plan.

C. Plan for Removal of Juveniles from Adult Jails and Lockups – Section 223 (a)(13).

No changes from the 2007 update previously submitted to OJJDP. The 2007 updated detailed the significant changes from the 2006 three year plan.

D. Plan for Compliance Monitoring – Section 223 (a)(14).

No changes from the 2007 update previously submitted to OJJDP. The 2007 updated detailed the significant changes from the 2006 three year plan.

Below are listed details of Iowa's monitoring plan. Discussion is provided in each of the subheadings to explain Iowa's monitoring process.

1. Identification of the Monitoring Universe

Identification of the monitoring universe for the jail removal mandate is completed utilizing lists provided from the State Jail Inspector's Office of the Iowa Department of Corrections (DOC). That department is statutorily required to inspect state jails/lockups. Iowa's guidelines for non-secure juvenile holdovers are also detailed in DOC administrative rules. CJJP staff maintains regular contact with the Jail Inspector's Office to keep jail/lockup monitoring lists updated. The State Jail Inspector's Office does have the capability to close jail/lockup facilities.

CJJP also works closely with DHS to identify and monitor other secure facilities that can hold juveniles.

To determine if Iowa has Native American tribes with law enforcement capabilities CJJP contacts Martin Hansford of the Bureau of Indian Affairs District 1 Office, 115 4th SE, Aberdeen, SD 57501, phone (605) 226-7347. According to that office Iowa has no tribe located in the state's boundaries that provide law enforcement capabilities for residential areas. However, two tribes located in Nebraska operate casinos in Iowa, and provide security at their respective casinos. These tribes do not provide law enforcement for any residential areas in the State of Iowa. Iowa's tribes are presently covered under Public Law 280 which allows them to utilize other law enforcement assistance as provided by state, county or city entities.

Iowa's Department of Human Services is the licensing agency for residential facilities and other out-of-home placements for youth (i.e., juvenile detention facilities, State Training School, group foster care, State Mental Health Institutions, etc.). Monitoring lists are provided from that department.

2. Classifications of Facilities

The State Jail Inspector's Office has a process which facilities must utilize in order to be certified to hold juveniles. That certification document differentiates those facilities that 1) can not provide sight and sound separation and thus are not certified to detain youth, 2) through administrative processes choose not to hold youth, and 3) can provide sight and sound separation and become certified to hold youth. Certification documents are provided to CJJP for all inspected facilities. The Iowa State Code and administrative rules provide licensure requirements for both secure and non-secure facilities for youth. Those same requirements prohibit 1) the placement of status and non-offender youth in secure juvenile facilities and 2) the placement of adult criminal offenders in secure juvenile facilities. Iowa's Department

of Inspections and Appeals (DIA), which is the licensing agent for the Department of Human Services, assist in assuring that facilities comply with the Iowa State Code and administrative rules. CJJP maintains regular correspondence with DIA.

3. Inspection of Facilities

The State Jail Inspector's Office certifies all state jails/lockups to hold youth. Authority to inspect these facilities is granted by Chapter 291-50.4 (356,356A) of the Administrative Code. As was mentioned previously, copies of the inspection report document utilized to certify facilities to hold youth are provided to CJJP.

The Department of Inspections and Appeals routinely inspects secure and non-secure juvenile facilities. The inspections involve a physical inspection of the facility, interviews with staff and children, review of facility records, etc. The Department of Inspections and Appeals provides information to the Department of Human Services which then licenses facilities. Inspections and Appeals routinely shares information with CJJP on facilities which could potentially be violating the mandates of the JJDP Act.

4. Data Collection and Verification

The State Jail Inspector's Office and CJJP collect data on all youth securely held in jails and lockups. Those data are maintained and analyzed by CJJP through a variety of software packages. Hard copy data are also maintained. Those data are collected on at least a quarterly basis.

During state fiscal year 1992 CJJP established a database containing information for all youth held in juvenile detention facilities. Data had historically been collected from the detention facilities to determine if holds were being done compliant with the mandates of the JJDP Act. Present data collection activities provide CJJP with name, age, committing offenses, legal status, disposition, etc. on all youth held in juvenile detention facilities. CJJP now routinely receives data from each of Iowa's eleven juvenile detention facilities, which is then loaded, sorted and analyzed utilizing a variety of software packages. Those data are received on a quarterly basis. CJJP receives similar types of data for youth held in the State Training School and in-patient holds at state mental health institutes. To ensure the validity of the data from one-third to 100% of each type of classified facility have an on-site inspection to review the data and inspect the physical facility on a yearly basis.

5. Barriers and Strategies

Iowa does not meet many barriers in its process to determine compliance with the JJDP Act. Iowa law either echoes or is more restrictive than the federal mandates. Most barriers that are encountered are from new staff that is not aware of the Iowa laws and federal mandates regarding the secure detention of juveniles. These issues typically come to the attention of the state compliance monitor through the intervention of veteran staff or the on-site visit of the compliance monitor. The first step that typically resolves the issue is to educate the non-complying individual of what state law and federal mandates require. Education is also provided to juvenile serving facilities and agencies through involvement and presentations to the Iowa Juvenile Detention Association, jailor's school at the Iowa Law Enforcement Academy, Iowa Juvenile Court Judges Association, Iowa County Attorney's Association and the Iowa Chiefs and Sheriffs Association.

Role of the Juvenile Justice Advisory Council - One of the primary functions of Iowa's JJAC in monitoring for the JJDP Act involves the grant committee. That committee reviews and approves applications for formula grant funding which are submitted utilizing a competitive RFP process. The JJAC also receives updates on the status of Iowa's monitoring visits and the compliance with the JJDP Act. Those updates include discussions on the compliance monitoring report, CJJP planning reports, legislative issues, training, etc.

4. PLAN FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONTACT (DMC) CORE REQUIREMENT

The below information serves as the DMC section of Iowa's application for federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act formula grant funding (JJDP Act). The format is largely similar to that submitted in the 2006 Three Year Plan and 2007 update. Information has been included immediately below regarding an updated DMC assessment performed in 2006.

A subgroup of the JJAC that assisted in the development of the DMC Section of the Iowa Plan is the Disproportionate Minority Contact Committee – **DMC Committee** (the DMC Committee is discussed in some detail later in this DMC plan).

Updated Assessment Study, Michael Leiber (Black Hawk, Johnson Linn, and Scott)

In August of 2006, Michael Leiber, Ph.D., released an assessment study examining the factors influencing decision-making in the juvenile courts in four Iowa counties (Black Hawk, Johnson, Linn, and Scott). The study documents include the full assessment, an executive summary, and an executive brief. Each of those documents is available at the listed web address (http://www.uiowa.edu/%7Enrcfcp/dmcr/news_and_report.shtml). The study involved case tracking on information available through Iowa's Justice Data Warehouse (JDW). JDW is discussed at some length later in this report. This recent assessment study was largely a replication of a study Leiber had completed approximately ten years earlier.

Leiber studied a sample of 4,400 delinquent court referrals. The study population included a random sample of white youth, with African American youth and judicial disposition cases over-sampled to increase their numbers in the study.

Major Finding

Leiber concluded that there were "race effects" operating in these four counties. These were most consistently found at juvenile court intake, with African American youth more likely to be referred for further court proceedings than similarly-situated white youth. Consequently, it appears that both offending characteristics and racial bias seem to be contributing to African American overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system. This conclusion is consistent with Leiber's 1993 findings.

Leiber and colleagues also found in this current study that females were less likely than males to be referred to court for formal proceedings in two jurisdictions.

Note: Staff in the counties studied shared concerns regarding the finding that minority youth were treated more harshly at the decision-making phase of intake. They questioned whether or not the study group, a sample of cases reaching the court decision-making phase of disposition, may have contributed to the finding. After performing a test on an additional sample of cases at the decision making phase of intake, Leiber's conclusion pertaining to African American overrepresentation was unchanged.

Assessment Study Limitations:

- The study was based on an un-weighted sample that involved over-sampling of African American youth and cases that reached judicial disposition. A majority of the cases processed in the juvenile court are not African American and most cases do not reach judicial disposition. The sample of African Americans was chosen to allow for greater numbers for the purpose of comparisons to whites and the back-end cases were chosen to provide analysis on cases at a number of the court's major decision making phases.
- JDW, the state-wide system from which the study data were taken, focuses on capturing information regarding the juvenile justice system's legal decision-making process. The system contains only limited information regarding family and school status information. This is a major weakness, as other studies have identified family and school factors as variables that influence detention decision-making.

- JDW is a statewide system that is the product of data input at the local level. There are inconsistencies regarding data entry in certain jurisdictions for certain decision points. Data entry for the decision phase of juvenile probation was being reported inconsistently in some of the jurisdictions during some of the years of the existing study. Similarly, the JDW includes a screen that provides basic information regarding whether or not youth are being placed in juvenile detention facilities. A variety of research has demonstrated that minority youth are often overrepresented in juvenile detention compared to their representation in the general population. Unfortunately, Leiber's research found that local jurisdictions are not routinely completing the detention placement screen in the JDW, further limiting the data available in the research.

Assessment Study Recommendations

Leiber made five recommendations (listed below). The Leiber study has influenced the efforts of the, the DMC Committee, and the YRDTF. ***Leiber's recommendations are reflected in the activities taking place in the 2008 DMC reduction plan later in this section.***

Recommendation 1: Increase Structured Decision-Making at Intake

Recommendation 2: Continue to Require Decision-Makers to Participate in Race and Gender Cultural Sensitivity Training

Recommendation 3: Conduct Additional Research on DMC

Recommendation 4: Improve Upon Iowa's Justice Data Warehouse (JDW) System for Case Management and DMC

Recommendation 5: Expand Crime Prevention Programs

Additional Assessment (Detention) Research, Michael Leiber (Black Hawk)

In November 2007 Michael Leiber released a detailed study regarding race and juvenile detention in Black Hawk County. The initiative for the study came from the Court itself due to concerns about the number of detained youth, particularly minorities. A detailed inquiry into the use of detention, the types of detention used, for what and whom, had not been previously conducted. Data were manually collected from case files in Black Hawk County covering referrals to juvenile court and the North Iowa Detention facility from 2003 through 2004. Aggregate information was also used that represented the number of detention referrals for the years 1990 through 2004. Specific information on the detailed history of DMC in Iowa, Black Hawk County, sampling, tables, and findings

can be found in the full technical report: *Race and Detention Decision-making and the Impact on Juvenile Court Outcomes in Black Hawk County, Iowa* and in an executive summary (both by Leiber, Fox, and Lacks, 2007). Each of those documents is available at the listed web address (http://www.uiowa.edu/%7Enrcfcp/dmcr/news_and_report.shtml).

The sample included 449 randomly-selected juvenile court referrals plus 478 nonrandom youth who were held in detention. African-American youth were over-sampled to increase their numbers in the study and to assess any racial aspects of decision-making across the juvenile justice system. The total weighted sample is 927.

Limitations

The study focused only on juvenile justice decision-making in Black Hawk County. There is a need to replicate the study in other jurisdictions since detention decision-making may vary by locality. For example, in Black Hawk County, it was discovered that youth who received an informal adjustment at intake were rarely detained for probation violations. It is unknown to what extent this occurrence may be found in other juvenile courts in Iowa and elsewhere across the nation.

Major Findings

- Over time (1990 through 2004), the data revealed that the primary reasons for detention admissions of whites were court violations, followed by property crimes and person offenses. For African Americans, it was court violations, crimes against persons, and property offenses. While drug

admissions represented a small percentage of total admissions, the largest racial gap was for drug offenses for African Americans.

- African American youth were subjected to more multiple court violation detentions than were white youth. This relationship was reversed when the detention was a 48-hour hold, where whites were more likely to receive multiple 48-hour hold detentions than were African Americans.
- Legal variables (e.g., offense seriousness) and extralegal factors (e.g., age, coming from a single parent household) most often had the strongest effects on detention decision-making and decision-making in general.
- Race, individually and in combination with other variables (e.g., gender), was found to have an impact on detention and system decision-making even after considering differences in crime severity, prior record, etc. For example:
 - Being African American substantially increased the likelihood of detention relative to similar whites.
 - Being detained increased the chances of moving further into the system and, because being African American increased the odds of being detained, black youth as a group were more likely to receive a more severe outcome at intake than were whites.
 - Even after controlling for offending characteristics, African Americans were found to be less likely than similar whites to participate in diversion.
 - Race effects were also discovered at petition, adjudication, and judicial disposition. Sometimes, the effects resulted in more severe or more lenient outcomes.
 - With the exception of decision-making at intake, race was not found to operate through detention to produce a negative cumulative impact. That is, being detained did not contribute to minority overrepresentation throughout the proceedings. This finding, however, does not diminish the impact of race on intake decision-making or the apparent impact of race at every stage examined.
- In short, both offending characteristics and racial bias appear to be contributing factors to African American overrepresentation in secure detention and in the juvenile justice system in Black Hawk County.
- Leiber and colleagues also found that being female was influential at intake and petition and worked in combination with race to influence adjudication and judicial disposition decision-making. These findings are consistent with previous research (*An Examination of the Factors that Influence Juvenile Justice Decision-making In The Jurisdictions of Black Hawk, Johnson, Linn and Scott, Iowa: An Assessment Study*, by Leiber, Johnson, and Fox, 2006).

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Reform Detention Admissions of All Types

Recommendation 2: Increase Structured Decision-making at Intake

Recommendation 3: Continue to Require Decision-Makers to Participate in Race and Gender Cultural Sensitivity Training

Recommendation 4: Conduct Additional Research on DMC

Recommendation 5: Expand Crime Prevention Programs

Additional Assessment (Detention) Research, William Feyerherm (Black Hawk, Scott, and Woodbury)

In November of 2007 William Feyerherm, Ph.D., released a study related race and the use of detention in Black Hawk, Scott, and Woodbury Counties. This analysis was requested by officials in the Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning to assess several characteristics of the detention decision making process. Specifically, interest was in examining consistency in the use of decision making criteria, whether those criteria are used in a fashion consistent with policy expectations, whether the application of criteria is reasonably consistent across multiple judicial districts within the State, and whether there is indication that non-legal factors (particularly race or ethnicity) enter into the decision to hold juveniles in secure detention,.

Information was collected by Juvenile Court Officers on cases that had the potential to enter detention. Two data entry forms developed by CJJP staff were used: a "Pilot Juvenile Detention Screening Instrument" with standard detention intake information (delinquent history, current charges, basic

demographic information ,etc), and a second instrument, 'Additional Study Information.' The second of these was designed to elicit the supervising officer's assessment of such factors as whether the youth exhibited aggressive behavior, suicidal indications, or indications of alcohol or substance impairment, and if the youth was alleged to have committed a probation violation. Data collection and data entry steps were conducted either by court officials or CJJP staff.

Blackhawk County and Woodbury County each contributed 347 cases, with Scott County accounting for 209 cases. This resulted in a total of 903 independent cases

Conclusions

- The detention decision in Iowa involves two very dissimilar situations:
 - Detention decisions for youth who are not accused of probation violations, but are charged with offenses sufficient to consider detention
 - Detention decisions for youth currently under probation supervision, whether or not an allegation of probation violation is accompanied by new offense allegations. For such youth, the likelihood of initial detention is very nearly 100%. For these youth, the 24-hour hearing is a point of control, with roughly 1/3 leaving detention at this point.
- For the first group of youth, variables related to their current offense, their delinquency history, and their current behavior appear to be individually related to the likelihood of detention. Multivariate analyses confirm the importance of those areas and lead to the conclusion that the decision making processes are generally consistent across jurisdictions and are strongly correlated with relevant and appropriate variables.
- For the second group of youth, the critical variables appear to be those that are related very directly to the behavior while on supervision, specifically failure to appear, runaway, school or community issues, as well as degree of parental control. On a multivariate level, the outcomes of the 24 hour hearing do not exhibit predictability or consistency across jurisdictions based on the set of information collected in this study.

Recommendations


- As a result of the variability identified in conclusions above, the information within counties may not be comparable across counties. From the vantage point of being able to compare patterns and move toward a consistent application of state juvenile justice policies, a more consistent and universally utilized information system would greatly facilitate this type of system management analysis, and could lead to additional opportunities for collective policy setting and consistency in practices.
- Related to Disproportionate Minority Contact, the State should examine the set of processes that places a youth under probation custody and that lead to an allegation of probation violation. In the current set of information, African-American youth comprise 23% of the group with offense allegations only, 35% of the group that has both new offense and probation violation allegations, and 39% of the group that has only probation violation allegations.

Additional Assessment, CJJP

CJJP has performed a variety of assessment/analyses in its staff work for the JJAC, the State DMC Committee, and the Governor's YRDTF. A variety of these key data are provided below. Much of the data were taken from a juvenile detention facility data base maintained by CJJP. The data base contains information on all holds for youth in Iowa's 11 juvenile detention facilities. Information is provided, as well, from the U.S. census and the Justice Data Warehouse.

Juvenile Population

Given Iowa's fairly small minority population, CJJP had a desire to briefly review population trends. The below illustration reflects accordingly.




Juvenile Population Analysis/Observations:

- Data reflect fairly stable, if declining overall youth population trends.
- The number of minority youth has increased slightly in recent years, while the number of Caucasian youth has decreased.

Juvenile Arrest Rate

CJJP examined juvenile arrest rates. It should be noted that the most recently completed Uniform Crime Report covers 2005.



Juvenile Arrest Rate Analysis/Observations:

- Iowa arrest rate peaked in 1996 and was at a 12 year low in 2001.
- The arrest rate has held steady from 2002 thru 2005.

Increase in the Number of Juvenile Detention Beds

Analysis by CJJP reflects a dramatic increase in the number of detention beds available in Iowa since 1993.

Detention Beds Available in the State of Iowa														
	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
North Iowa	15	15	15	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
Dubuque County	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	6
Central Iowa	--	10	10	10	15	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Woodbury County	16	16	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
Northwest Iowa	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
Southwest Iowa	10	10	10	10	11	11	11	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Polk County	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	33	33	33	33	33
Broadlawns	--	--	--	14	14	14	14	14	21	--	--	--	--	--
Linn County	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	21	35	35	35	35	35	35
Scott County	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	6	16	16	16
South Iowa - Chariton	15	15	15	15	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21
South Iowa - Montrose	15	15	15	15	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21
Totals Detention Beds:	126	136	140	170	188	193	193	217	238	230	226	236	236	242
Percent Change:	--	7.9%	2.9%	21.4%	10.6%	2.7%	0.0%	12.4%	9.7%	-3.4%	-1.7%	4.4%	0.0%	2.5%
Number Change from 1993 to 2006:	116 Beds													
Percent Change from 1993 to 2006:	92.1%													

Detention Bed Availability Analysis/Observations:

- Every detention facility increased the number of beds available during the report years (the exception is the Broadlawns facility with was only open from 1996 to 2001).
- The total number of juvenile detention beds grew from 126 (1993) to 242 (2006), which represents a 92.1% increase in the number of beds.

Increases in Juvenile Detention Facility Holds

CJJP examined the number and percentages of youth held in juvenile detention facilities during the report years.

Juvenile Detention Holds

1993				2006			
	Number	Percentage	Average Length of Stay		Number	Percentage	Average Length of Stay
Caucasian	1,829	66.5%	9.5 days	Caucasian	3,232	63.1%	12.0 days
African American	654	23.8%	11.7 days	African American	1,314	25.7%	11.5 days
Hispanic	151	5.5%	11.5 days	Hispanic	412	8.0%	14.4 days
Native American	80	2.9%	15.4 days	Native American	103	2.0%	15.7 days
Asian	29	1.1%	16.7 days	Asian	56	1.1%	10.1 days
Other/Unknown	6	0.2%	3.3 days	Other/Unknown	3	0.1%	7.3 days

Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning


Increase in Holds Analysis/Observations:

- The number of youth held in detention increased from 2,749 during the report years to 5,120.
- The percentage of minority youth held in detention increased slightly during the report years from 33.5% (1993) to 36.9% (2006).

Juvenile Detention Holds by Level of Offense

Because of the dramatic increase in the number of state juvenile detention beds and juvenile detention holds, CJJP examined the level of offense for which youth were held.

Number of Detention Holds



Source: Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning


Level of Offense Analysis/Observations:

- The number of youth held in juvenile detention facilities for felony level offenses increased slightly (7%) during the report years from 1,541 (1993) to 1,650 (2006).
- The number of youth held in juvenile detention facilities for misdemeanor level offenses increased dramatically (187%) during the report years from 1,208 (1993) to 3,470 (2006).

Juvenile Detention Holds for Probation Violators

CJJP also examined the number of youth held in juvenile detention as probation violators. The information in the figure compares the percentage of juvenile detention holds for new offenders to those for youth that have violated the conditions of their probation.

Percentage of Secure Juvenile Detention Holds by Hold Type (Minority Youth)



Other includes: Run from Placement, Loss of Placement, Failure to Appear, Other and Unknown.

Probation Holds Analysis/Observations:


- Juvenile detention holds for probation violators ranged from a low of 35% (1998) to a high of 47% (2005).
- The percentage of juvenile detention holds for probation violators exceeds holds for new offenders during the majority of the report years.
- There was a significant reduction in the percentage of “other” holds between 2003 and 2005 (from 25% to 18%). CJJP attributes a significant portion of that reduction to better reporting and monitoring of local detention facilities.

Allegation Comparison – Referrals to Juvenile Court


CJJP maintains data regarding juvenile court decision making in its Justice Data Warehouse (JDW). JDW is explained in some level of detail in the next section “Updated DMC Identification Spreadsheets” of this report. Given the increases in detention as reflected in the previous figures, CJJP sought to determine the types of offenses for which youth were being referred to juvenile court. The data in the figure is a count of the allegations referred to juvenile court. The data in the figure compares the types of allegations for which minority and Caucasian youth are referred to juvenile court.

Comparison of Allegations By Race

2003 Vs. 2007 Allegations - Caucasian



2003 Vs. 2007 Allegations - Minority



Note: Includes felonies and misdemeanors only.

Allegation Comparison Analysis/Observations:

- The number of allegations for which Caucasian youth were referred to juvenile court decreased in all categories during the report years. The most significant reductions were in property and public order offenses.
- The number of allegation for which minority youth were referred to juvenile court increased in all categories except other during the report years. The most significant increases were in property and public order offenses.

A. Updated DMC Identification Spreadsheets

Matrices - The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP Act) requires states to submit matrices with their annual JJDP Act formula grant application. The statewide matrices are available by clicking on the highlighted years within the following parentheses (2008, 2007, 2006, and 2005 matrices). Information regarding local matrices is available later in this report. The matrices examine major court decision points and compare "relative rates" for minority youth based on comparison with incidence for White youth through calculation of a relative rate index (**RRI**), which is discussed below.

Matrices information has also been updated on OJJDP's web-based matrices system, and it available for review through that system. The attachments submitted with this application are from the matrices template utilized at the state level for the preparation of this application. That template was provided by OJJDP officials in prior years.

Relative Rate Index - The matrix uses RRI to compare processing rates of minority youth to white youth. The formula and an example from which the relative rate index was obtained are presented below:

Rate of Occurrence (Afr. Amer. Youth)	divided	Rate of Occurrence (White Youth)	Relative Rate
371.97/1000 referrals	by	67.49/1000 arrest =	Index
	divided by		5.51 RRI

In the example above, a relative rate index of 5.51 is obtained for arrests of African American youth. The data were taken from the referrals for African American youth reflected in the 2008 state level matrix (the state level matrix is included as an attachment). The RRI from the statewide data reflects that for each white referral to juvenile court services there are 5.51 referrals of African American youth. The juvenile court referral rate for African Americans youth is considerably higher than that of white youth.

Individual Pages of the Matrices – The following pages are included in a single matrix (see below).

- **Date Entry Page** - The first page in each of the matrices at the end of this section provides data (annualized data counts) for some of the major juvenile court decision making phases as well as data for some secure settings (juvenile detention & boys state training school), census data, and arrest data from the Iowa Uniform Crime Reports.
- **Race Specific Pages** - Additional pages of the matrix calculate the RRI by race/ethnicity (one page for each race/ethnicity White, African American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Native American, Other/Mixed).
- **All Minority Population Page** - Another page of the matrix calculates the relative rate index for a combined population of “all minority” youth.
- **Summary Page** - A summary page lists RRI’s for all the different races at all of the different decision points.
- **Population Based Rates** - The final matrix page shows the cumulative effect of multiple decisions as the population based relative rate index.

Different Rates at Different Stages – The matrices calculate rates per thousand at some of the initial decision making stages (“arrest” and “referral to juvenile court”) because the numbers are sufficiently large at those points in the process. Rates per 100 are calculated for some of the deeper end system processing points such as “finding of delinquency” because relatively few youth advance to those points in the system.

Statistical Significance - The matrices also include a column related to statistical significance of the RRI - “YES” in the column indicates that the difference in rates between the groups is large enough to be statistically significant (at the .05 level); “NO” indicates that there is no statistical significance between the groups. Due to the problem of small numbers, there are cases where a “NO” may appear in the significance column simply because the number of minority youth is insufficient to calculate statistical significance. Analysis performed in the matrices later in this plan generally address those data elements found to be of statistical significance.

Identification Tool - It should be noted that OJJDP officials view the matrix as an identification tool. It identifies differential processing rates. **It does not explain the reasons for differential rates (e.g. differential offending versus system bias).** It is a tool that the JJAC, the DMC Committee, and the Governor’s YRDTF utilize to help identify potential areas of focus for DMC related efforts.

Iowa’s Completion of the Matrices - Provided below is a brief discussion related to information Iowa utilized to complete its matrices, as well as potential issues related to the use of that information.

Justice Data Warehouse - Information to complete the matrices was taken, in large part, from Iowa’s Justice Data Warehouse (**JDW**). JDW is a central repository of key criminal and juvenile justice information. Information for the warehouse is taken from the Iowa Court Information System (ICIS). ICIS is operated on 26 local data bases and is comprised of subsystems: juvenile court services, consolidated case processing, financial reporting, jury selection, appellate records management, scheduling, tickler system administration, etc. The overall mission of the JDW is to provide the judicial, legislative and executive branches of state government and other entities with improved statistical and decision support information pertaining to justice system activities.

Expanded ICIS Data - In the past two years the ICIS system was updated to include a variety of new and expanded information. CJJP has had initial discussions with the Chiefs regarding

potential reports to generate from the new information. CJJP has secured funding and is in the process of arranging for the transfer of the new ICIS data into JDW. It is anticipated the transfer of information to JDW will take place during the first half of 2008.

New ICIS Based Assessment Tool - Also, in the fall of 2006 Iowa Chief Juvenile Court officers began training on an assessment tool that is being maintained on the ICIS system. The tool is being used to assess youth needs at the decision point of "intake" in the juvenile court referral process. A similar, more comprehensive, tool is also being utilized for youth at more advanced stage in the decision making process. CJJP has held initial discussions with the Chiefs regarding potential reports to generate for the new information. CJJP will also be involved in the validation process for the new assessment tools. CJJP has secured funding and is in the process of arranging for the transfer of the new ICIS data into the JDW. It is anticipated the transfer of information to JDW will take place during the first half of 2008.

For purposes of administration relating to Iowa's court system, Iowa's 99 counties are organized into eight judicial districts. Presently all eight judicial districts are entering and utilizing information from ICIS. Information from each of these districts is available for analysis from the JDW.

*Labeling of Matrices – This plan is Iowa 2008 formula grant update. The most recently updated matrices are referred to the "2008" matrices. **The time period reflected in the 2008 matrices is for the most recent full calendar year available, 1/1/07 through 12/31/07; the 2007 matrices are for the calendar year of 1/1/06 through 12/31/06, etc.** The statewide matrices are available by clicking on the highlighted years within the following parentheses (2008, 2007, 2006, and 2005 matrices). Information regarding local matrices is available later in this report.*

Other Data Source in Matrices - State training school holds exclude those youth sent for 30 day evaluations – only boys state training school holds were included. Data for the decision points of "arrest" and "juvenile detention" were not taken from JDW - further discussion of the data from those decision points is included below.

Over the past six years CJJP has worked with a juvenile court services committee (ICIS User Group) and Iowa's Chief Juvenile Court Officers to create agreed upon procedures for data entry and analysis. Juvenile court officials have also provided feedback on design for a variety of standardized reports. Those reports have enhanced Iowa's ability to provide juvenile court processing and monitoring information that is being used for completion of OJJDP's DMC Matrices.

Data Reconciliation - Each month CJJP works with ICIS User Group staff to validate JDW data against county reports. The data used to complete the matrices have been through that validation process.

Despite the validation efforts there are still data entry inconsistencies in certain jurisdictions for certain decision points. Training efforts have continued to improve the quality of the data and have targeted that specific issue. CJJP will continue discussions with local officials to determine if any additional training or technical assistance is needed.

*Adult Court Waiver – The adult court waiver data reflected on the DMC matrices includes those incidents where the juvenile court has waived youth from the juvenile court to the jurisdiction of the adult criminal court. **The adult court waiver data in the matrices do not include information on those 16- and 17-year-old youth who end up under adult court jurisdiction due to statutory exclusion from juvenile court jurisdiction for the commission of certain serious offenses** (forcible felony offenses; certain drug, weapon or gang related offenses) – such statutory exclusion is detailed in Iowa Code Section 232.8(3).*

Arrest Data - Data for completion of this decision point in the matrices were taken from the Iowa Uniform Crime Report (UCR). The UCR is generated by the Department of Public Safety (DPS) from law enforcement agencies throughout Iowa that supply information to DPS regarding the numbers and types of arrests that they make every year.

DPS officials note that not all Iowa law enforcement agencies report arrest information and that some reporting agencies under-report juvenile arrest statistics. It is important to note that the arrest rates reported by DPS are adjusted rates and are based on age-specific populations in those law enforcement jurisdictions reporting data to DPS. If a law enforcement agency underreported data, but reported at least some data, both the arrest and population numbers from that jurisdiction were included in the calculation of the statewide rates reported by DPS. Assuming that the population numbers for given jurisdictions are accurate, and the number of arrests are less than what actually occurred, the actual statewide arrest rate would be greater than that reported below. Given current and past underreporting of juvenile arrests by some jurisdictions, CJJP believes that the arrest rates discussed below are lower than would be seen if all juvenile arrests were reported. The reader is strongly urged to refer to DPS's "2006 Iowa Uniform Crime Report" for more information on this topic.

Other Data Sources – As was mentioned briefly above, additional information for completion of the matrices was taken from a juvenile detention facility database that is maintained by CJJP for compliance monitoring for the JJDP Act. Additional information was provided from census sources maintained by OJJDP and its contractors. The data sources are noted at the bottom first page of each matrix.

Incident Based data – In large part the data reflected in the report are “incident-based,” not “youth-based.” For example, the statewide matrices reflect 27,102 “incidents” of referral during the report period. That does not reflect that there were 27,102 youth referred; it means there were that many referral incidents to Juvenile Court Services. It is possible that an individual youth could have experienced multiple referral incidents during a report year. Therefore, the number of youth who have been referred is lower than the number of referral incidents – the data in the matrices reflect the number of incidents. Similarly, a single referral incident for a given youth could include multiple offenses. The matrices reflect the number of referral incidents, not the number of offenses.

Population Reflected on Matrix – Report Period - The population group represented in the matrices is youth ages 10-17 (except for STS – only youth from 12-17 are admitted to that institution). The time period reflected for most of the decision points is calendar 2007 (1/1/07 thru 12/31/07). *As noted previously, the information for the period of 1/1/07 through 12/31/07 is reflected as the 2008 matrix as it is the most recent matrix available to be submitted with this 2008 plan update. Arrest data are from the Iowa 2006 Uniform Crime Reports.* Explanations at the bottom of the individual data entry sheets reflect the data source.

Geographic Area Targeted with the Matrices - Much of Iowa's DMC effort focuses on providing technical assistance to three sites with high minority populations. The technical assistance sites (TA sites) include Black Hawk, Polk, and Woodbury counties. The technical assistance is provided by the University of Iowa School of Social Work, National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice; the University serves as the state's DMC Resource Center (Resource Center). The Resource Center's efforts are discussed later in this plan. DMC Matrices have been completed for each of Resource Center's TA sites.

B. Organization of Iowa's Approach – State and Local

Iowa's DMC Approach is focused at both the state and local level. This DMC report is organized accordingly. The following state and local sections include information regarding (1) DMC Data Discussions, (2) Progress Made in FY 2007, and (3) DMC-reduction Plan for FY 2008-2010.

C. State Level DMC Plan

1. State DMC Data Discussions

Quantifiable Documentation

Sufficient documentation exists for the development/maintenance of the state DMC plan.

Discussion of State Relative Rate Indexes

Provided below is discussion of Iowa's statewide matrices. The matrices can be accessed by clicking on the highlighted years within the following parentheses ([2008](#), [2007](#), [2006](#), and [2005](#) matrices).


Information regarding local matrices is available later in this report. *Later in this plan, information is provided regarding Governor Culver's Youth Race and Detention Task Force (YRDTF). In its August 1, 2007 meeting the YRDTF voted to focus its efforts at the decision making phases of referral, diversion, and detention.* That decision was based on the following observations by the YRDTF:

- The highest relative rates are at the front of system processing (arrest, referral, and detention). That finding is consistent at both the state and local levels. That finding reflects that minority youth are arrested, referred and detained at rates higher than Caucasian youth.
- Consistent at both the state and local levels, the lowest relative rates are for the decision point of diversion. That finding reflects that minority youth are diverted at rates lower than Caucasian youth.
- The highest relative rates at state and local levels are generally for African American youth.

The below tables were created to reflect Iowa's focus on referral, diversion, and detention.

State Level Matrix Data - Referral

Below is a table that details the rate per thousand of delinquency referrals to the juvenile court. Data for the referrals is taken from the 2005 through 2008 DMC Matrices, which are included as an attachment to this application.




State Level Matrix Data - Referral Analysis/Observations

- Referral rates for African American (average 331.98), Native American (average 187.39), and Hispanic (average 104.93) youth are higher than Caucasian (71.96) youth for the 2005 – 2008 period.
 - The average rate of referral for African American youth is 4.6 times higher than that of Caucasian youth during the report years.
 - The average rate of referral for Native American youth is 2.6 times higher than that of Caucasian youth.
- The rate of referral for Asian youth (average 46.28) is lower than that of Caucasian youth for all of the report years.
 - The average rate of referral for Asian youth is approximately two thirds lower than that of Caucasian youth for the report years.
- Referral rates for African American (from 283.40 – 2005, to 371.97 2008) and Native American (from 170.60 – 2005 to 214.64) youth increased during the report years.
- Referral rates for Hispanic (slight decrease for Hispanic youth), Caucasian and Asian youth remained fairly level for the report years.

State Level Matrix Data - Diversion

Below is a table that details the rate per thousand of juvenile court delinquency diversions. In Iowa such diversions are called informal adjustment agreements. Data for the diversion is taken from the 2005 through 2008 DMC Matrices which are included as an attachment to this application.




State Level Matrix Data - Diversion Analysis/Observations

- Overall rates for diversion (average - all races 30.21) are considerably lower than referral rates (average - all races 148.51).
- The average diversion rates for the racial/ethnic groups are as listed for the 2005 - 2008 period:
 - Asian 40.87, Caucasian 37.06, Hispanic 30.41, African American 23.61, and Native American 19.12.
 - The average diversion rates for Native American and African American are approximately half the average rates for Asian and Caucasian youth.
- Diversion rates for African American youth decreased slightly during the report years.
- Diversion rates for Hispanic, Asian, and Caucasian youth increased slightly or remained level during the report years.

State Level Matrix Data – Juvenile Detention

Below is a table that details the rate per thousand of detention facility holds. Data for detention facility holds are taken from the 2005 through 2008 DMC Matrices, which are included as an attachment to this application.



State Level Matrix Data – Juvenile Detention Analysis/Observations

- Overall rates for holds in juvenile detention (average - all races 26.33) are considerably lower than referral rates (average - all races 148.51).
- The average detention rates for the racial/ethnic groups are as listed for the 2005 - 2008 period:
 - Native American 38.21, African American 29, Hispanic 25.30, Asian 23.97, and Caucasian 15.19.
 - The average rate of detention for Native American youth is approximately 2.5 times higher than that of Caucasian youth.
 - The average rate of detention for African American youth is approximately 2 times higher than that of Caucasian youth during the report years.
- The detention rate for all racial/ethnic groups declined or remained level during the report years.
 - Detention rates for Native American youth (from 44 – 2005, to 31.46 - 2008) had the largest decrease during the report years.

2. Progress Made at the State Level in 2007

Listed below is an overview of Iowa’s existing efforts to influence DMC. The activities outlined below have been approved by the DMC Committee, the YRDTF and the JJAC.

DMC Committee - Iowa continues to maintain an active DMC Committee. The group has met approximately every other month for the past 8 years. The group includes members of the minority community, a broad base of juvenile justice system related staff, local planners, researchers, community activists, etc. The DMC Committee is a subgroup of the JJAC, but many of its members are not on the JJAC. CJJP provides the staff support for Iowa’s DMC Committee.

DMC Committee Activities Implemented

- Provide oversight for all the DMC related activities of the JJAC.
- Assist in the planning and implementation of the DMC Resource Center
- Assist in the planning of Iowa’s DMC Conferences in 2002 through 2007.
- Participated in a visit by the Annie E. Casey Foundation in August 2007 related to Iowa’s potential to become a Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative site.
- Reviewed and were involved in the release and planning related to Iowa’s updated assessment study and detention study.
- Involved in providing a variety of information to local media.
- Involved in feedback and review of DMC Matrices.

- Involved in meetings with local Decats regarding the use of formula grant and furthering local Decat planning related to DMC.

DMC Committee Activities Not Implemented

- Planned activities were implemented – committee continues to identify ways to expand the use of information to broader audiences.

Governor's Youth Race and Detention Task Force – In May 2007 the first meeting of the Governor's Youth Race and Detention Task Force (YRDTF) took place. Governor Culver is utilizing the group to reduce the overrepresentation of minority youth in juvenile detention. Membership of that group includes state department heads from Public Safety, Human Rights, and Education; a liaison from the Governor's office; staff representatives from Iowa's federal senatorial delegation, the state Attorney General's Office, Department of Human Services; state law enforcement, prosecutorial, and county associations; the State Public Defender, the Executive Director of the state ACLU; key community members; etc. Governor Culver issued Executive Order 5 October 30, 2007, which outlines the overall activities of the YRDTF. The establishment of the YRDTF was considered a major factor in the naming of Iowa by the Annie E. Casey Foundation as one of its Juvenile Detention Alternatives site at the state DMC Conference in November 2007. The YRDTF is staffed by CJJP.

YRDTF Activities Implemented

- Provided oversight regarding Governor Culver's effort to reduce minority overrepresentation in juvenile detention.
- Reviewed various research information including: the Casey Foundation, the Leiber studies, a study by William Feyerherm, Ph.D., and data from CJJP's detention data base, JDW, etc.
- Sent key staff to the Casey Foundation November 2007 Conference and also to Iowa's 2007 state DMC Conference.
- Assisted in Iowa's becoming a site for the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative. JDAI has been one of a small number of initiatives that have been able to influence DMC in a number of sites across the country.

YRDTF Activities Not Implemented

All anticipated activities were implemented.

DMC Resource Center - In January of 2002 Iowa initiated its DMC Resource Center effort with the University of Iowa, School of Social Work, National Resource Center for Family Centered Practice. The University has established a DMC Resource Center (Resource Center). The Resource Center concept was developed with consultation from OJJDP staff (Heidi Hsia) and a technical assistance consultant (Randy Thomas). **The JJAC has approved \$100,000 to continue its DMC Resource Center effort.**

DMC Resource Center Activities Implemented

- Provided support for the annual DMC Conference. In excess of 340 persons attended the late fall conference, which was held November 29 & 30, 2007. The conference attracted attendees from multiple states, including Midwest DMC Coordinators from surrounding states.
- Initiated interviews with decision makers in Black Hawk, Polk, and Woodbury Counties regarding local detention practices, DMC, use of alternatives, etc. A report will be issued in 2008.
- Provided technical assistance to three local Iowa Sites – planning assistance, data analysis, training, local event facilitation, etc. (see detailed information regarding efforts in sites later in this report).
- Participated in a visit by the Annie E. Casey Foundation in August 2007 related to Iowa's potential to become a Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative site.
- Reviewed and was involved in the release and planning related to Leiber and Feyerherm studies.

- Received feedback from local DMC sites, DMC Committee and CJJP to monitor the effectiveness of their efforts.
- Maintained the State DMC Website - website contains information relevant to DMC (http://www.uiowa.edu/~nrcfcp/index_dmcrc.htm).
- Worked with state DMC Committee and YRDTF on various DMC-related activities.

DMC Resource Center Activities Not Implemented

- All planned activities were implemented.

Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative – In November 2007 Bart Lubow from the Annie E. Casey Foundation named Iowa as a new Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative Site (JDAI). JDAI is a detention reform initiative that requires sites to study detention policies, prioritize those youth they seek to detain, and utilize alternatives for those youth who can best be served in alternatives. JDAI has been one of a small number of initiatives that have been able to influence DMC in a number of sites across the country. As Iowa moves into implementation as a JDAI site, it is anticipated that representatives from the Casey foundation will be making regular visits related to training and technical assistance.

JDAI Activities Implemented

- Casey representative presented at YRDTF meeting in August 2007.
- Casey names Iowa as a site in November 2007.
- CJJP released RFA for potential local Casey sites – unspent JJDP Act related funds included in RFA.
- In response to RFA, JJAC names Black Hawk, Polk, and Woodbury Counties conditional sites (pending receipt of requested information) for funding and technical assistance.
- Casey began scheduling technical assistance for 2008.

JDAI Activities Not Implemented

All anticipated activities were implemented.

Other State Level Efforts Implemented Related to DMC – Listed below are a variety of other state activities with direct relevance to DMC.

- *Justice Data Warehouse* – An extensive discussion of the justice data warehouse (JDW) is provided at the beginning of the DMC plan. New activities regarding the expansion of ICIS data and assessment tools being utilized by the Chiefs are discussed there as well. *Given the expanded information available, JDW will continue to be a critical tool as Iowa moves forward with implementation of its DMC efforts.* It is a tool that will be accessed as Iowa updates its assessment process in select counties and works to develop a state detention risk assessment tool.
- *Updated Assessment Activities* – The updated assessment study released by Dr. Leiber in August 2006 is discussed at some length in the beginning of this section. Leiber is expanding his recent study to include site specific information for Polk and Woodbury Counties. Both of those were sites in his 1993 study, but not in the assessment in August 2006. Data from JDW were shared with him in 2007. As a part of the research he will be gathering information from a number of local sites in Virginia for comparative purposes. He will be researching and writing the study contingent upon a grant from the National Institute of Justice.
- *Committee to Dialogue With Decats* – In March 2007 the JJAC formed a Committee to Dialogue With Decats (CDWD). The JJAC utilized CDWD to learn from and share information with local Decats. Decats have been the major recipient of JJDP Act related

funding in Iowa. The CDWD provided two trainings during 2007. As part of those trainings the CDWD provided specific information to further Decat knowledge and activity regarding gender and DMC.

- *Community Allocation Process* - As described in previously submitted plans, the JJAC and CJJP are now in the eighth year of a process that utilizes a significant portion of JJDP Act Title II, Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws funds, and JAIBG funds through a community allocation process. The funds are allocated to local Decat Governance boards. Through the Decat process communities are allowed to prioritize funding to locally address the child welfare/juvenile justice issues of greatest importance. Some of the types of programming funded through the local allocation process with the potential to influence DMC include local conferences, substance abuse prevention activities, after school or summer school programs, specialized curricula, tracking and monitoring, school based liaisons, day treatment, aftercare, etc. The allocation process has helped move decision making to the local level where it is believed that there is ultimately the greatest potential for reducing DMC. A vital role for CJJP staff and the DMC Resource Center will be to serve as a resource to assist local planning entities with information, training, local planning tools, programmatic information etc. *As a result of training provided through the CDWD, CJJP has increased local knowledge regarding DMC, making the Decats better equipped to plan for DMC; over the past year the plans have improved and reflect accordingly. It should be noted, however, that the substantial reduction in JJDP Act related funding, and the dramatic increase in federal performance requirements, have made continuation of the community allocation impractical. **The JJAC voted in February 2008 to discontinue the community allocation process and to move to an allocation by Judicial District, as described immediately below.***
- *Allocation of JJDP Act Related funds by Judicial District* - Beginning October, 2008, the majority of the federal 2008 formula grant award will be combined with other JJDP Act related funds and will be allocated to the juvenile court services offices in each of the State's eight judicial districts. The chief juvenile court officer for each judicial district shall submit plans to CJJP for approval and for authorization of allocations. The allocations will be based on the percentage of child population ages 5-17 in each judicial district. The funds must be expended in one or more of the appropriate formula grant program areas. This approach will allow for regional planning, by judicial district, to prioritize the juvenile justice issues and develop strategies to address local needs. This new approach will require the districts to develop their own priorities and develop strategic plans to address the issues. CJJP will continue to provide resources (e.g. county level data and technical assistance) to assist in the development of the plans.
- *JJDP Act Secure Facility Compliance Monitoring* - A significant part of Iowa's compliance monitoring for the JJDP Act DMC requirement relates to its monitoring of jails and detention facilities to ensure jail removal, sight and sound separation, and deinstitutionalization of status offenders. As was described earlier in this report, CJJP maintains an extensive compliance monitoring system. Virtually all of the state's compliance monitoring information is collected by race. *Iowa will continue to maintain that system.*
- *Information Effort with the Iowa Department of Human Services* – In the spring and summer of 2004 through 2007 the DMC Committee and the Gender Specific Services Task Force released reports that provided county level state service and decision making information. It is expected that another year's data will be released within the next few weeks. Data from those reports are available on the website (http://www.state.ia.us/dhr/cjpp/juve_delinq_data/juve_dhs.html). Extensive court processing/service information is provided by race and gender. The effort provides information regarding a variety of state DHS services (i.e. group care, family foster care, family centered services, shelter care, detention, state training school admissions, etc.),

and court decision making phases (referral, diversion, petition, consent decree, adjudication, etc.). The information has assisted state and local officials in their planning efforts.

- *Iowa DHS Effort to Impact on Needs of Youth of Color in the Child Welfare System* - As part of the DHS child welfare system redesign there was a specific desire to increase statewide awareness, examine decision-making, provide more cultural responsive services, and improve outcomes for children of color. The redesign was discussed in the "system description" section of the 2006 three year plan and 2007 update. The child welfare redesign related to youth of color calls for a two-pronged approach consisting of 1) the initiation of local demonstration projects to increase positive outcomes for youth of color, and 2) and partnering with the existing efforts of the DMC Resource Center related to policy recommendations and site work (University of Iowa). Over the past two years the Resource Center has been involved in examining data on decision points (both quantitative data through the Child Welfare Information System and qualitative data collected through on-site shadowing at DHS offices), providing technical assistance to the two local sites involved in the DHS initiative (Woodbury and Polk Counties), and working to connect the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. Both of the DHS sites are jurisdictions the Resource Center is working with for its juvenile justice related work with CJJP and the DMC Committee. The Resource Center has specifically attempted to connect the DHS efforts with its juvenile justice related activities in those sites. Funding from the DHS Children of Color effort helped support the DMC Committee's December 2005, 2006, and 2007 DMC Conferences.
- *Urban Children are Really Essential (U.C.A.R.E.)* – Urban Dreams, a local youth serving agency secured a federal grant that allows DMC-related efforts in a number of Iowa communities. The DMC Committee is partnering with U.C.A.R.E. to target efforts in some of the communities in which the DMC Resource Center is working and in other areas of the state with high minority populations.

3. DMC Reduction Plan for FY 2008-10

Provided below is the state level reduction plan related to DMC. CJJP has organized the reduction plan in a manner that connects reduction activities to recommendations in Dr. Leiber's updated assessment study. These assessment recommendations are presented immediately below along with a time task plan that lists activities and related Leiber recommendations.

Assessment Study Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Increase Structured Decision-Making at Intake

Recommendation 2: Continue to Require Decision-Makers to Participate in Race and Gender Cultural Sensitivity Training

Recommendation 3: Conduct Additional Research on DMC

Recommendation 4: Improve Upon Iowa's Justice Data Warehouse (JDW) System for Case Management and DMC

Recommendation 5: Expand Crime Prevention Programs

Overview of Activities, Timeline, & Identification of Efforts Supported with Formula Grant Related Funding

Activity	Timeline	Amount Formula
<i>DMC Committee</i>		
Related to All of Leiber's Recommendations		
• Continue Regular Meetings	Every 2 Months	
• Assist w/ Resource Center	Progress Reports – Applications	
• Assist w/ Conference Planning	Meetings & Subcommittee Mtgs	
• Provide Information to Media	Periodic Reports to Media	
• Provide Feedback on Matrices	Annual Review of Matrices	
<i>DMC Resource Center</i>		\$100,000
Related to All of Leiber's Recommendations		
• Continue TA – 3 sites	Visit Sites Quarterly	
• Continue Annual Conference	Late Nov./Early Dec. 07	
• Continue to provide Info.	DMC Mtgs. – Website Postings	
<i>YRDTF</i>		
Related to all of Leiber's Recommendations		
• Continue Regular Meeting	Meet Quarterly	
• Review Relevant data	Continue	
• Begin writing committee for Report due to Governor	Approx Every two months Gov Report due 05/09	
<i>Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative</i>		
Related to All of Leiber's Recommendations		
• Offer Local Contracts	March/April 2008	
• Implement TA –Local Sites	Spring 2008	
• Coordinate Efforts w/ DMC Cmte., YRDTF & JJAC	2008	
<i>Justice Data Warehouse</i>		
Related to Leiber Recommendations 1, 3, & 4		
• Update Matrices & Reports	Throughout 2008	
• Expand Info and Validation.	Spring & Summer 2008	
<i>Updated Assessment Activities</i>		
• Leiber Research in Polk And Woodbury Counties And sites in Virginia	2008 - Contingent on NIJ Grant	
<i>Allocation Process to Judicial Districts</i>		
Related to Leiber Recommendation 2 & 5		
• Meet w/ Chiefs & SAMS	Spring thru Fall 2008	
<i>Compliance Monitoring</i>	Annual OJJDP Schedule and Other Reports	
Related to Leiber Recommendation 3		
<i>DHS Information Effort</i>	Updated Report – Spring 08	
Related to Leiber Recommendation 3 & 5		
<i>Youth of Color – DHS</i>	Continued Throughout 08	
Related to Leiber Recommendations 2,3, & 5		
<i>U.C.A.R.E.</i>	Continued Throughout 08	
Related to Leiber Recommendation 2 and 5		

D. Local Level DMC Plan

Local Interventions – Iowa has utilized a DMC Resource Center to provide information and education, training, technical assistance and research and evaluation capacity for the state and local communities. The DMC Resource Center has in the past worked with at least nine Decat projects or other local planning entities to increase awareness and enhance local data analysis, planning, and policy efforts related to DMC (Black Hawk, Polk, Woodbury, Hamilton/Humboldt/Wright, Muscatine, Scott, Webster, Linn and Johnson Counties). All of the sites have higher than average minority populations, express concern about over-representation, and have significant over-representation-related issues. Currently resources are only available to provide continuing targeted technical assistance to Black Hawk, Polk, and Woodbury; however, contact is being maintained and some activity exists in most of the other sites.

1. BLACK HAWK COUNTY

D1. Black Hawk County DMC Data Discussions

Quantifiable Documentation


Adequate documentation exists for the development/maintenance of the state DMC plan.

Discussion of Black Hawk Relative Rate Indexes

Analysis regarding Black Hawk County's matrices is provided below. The matrices can be accessed by clicking on the highlighted years within the following parentheses (2008, 2007, 2006, and 2005 matrices). Information regarding state matrices is available earlier in this report. *In its August 1, 2007 meeting the YRDTF voted to focus its efforts at the decision making phases of referral, diversion, and detention. Matrix data and analysis regarding those three decisions points is noted accordingly below. Data for individual racial/ethnic groups have not been included in the charts if the average number of incidents did not exceed 20 for the report years.*

Black Hawk County Matrix Data - Referral

Below is a table that details the rate per thousand of juvenile court delinquency diversion in Black Hawk County. In Iowa such diversions are called informal adjustment agreements. Data for the diversion are taken from the 2005 through 2008 DMC Matrices which are included as an attachment to this application.




Black Hawk County Matrix Data - Referral Analysis/Observations

- Referral rates for African American youth (average 337.21) are higher than rates for Caucasian (79.93) youth for the 2005 – 2008 period.
 - The average rate of referral for African American youth is 4.2 times higher than that of Caucasian youth during the report years.
- Referral rates for African American youth (from 229.78 – 2005, to 440.22 - 2008) increased during the report years.
- Referral rates for Caucasian youth remained level during the report years.

Black Hawk County Matrix Data - Diversion

Below is a table that details the rate per thousand of Black Hawk County juvenile court delinquency diversion. Data for the diversion are taken from the 2005 through 2008 DMC Matrices which are included as an attachment to this application.




Black Hawk Matrix Data - Diversion Analysis/Observations

- Overall rates for diversion (average - all races 36.32) are considerably lower than referral rates (average - all races 208.57).
- The average diversion rate for African Americans youth was 30.06, and for Caucasian youth was 42.57 for the 2005 - 2008 period.
- Diversion rates for African American youth (from 41.26 – 2005 to 23.9 – 2008) and Caucasian youth (from 48.12 2005, to 34.12 – 2008) decreased during the report years.

Black Hawk County Matrix Data – Juvenile Detention

Below is a table that details the rate per thousand of Black Hawk County detention facility holds. Data for detention facility holds are taken from the 2005 through 2008 DMC Matrices, which are included as an attachment to this application.



Black Hawk County Matrix Data – Juvenile Detention Analysis/Observations

- Overall rates for holds in juvenile detention (average - all races 25.66) are considerably lower than referral rates (average - all races 208.57).
- The average detention rate for African Americans youth was 31.7, and was 19.62 for Caucasians during the 2005 - 2008 period.
 - The average rate of detention for African American youth is approximately 1 and 1/2 times higher than that of Caucasian youth during the report years.
- The detention rate for African American youth declined (from 33.25 – 2005, to 26.28 – 2008) during the report years.
- The detention rate for Caucasians fluctuated somewhat during the report years.

D2. Progress Made in Black Hawk County in 2007

Black Hawk County Site Activities Implemented

- Continued efforts of local DMC Committee.
- Participation of DMC Resource Center with local DMC Committee & local DMC Coordinator.
- Collected local data; utilized assistance of DMC Resource Center with analysis.
- Actively participated in state DMC Conference, and state DMC Committee.
- Continued staff support for local efforts through UCARE initiative sponsored by Urban Dreams, a non-profit agency in Des Moines, IA and local funding.
- With DMC Resource Center assistance, identified additional funding sources and opportunities and collaborated with Iowa Federation for Children’s Mental Health.
- Local provider participated with state DMC Coordinator in Public Television-sponsored television program on disproportionality.
- Participation in national DMC Conference, October, 2007, Denver, CO.
- Participated in efforts to engage the Casey JDAI.

Black Hawk County Site Activities Not Implemented

- All planned activities were implemented.

D3. DMC-Reduction Plan for Black Hawk County - FY 2008-10

The timeline and identification effort done for the state-level activities is organized in a manner that connects reduction activities to recommendations in Dr. Leiber’s updated assessment study. The below local timeline and identification does not specifically connect activities with the Leiber assessment. It

should be noted, however that the overall activities planned in Black Hawk County for 2007 are viewed as consistent with the recommendations of the Leiber study.

Overview of Activities, Timeline, & Identification of Efforts Supported with Formula Grant Related Funding

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Timeline</u>	<u>Amount Formula</u>
<i>Participate in State DMC Committee</i>	Every 2 Months	
<i>Begin Implementation as JDAI Site</i> Subject to Contract negotiation	April 2008	
<i>Continue Participation in State Conf.</i>	December 4&5, 2008	
<i>Participate in Local DMC Committee</i>	Local Committee meets monthly	
<i>Utilize DMC Res. Cntr.</i>	Site visits from Resource Center	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partic. of DMCRC-Local Mtgs. • Analysis of UCARE Surveys • Analysis of JCS Data • Identification of funding sources • Info or UCARE – survey analysis • Continue funding for JCS/Decat 		

2. POLK COUNTY

D1. Polk County DMC Data Discussions

Quantifiable Documentation


Adequate documentation exists for the development/maintenance of the state DMC plan.

Discussion of Polk County Rate Indexes

Analysis regarding Polk County’s matrices is provided below. The matrices can be accessed by clicking on the highlighted years within the following parentheses (2008, 2007, 2006, and 2005 matrices). Information regarding state matrices is available earlier in this report. *In its August 1, 2007 meeting the YRDTF voted to focus its efforts at the decision making phases of referral, diversion, and detention. Matrix data and analysis regarding those three decisions points is noted accordingly below. Data for individual racial/ethnic groups has not been included in the charts if the average number of incidents was not over 20 for the report years.*

Polk County Matrix Data - Referral

Below is a table that details the rate per thousand of juvenile court delinquency diversion in Polk County. In Iowa such diversions are called informal adjustment agreements. Data for the diversion are taken from the 2005 through 2008 DMC Matrices which are included as an attachment to this application.




Polk County Matrix Data - Referral Analysis/Observations

- Referral rates for African American (average 249.94), are considerably higher than the other racial/ethnic groups for the 2005 – 2008 period; Hispanics (average 86.81), Caucasians (average 65.97) and Asians (average 46.31).
 - The average rate of referral for African American youth is 3.8 times higher than that of Caucasian youth during the report years.
- Referral rates for African American were at a four year high in 2007 (281.33) and dropped in 2008 (249.63).
- Referral rates for the other racial/ethnic groups remained fairly level for the report years.

Polk County Matrix Data - Diversion

Below is a table that details the rate per thousand of Polk County juvenile court delinquency diversions. Data for the diversion are taken from the 2005 through 2008 DMC Matrices which are included as an attachment to this application.




Polk County Matrix Data - Diversion Analysis/Observations

- Overall rates for diversion (average - all races 39.13) are considerably lower than referral rates (average - all races 112.25).
- The average diversion rates for the racial/ethnic groups are as listed for the 2005 - 2008 period:
 - Asian 49.87, Caucasian 41.11, Hispanic 36.28, and African American 29.9.
- Diversion rates for African American youth were level during the report years. Diversion rates for African Americans were lower than the other racial/ethnic groups all of the report years.
- Diversion rates for Hispanic and Caucasian youth increased slightly during the report years.
- Diversion rates for Asians fluctuated during the report years.

Polk County Matrix Data – Juvenile Detention

Below is a table that details the rate per thousand of Polk County detention facility holds. Data for detention facility holds is taken from the 2005 through 2008 DMC Matrices which are included as an attachment to this application.



Polk County Matrix Data – Juvenile Detention Analysis/Observations

- Overall rates for holds in juvenile detention (average - all races 31.74) are considerably lower than referral rates (average - all races 112.25).
- The average detention rates for the racial/ethnic groups are as listed for the 2005 - 2008 period:
 - African American 38.25, Hispanic 36.21, Asian 29.11, and Caucasian 23.27.
 - The average rate of detention for African American youth is approximately 1.7 times higher than that of Caucasian youth during the report years.
- The detention rate for all racial/ethnic groups declined during the report years.

D2. Progress Made in Polk County in 2007

Polk County Site Activities Implemented

- Actively participated in state DMC Conference and state DMC Committee.
- Served as the site of the statewide DMC Conference each year since 2002.
- Met regularly about issues of disproportionality (Decat, Urban Dreams/UCARE etc.) and the DMC Resource Center is regularly present in the community.
- Worked with the DMC Resource Center providing data related to youth who appear at the detention center

- Received ongoing DMC Resource Center TA and data sharing with the detention center
- Received ongoing DMC Resource Center TA with the Des Moines schools on suspensions and expulsions and linkages among schools, child welfare, and over-representation in juvenile justice
- Coordinated DMC effort in Polk County with state-funded initiative to reduce disproportionality in child welfare (MYFI)
- Provided Global Appraisal of Individual Needs (GAIN) training to school staff
- Participated in efforts to engage the Casey JDAI
- Provided OJJDP DMC training to local DMC coordinators

Polk County Site Activities Not Implemented

- All planned activities were implemented.

D3. DMC-Reduction Plan for Polk County - FY 2008-10

The timeline and identification effort done for the state-level activities is organized in a manner that connects reduction activities to recommendations in Dr. Leiber’s updated assessment study. The below local timeline and identification does not specifically connect activities with the Leiber assessment. It should be noted, however that the overall activities planned in Polk County for 2007 are viewed as consistent with the recommendations of the Leiber study.

Overview of Activities, Timeline, & Identification of Efforts Supported with Formula Grant Related Funding

Activity	Timeline	Amount Formula
<i>Participate in State DMC Committee</i>	Every 2 Months	
<i>Begin Implementation as JDAI Site</i> Subject to Contract negotiation	April 2008	
<i>Continue Participation of State Conf.</i>	December 5&6, 2008	
<i>Assist With Research for Leiber Assmt</i>	Throughout 2008	
<i>Utilize DMC Res. Cntr.</i>	Site visits from DMC Resource Center	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TA to DMPS, UCARE • Data Analysis – Schools & UCARE • Coordinate with UCARE • Coordinate with MYFI 		

3. WOODBURY COUNTY

D1. Woodbury County DMC Data Discussions


Quantifiable Documentation

Adequate documentation exists for the development/maintenance of the state DMC plan. The matrices can be accessed by clicking on within the following ([2008](#), [2007](#), [2006](#), and [2005](#) matrices).

Discussion of State Relative Rate Indexes

Woodbury County Matrix Data - Referral

Below is a table that details the rate per thousand of juvenile court delinquency diversion in Woodbury County. Data for the diversion are taken from the 2005 through 2008 DMC Matrices which are included as an attachment to this application.




Woodbury County Matrix Data - Referral Analysis/Observations

- Referral rates for Native American (average 538.05), African American (average 386.67), and Hispanic (average 193.28) youth are higher than Caucasian (125.02) youth for the 2005 – 2008 period.
 - The average rate of referral for Native American youth is 4.3 times higher than that of Caucasian youth.
 - The average rate of referral for African American youth is 3 times higher than that of Caucasian youth during the report years.
 - The average rate of referral for Hispanic Youth is 1.6 times higher than that of Caucasian youth during the report years.
- Referral rates for Native American (from 446.3 – 2006 to 675.24 - 2008) youth increased significantly during the report years.
- Referral rates for the other racial/ethnic groups remained fairly level or decreased slightly for the report years.

Woodbury County Matrix Data - Diversion

Below is a table that details the rate per thousand of Woodbury County juvenile court delinquency diversions. Data for the diversion are taken from the 2005 through 2008 DMC Matrices which are included as an attachment to this application.




Woodbury County Matrix Data - Diversion Analysis/Observations

- Overall rates for diversion (average - all races 24.19) are considerably lower than referral rates (average - all races 310.76).
- The average diversion rates for the racial/ethnic groups are as listed for the 2005 - 2008 period:
 - Caucasian 31.49, Hispanic 30.65, African American 18.9, and Native American 15.71.
 - African American and Native American youth have a rate of diversion that is approximately half that of Hispanic and Caucasian youth.
- Diversion rates for Caucasian, African American and Native American youth increased during the report years.
 - Diversion rates for Native American (from 9.38 – 2007 to 27.14 - 2008) youth increased significantly during the report years.
 - Diversion rates for Hispanic youth fluctuated during the report years.

Woodbury County Matrix Data – Juvenile Detention

Below is a table that details the rate per thousand of Woodbury County detention facility holds. Data for detention facility holds is taken from the 2005 through 2008 DMC Matrices which are included as an attachment to this application.



Woodbury County Matrix Data – Juvenile Detention Analysis/Observations

- Overall rates for holds in juvenile detention (average - all races 22.39) are considerably lower than referral rates (average - all races 310.76).
- The average detention rates for the racial/ethnic groups are as listed for the 2005 - 2008 period:
 - Native American 27.67, African American 25.53, Hispanic 23.41, and Caucasian 12.95.
 - The average rate of detention for Native American, African American and Hispanic youth is approximately 2 times higher than that of Caucasian youth during the report years.
- The detention rate for all racial/ethnic groups declined during the report years.
 - The most significant rate decline was for African American youth (from 35.12 – 2006, to 13.68 – 2008).

D2. Progress Made in Woodbury County in 2007

Woodbury County Site Activities Implemented

- Conducted 5th annual County DMC Conference with national participation

- Utilized federal TA to conduct site visit and serve as speaker at conference and for other local DMC issues.
- Actively participated in state DMC Conference, and state DMC Committee.
- Prepared Decat and other local plans that reflect DMC as an issue being addressed by community.
- Obtained staff support for local efforts through local initiatives.
- Connected local community groups, national groups (e.g., Race Matters Consortium, Center for Study of Social Policy, Casey Family Alliance) targeting over-representation in the juvenile justice and child welfare systems and local Community Initiative for Native Communities and Families.
- Conducted local training and meetings through DMC Resource Center and Minority Youth and Families Initiative , First Nations, CINCF and national organizations (see above) including Iowa Department of Human Services and a variety of other state agencies (e.g., Workforce Dev., Econ. Dev.).
- Collected data at detention center and at JCS.
- Actively participated in state DMC Conference, and state DMC Committee.
- Participated in efforts to engage the Casey JDAI.

Woodbury County Site Activities Not Implemented

- All planned activities were implemented.

D3. DMC-Reduction Plan for Woodbury County - FY 2008-10

The timeline and identification effort done for the state-level activities is organized in a manner that connects reduction activities to recommendations in Dr. Leiber’s updated assessment study. The below local timeline and identification does not specifically connect activities with the Leiber assessment. It should be noted, however that the overall activities planned in Woodbury County for 2007 are viewed as consistent with the recommendations of the Leiber study.

Overview of Activities, Timeline, & Identification of Efforts Supported with Formula Grant Related Funding

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Timeline</u>	<u>Amount Formula</u>
<i>Participate in State DMC Committee</i>	Every 2 Months	
<i>Begin Implementation as JDAI Site</i> Subject to Contract negotiation	April 2008	
<i>Continue Participation of State Conf.</i>	December 5&6, 2008	
<i>Assist With Research for Leiber Assmt</i>	Throughout 2008	
<i>Coordinate Local DMC Committees</i>	<i>local committees meet monthly</i>	
<i>Utilize DMC Res. Cntr.</i>	Site visits from Resource Center	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinate local DMC Conf. • Participation in DMCR-Local Mtgs. • Analyze of Local Data • Coordinate w/ local initiatives • Provide CC Training 		

5. PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

ISSUE ONE: YOUTH DEVELOPMENT & DISTRICT AND COMMUNITY PLANNING

Standard Program Area Code and Title:

19 - Juvenile Justice System Improvement

Program Problem Statement:

There are more than a half million school-age youth, ages 6 – 17, in the state of Iowa. Most are doing well; but, as the Crime Analysis section of the 2006 Three Year Plan reflects, some do not have the advantages of safe and supportive families and communities. Too many youth are engaging in unhealthy and dangerous behaviors and are doing poorly academically, socially, and emotionally. If Iowa is to maintain safe and caring communities and make progress on a variety of youth-related issues, including delinquency, disproportionate minority confinement, substance abuse and the academic achievement gap, it is essential to invest in programs that address the causes of crime and violence and stress protection rather than restoration.

At the same time there has been a positive trend in Iowa to provide services for delinquent and non-delinquent youth in their community. The move of funding, services, and decision making to the local level has greatly increased the need for community planning. Communities need training and technical assistance to deal with the various aspects of planning including engagement, mobilization, data collection, resource assessment, plan development, implementation etc. The local skills that are necessary for community planning are “trainable” and have practical application for multiple uses - the sophistication level in local planning processes varies by community.

Local officials vocalize frustration over the need to go through similar planning processes for different state agencies (CJJP, Health, Human Services, Education, Workforce Development, Early Childhood, etc.) that have separate requirements. Locals speak of the need for state officials to coordinate application and reporting requirements. The challenge at a local level is coordinating the various requirements of these multiple prevention and planning initiatives - it could be greatly aided with a common understanding of youth development.

The JJAC and CJJP are particularly interested in coordinated planning and service provision for court involved youth. There is also recognition that the most effective policies and programs are those that comprehensively address the full range of developmental needs of youth. Research has demonstrated that investments in youth development and prevention-oriented strategies return multiple dividends in reduced demand for more costly services and sanctions and greater likelihood of school success, employability and economic productivity.

With the exception of education, state resources for youth programs are concentrated primarily in services that respond to problems after they occur. While these are necessary and important programs, they represent only a portion of the continuum of services, opportunities and supports that are critical to ensuring the positive development of all youth. In order to reverse the increasing demand for costly, high-end services and sanctions that are designed to respond to problems, it is critical to invest in prevention and youth development programs and strategies that have proven effective in improving outcomes for youth and reducing problem behaviors. Similarly, services and sanctions for system-involved youth must be directly linked to their developmental needs in order to be effective.

Beginning October, 2008, the majority of the federal 2008 formula grant award (**\$419,000**) will be combined with other JJDP Act related funds, and allocated to the juvenile court services offices in each of the state's eight judicial districts. The chief juvenile court officer for each judicial district shall submit plans to CJJP for approval and for authorization of allocations. The allocations will be based on the percentage of child population ages 5-17 in each judicial district. The funds must be expended in one or more of the appropriate formula grant program areas. This approach will allow for regional planning, by judicial district, to prioritize the juvenile justice issues and develop strategies to address the needs. It is more

appropriate for the prioritization of the needs to be completed at the local level, and for local communities to strategically plan to address the issues. CJJP will continue to provide resources (e.g. county level data and technical assistance) to assist in the development of the plans.

Program Goal – State Policy:

- 1) Work toward the adoption of a consistent state youth policy based on prevention, positive youth development and results accountability.

Program Objective – Allocation Effort:

- A) The JJAC and CJJP will transition from state-wide process to allocate formula grant dollars to local Decat initiatives to one for the state's 8 judicial Districts. The approach will utilize youth development as the vehicle to plan a local continuum of services ranging from prevention to sanction. **The JJAC has approved the use of \$419,000 in formula grant funding from this 2008 three year plan for the allocation effort to local Decats.**

Activities and Services Planned – Allocation Effort:

- Provide administrative and financial reports to CJJP and JJAC that document performance of judicial districts.
- Document community planning training and technical assistance to judicial districts, local Decat officials, private providers, and representatives from local units of governments, etc. to enhance planning capabilities.
- Maintain copies of progress reports and other reporting and administrative materials provided by judicial districts.

Program Objective – Youth Involvement:

- B) Identify opportunities for increasing meaningful involvement of youth in state policy-making.

Activities and Services Planned – Youth Involvement:

- Document through minutes youth participation in JJAC activities.
- Documentation of coordination activities related to youth involvement between JJAC and ICYD.
- Document involvement of members of Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development Involvement in State of Iowa Youth Action Committee.

Program Objective – Youth Development:

- C) Continue efforts to facilitate an "Iowa Youth Development Policy" for planning and programming among the various audiences (legislature, state agencies, advocacy groups, communities, etc) on issues related to prevention and youth development.

Activities and Services Planned – Youth Development:

- Maintain state planning structure of the Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development (steering committee, state agency group, and State of Iowa Youth Action Committee, etc.).
- Utilize lessons learned from ICYD pilot communities to affect state policies regarding administration of various state funding sources.
- Continue youth development trainings provided by ICYD.
- Document common data or management information systems, joint planning, and joint or coordinated funding processes for youth services.
- Document efforts by communities to develop integrated youth service plans and single application for support, as well as recommended appropriate action for state agencies.

- D) Support increased knowledge of cultural competency in state and local youth development activities.
- Utilize DMC Committee and Gender Task Force members to review allocation programs funded for youth of color and girls.
 - Continue dialogue with Chief Juvenile Court Officers and Department of Human Services Service Area Managers to discuss programs funded for youth of color and girls.

Program Goal – Capacity Building for Judicial Districts and Communities:

- 2) Build the capacity of local communities to use a prevention and youth development approach in providing youth services.

Program Objective – Training and TA for Judicial Districts and Communities Regarding Youth Development:

- A) Increase awareness and understanding of prevention and youth development approaches among youth serving agencies operating at the district and community levels through development and support of training and technical assistance opportunities.

Activities and Services Planned – Training and TA

- Documentation of efforts to assist communities to utilize a youth development approach in the delivery of youth services and in creating opportunities for youth empowerment.
- Document information sharing, training and technical assistance, the use of the ICN, creation of a web page, etc.
- Utilize lessons learned from ICYD pilot communities in youth development related training performed at local level.

Program Objective – Youth Development in Programs Developed at the District and Local Level

- B) Incorporate a youth development approach into guidance on State initiatives that allow planning and implementation of youth programs to be determined at the district and local level.

Activities and Services Planned – Programs Developed at the District and Local Level

- Document the coordination of the participating state agencies participating on the Youth Development State Collaboration to ensure that a youth development approach is included in any state guidelines or requirements as appropriate.
- Documentation of the state agencies' efforts to work with local sites in a coordinated approach to integrate the principles of prevention and youth development.
- Utilize lessons learned from ICYD pilot communities in youth development related training performed at local level.

Program Objective – Youth Involvement at the District and Local Level

- C) Promote increased opportunities for youth involvement at the local level.

Activities and Services Planned - Youth Involvement at the District and Local Level:

- Document technical assistance and state programs that encourage creation of local youth advisory boards and other new opportunities for youth involvement.
- Utilize lessons learned from ICYD pilot communities in youth development related training performed at local level.

Performance Measures CJJP will provide all measures as required by OJJDP via the DCTAT system.

Outputs:

- 1) FG funds awarded for system improvement.
- 2) Number of programs implemented.
- 3) Number of program youth served.
- 4) Total number of program families served.
- 5) Number of planning activities conducted.
- 6) Number of funded programs evaluated.

Outcomes:

- 1) Number and percent of youth completing program requirements.
- 2) Number and percent of program youth exhibiting a desired change in targeted behaviors.
- 3) Family relationships.
- 4) Antisocial behavior.
- 5) Substance use/abuse.
- 6) Number of families who report being satisfied with program.
- 7) Total number of program youth who report being satisfied with the program.
- 8) Total number of days between initial court appearance and disposition.

Budget:

	<u>JJDPF Funds</u>	<u>State/Local/Private Funds</u>
FY08	\$0	\$0
FY09	\$419,000	\$0
FY10	\$0	\$0

ISSUE TWO: TREATMENT AND ASSESSMENT OF MENTALLY ILL YOUTH

Standard Program Area Code and Title:

20 - Mental Health Services

Program Problem Statement:

Funding for Iowa's mental Health effort is being requested in Iowa's 2008 JABG application. No mental health funding is being requested in this formula grant application. JABG measures will be utilized for performance reporting for related activities. Iowa's Mental Health Access Plan (MHAP) operates with a managed care organization providing the management of the program. The intent of the program is to expand the access and range of appropriate mental health services and to help contain federal, state and county expenditures for mental health services. Mental Health services provided include inpatient, partial hospitalization, day treatment, residential, intensive outpatient, outpatient (individual, marital and family, group), crisis intervention, targeted case management, mobile treatment.

A requirement to access some of the various services of the MHAP system is a diagnosis of the mental health problems for the persons involved - the diagnosis is necessary to engage the system. System officials indicate the process creates access issues for delinquent youth, who because of justice system involvement, may not have a mental health diagnosis or simply be diagnosed youth presenting acting-out or violent behavior that cause them to be placed in the Juvenile Justice system because the behavioral aspects of their treatment "override" the mental health issues.

CJJP and the JJAC identified a number of specific issues relative to mental health in their analysis process for the development of this plan. They include

- Duration of services in a mental health or hospital setting especially for delinquent youth.
- The ability to serve delinquent youth with mental health issues in typical residential, institutional or community based settings.
- Inability to use federal Medicaid funding for eligible recipients being held in county operated juvenile detention facilities or state operated training schools (such mental health costs must presently be paid either by the county, the state or the youth's family).

Program Goal – Improve the “system” response to youth with mental health issues:

To learn more about the mental health issues of youth involved in the juvenile justice system; provide support for these issues through the establishment of the “Mental Health Issues in Detention/Shelter” sub-committee of the JJAC; and continue to advocate for identified changes in the mental health system to enhance necessary services to youth and the families of youth with mental health issues in the juvenile justice system.

Program Objective – JJAC Presentations:

A) Provide presentations to the JJAC regarding mental health issues for system youth.

Activities and Service Plan - JJAC Presentations:

Document presentations to JJAC from DHS, DPH, mental health, state institutions, residential treatment, and others.

Program Objective – Share Materials:

B) Access and share with the JJAC relevant materials relating to mental health issues.

Activities and Service Plan - JJAC Presentations:

- Documentation and utilization of relevant information from the National Coalition for Juvenile Justice
- Document other materials related to mental health issues produced through the Mental Health Issues in Detention/Shelter sub-committee and as a part of the service contract with the University of Iowa Department of Rehabilitative Therapies.
- Insure that CJJP and JJAC are represented through the participation of CJJP staff in the MHDD system redesign efforts that remain a stated goal for the Governor on the Legislature of Iowa.

Program Objective – Change to Impact Problems:

C) Through learning more about the mental health system and the identification of problems affecting youth and the families of youth with mental health disorders in the juvenile justice system, the JJAC will advocate for changes to impact the problems.

Activities and Service Plan - Change to Impact Problems:

- Document identified problem areas of the mental health system, based on the education process conducted in Objectives A and B of this issue.
- Document steps taken by the JJAC (i.e. establishment of the MH Issues in Detention/Shelter sub-committee and the contract for services with the University of Iowa) to advocate for necessary changes in mental health services for juveniles in the juvenile justice system.
- Production and distribution of “Staff Guide for Working With Problem Behaviors” for shelter/detention staff and other interested parties.

Performance Measures (CJJP will provide all measures as required by OJJDP via the DCTAT system.):

See Iowa’s 2008 JABG application.

Budget:

	<u>JJDPA Funds</u>	<u>State/Local/Private Funds</u>
FY07	\$0	\$0
FY08	\$0	\$0
FY09	\$0	\$0

ISSUE THREE: DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONTACT

Standard Program Area Code and Title:

10 – Disproportionate Minority Contact

Problem Statement:

Funding for Iowa's DMC effort is being requested in Iowa's 2008 JABG application. That application reflects accordingly. No DMC funding is being requested in this formula grant application. JABG measures will be utilized for performance reporting for related activities. Approximately a third of the youth held in juvenile detention facilities and state training schools in Iowa are minority. Minority youth comprise just 11 percent of Iowa's youth population. Clearly minority youth are overrepresented. Research as well reflects non-whites perceive court decision-making to be biased against non-white youth. Lack of respect for the system—because minorities think it is discriminatory—leads to lack of cooperation with juvenile justice system personnel, and also leads to recidivism. Additional information regarding research conducted in Iowa relative to DMC is provided in Section 4 of this plan.

In the late 90's Iowa was one of the pilot states for OJJDP's Comprehensive Strategy process. The Comp. Strategy process helped illustrate the power of local planning to impact on unique issues and problems locally. Indeed, a number of local Comprehensive Strategy plans had fairly specific mention of the needs of minority youth. As a result of the Comp. Strategy, Iowa initiated an effort to allocate a significant portion of its JJDP Act Title II & V, and JAIBG funds to local planning entities (Decats). One of the lessons learned from the Comprehensive Strategy process, however, relates to the difficulty to engage minority persons in participatory local planning processes. Indeed there is a need to continually engage and reengage communities of color in local planning processes. There is additionally a need to provide information to insure that the majority community has a knowledge of the issues relating to DMC. Finally, there is a need to provide to local planning entities training, assistance, and tools that assist them to better meet the needs of minority youth and families.

Program Goal – DMC Knowledge:

- 1) Maintain an environment that furthers the knowledge of DMC related issues for juvenile justice system officials and other selected audiences.

Program Objective - DMC Committee:

- A) Maintain the efforts of Iowa's DMC Committee to share information relative to DMC.

Activities and Services Planned – DMC Committee:

- Provide oversight and input regarding the overall efforts for Iowa's DMC initiative.
 - Assist in planning the annual DMC Conference
 - Implement recommendations from the updated DMC Assessments completed by Dr. Michael Leiber and Dr. William Feyerherm.
 - Begin implementation as a site for the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative.
 - Provide direction regarding secure facility and court processing data re: DMC.
 - Review and approve proposal/s re: DMC Related funding.
 - Provide information newspaper articles, publications, reports re: DMC.
 - Utilize the DMC Committee to get input from youth in the juvenile justice system.
- B) Support increased knowledge of cultural competency in state and local youth development activities.
 - Utilize DMC Committee members to review allocation programs funded for youth of color.
 - Continue dialogue with Chief Juvenile Court Officers and Department of Human Services Service Area Managers to discuss programs funded for youth of color.

Program Objective – DMC Resource Center:

- C) Maintain the efforts of the DMC Resource Center that has in its mission the specified activity to inform, educate, and provide basic information relative to DMC.

Activities and Services Planned – DMC Resource Center:

- Implementation support for annual DMC Conference.
- Maintenance of State DMC Website - website contains various information relative to DMC (http://www.uiowa.edu/~nrcfcp/index_dmcr.htm).
- Work with state DMC Committee for various DMC related activities.

Program Goal – Policy and Planning Efforts to Impact DMC:

- 2) Implement policy and planning efforts, programmatic efforts, or other activity that will specifically prevent and reduce the percentages of minority youth confined in secure settings.

Program Objective – Juvenile Detention Screening Tool:

- A) Implement the Casey Foundation's JDAI effort.

Activities and Services Planned – Juvenile Detention Screening Tool:

- Provide technical support to local sites that are working with the Casey Foundation to develop and implement local detention screening tools.
- Assist chiefs with data collection and validation process for mainframe data regarding a state-level juvenile intake assessment tool.

Program Objective – DMC Resource Center:

- B) Maintain the efforts of the DMC Resource Center that has in its mission the specified activity to assist local planning and policy efforts related to DMC.

Activities and Services Planned – DMC Resource Center:

- Provide technical assistance to three local Iowa Sites – planning assistance, training, local event facilitation, etc (due to federal reductions in funding only three sites will be served during calendar 2007).
- Coordinate Resource Center site activities with minority youth serving effort - Urban Children are Really Essential (U-CARE).
- Coordinate Resource Center site activities with minority youth serving effort - Urban Children are Really Essential (U-CARE).

Program Objective - DMC Committee:

- C) Maintain the efforts of Iowa's DMC Committee to impact on the issues of DMC.

Activities and Services Planned – DMC Committee:

- Provide oversight and input regarding the overall efforts for Iowa's DMC initiative.
- Direct and monitor activities of DMC Resource Center in its work in local sites.
- Continue discussions with Chief JCO's and Iowa Department of Human Services Service Area Managers regarding issues related to funding for DMC related programming in Iowa's CW/JJYD allocation effort.

Performance Measures CJJP will provide all measures as required by OJJDP via the DCTAT system.

See Iowa's 2008 JABG application.

Budget:

	<u>JJDPA Funds</u>	<u>State/Local Private Funds</u>
FY07	\$0	\$0
FY08	\$0	\$0
FY09	\$0	\$0

ISSUE FOUR: GENDER SPECIFIC SERVICES

Standard Program Area Code and Title:

13 – Gender Specific Services

Problem Statement

The Juvenile Justice And Delinquency Prevention Act requires states to conduct an analysis of gender-specific services that are intended to prevent and treat juvenile delinquency in females. States are also required to develop a plan for providing these needed services.

To address the Act's requirement, the Iowa Juvenile Justice Advisory Council developed a task force to oversee the Division of Criminal & Juvenile Justice Planning (CJJP) and the State Advisory Group's (JJAC) activities as well as make recommendations related to gender-specific services. The Iowa Gender-Specific Services Task Force involves key stakeholders in Iowa's juvenile justice system, particularly service providers who want comprehensive system change that reflects gender equity for girls and young women.

The JJAC approved the use of Challenge Grant funding from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to address gender equity in Iowa's juvenile justice system. An intra-agency agreement/contract between the Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning and the Iowa Division on the Status of Women provided staff support through a Program Planner to the Iowa Gender-Specific Services Task Force from May 1998 through September 2005. This agreement, now funded through Formula grant funds alone has allowed continued support of Task Force meetings and activities.

Major activities of the Task Force have included the annual "Whispers & Screams" conference for girl-serving professionals; publication and distribution of Female Juvenile Justice, a study that provides a snapshot of female offenders in the state's juvenile justice system; publication and distribution of Providing Gender-Specific Services for Adolescent Female Offenders: Guidelines & Resources, a desk protocol that outlines the gender-specific philosophy; Promising Directions: Programs that serve girls in a single-sex environment, a guide to programs in the state; a community planning initiative, funding provided to communities to infuse intentional planning for young women into already existing community planning processes; an evaluation project to study two programs using the gender-specific approach; a study creating an internal evaluation tool; numerous trainings on the gender-specific philosophy and its implementation attended by hundreds of juvenile justice system professionals and made online information available through the Iowa Division on the Status of Women web site at www.women.iowa.gov/girls. Further, due largely to the advocacy of the Task Force, the 1999 Iowa Legislature allocated funding for day treatment and aftercare services for young women and mandated that the gender-specific services approach should be used whenever possible.

Due to funding limitations, recent Task Force activities encompassed items identified as priorities and areas where the Task Force could have the most impact: support of the annual conference; distribution of all existing publications and reports; advocacy; and other training and technical assistance provided around the state. Fall 2007 brought a new initiative. The Gender Specific Services Task Force planned and executed a "Girls' Summit". This Summit brought together key players from across the state to examine the status of girls involved in the juvenile justice system. Participants received and offered information that resulted in a comprehensive report on the status of these young women in our state. The report was provided to legislators, Summit participants and others and served to offer guidance to those who work with young women as well.

Juvenile Justice Youth Development Allocation Funding – A few communities are utilizing the funding provided from the Juvenile Justice Youth Development allocation process through Decats to support services for girls for after school programming, mentoring, aftercare services, and group activities. It is anticipated that the Juvenile Justice Youth Development allocation will be a vehicle to further efforts for locals to provide gender specific services. The Gender Task Force has assisted with the provision of products and trainings to local officials in order that they might better plan for the needs of girls.

Although Iowa has not historically placed emphasis on providing gender-responsive services for females, since the formation of the Iowa Gender-Specific Services Task Force there has been increased discussion and action toward this end. Across the continuum of the Iowa juvenile justice system, service providers and system officials have been educated on female development and the need for more gender-responsive services that utilize the gender-specific services philosophy in programs that serve adolescent females. Encouragingly, there has been change in the way services are provided in various programs. However, a comprehensive change across the juvenile justice system has not occurred. Change must occur on a more fundamental level within the system to facilitate utilization of innovative gender-specific approaches in all programs and services as well as adequate funding of these services. Further, those involved in the planning of our efforts must expand to include a wider representation of players in the juvenile justice system. Both measures are necessary for Iowa to truly provide equitable services within its juvenile justice system.

Program Goal – Gender Responsive Programs and Services:

Facilitate a comprehensive fundamental change in the juvenile justice system that will enhance the understanding and utilization of innovative gender-responsive approaches in all programs and services, particularly those that serve the adolescent female population of Iowa's juvenile justice system.

Program Objective – Disseminate Information:

- A) Update and disseminate information concerning female development and the gender-specific services philosophy to girl-serving professionals using print media and website.

Activities and Services Planned – Disseminate Information:

- Distribute "The Girl Connection" newsletter bimonthly.
- Distribute Providing Gender-Specific Services for Adolescent Female Offenders: Guidelines & Resources as needed and requested.
- Distribute Female Juvenile Justice as needed and requested.
- Distribute Promising Directions: Programs that Serve Iowa Girls in a Single Sex Environment as needed and requested.

Program Objective – Training Regarding Female Development:

- B) Provide training regarding adolescent female development, the gender-specific program philosophy and component implementation and related topics to professionals in the juvenile justice system and related fields.

Activities and Services Planned – Training Regarding Female Development:

- Training and technical assistance provided by Coordinator and Task Force members to local communities/regions as requested.
- Coordinate Whispers & Screams annual conference.
- Coordinate annual retreat/intensive training.
- Provide justice system participants scholarships to attend the Whispers & Screams conference.

Program Objective – Participate and Assist in Community Planning:

- C) Participate and assist in the community planning processes across the state to ensure that the unique needs of girls involved with or at risk for involvement with the juvenile justice system are addressed.

Activities and Services Planned - Participate and Assist in Community Planning:

- Distribute “DHS Select Service Data” and “Juvenile Delinquency Statistical Report” to community planning entities.
- Distribute Providing Gender-Specific Services for Adolescent Female Offenders: Guidelines & Resources to community planning groups.
- Task Force members serve in community planning initiatives.
- Clearly stated intentions to address the unique needs of girls in community plans across the state.
- Training and technical assistance visits to local entities.

Program Objective – Education and Secure Wider Representation on Task Force:

- D) Educate legislators regarding the importance of gender-specific services and secure a wider representation of professionals on the Task Force.

Activities and Services Planned

- Plan and execute “Girls’ Summit” in fall 2008.
- Testify at the legislative hearings of the Iowa Commission on the Status of Women and any other entities as opportunities arise.
- Work with the Iowa Commission on the Status of Women and other advocacy groups as they push for legislative change that supports gender-responsive efforts.
- Add representatives from Juvenile Court; DECAT committees; the Departments of Public Health, Human Services, Education, and Management as well as from other girl-serving programs to the membership of the Task Force.
- Support efforts of local gender task forces with training and technical assistance and other resources as able.

Performance Measures (CJJP will provide all measures as required by OJJDP via the DCTAT system.):

Outputs:

- 1) Formula funds awarded for services.
- 2) Number of program youth served.
- 3) Number of FTEs funded by formula funds.
- 4) Number of program materials developed.
- 5) Number and percent of program staff trained.
- 6) Number of hours of program staff training provided.
- 7) Number of planning activities conducted.

Outcomes:

- 1) Number and percent of program youth completing program requirements.
- 2) Number and percent of youth charged with formal probation violations.
- 3) Number and percent of youth committed to correctional facility.

Budget:

	<u>JJDPA Funds</u>	<u>State/Local Private Funds</u>
FY08	\$0	\$0
FY09	\$91,000	\$0
FY10	\$0	\$0

ISSUE FIVE: COMPLIANCE MONITORING

Standard Program Area Code and Title:

06 Compliance Monitoring

Problem Statement:

Funding for Iowa's DMC effort is being requested in Iowa's 2008 JABG application. That application reflects accordingly. No compliance funding is being requested in this formula grant application. JABG measures will be utilized for performance reporting for related activities. Iowa continues to maintain an excellent system to monitor compliance with the JJDP Act. That system is described in some detail in Section 3 of this report, and in the 2006 Three Year Plan. However, the reduction of JJDP Act funding and the related administrative funding has made support for various compliance monitoring activities a challenge. Iowa has long utilized its compliance monitoring function as a tool to gather juvenile justice system related data. Collected data are compiled, analyzed, and supplied to system officials. The compliance monitoring function has resulted in activities related to research and assessment for system officials.

Program Goal - Insure Compliance and Research Mechanism:

To ensure that Iowa continues to comply with all JJDP Act core requirements and all federal administrative requirements while providing a mechanism for juvenile justice planning research and system improvement.

Program Objective – Maintain Monitoring System:

- A) To maintain a monitoring system that allows Iowa to continue its compliance with the core requirements of the JJDP Act.

Activities and Service Plan - Maintain Monitoring System:

- Provide all necessary reports to OJJDP, specifically the annual monitoring report.

Program Objective – Training:

- B) To provide training and information sharing functions for the JJAC, law enforcement, juvenile justice system officials, private youth serving agencies, etc.

Activities and Service Plan - Training:

- Continue compliance related training and information sharing capabilities;

Program Objective – Research and Assessment:

- C) Assist system officials with various research and assessment activities.

Activities and Service Plan – Research and Assessment:

- Continue the existing planning, research, assessment, program development, technical assistance, and training capabilities.

Performance Measures (CJJP will provide all measures as required by OJJDP via the DCTAT system.):

See Iowa's 2008 JABG application.

Budget:

	<u>JJDPA Funds</u>	<u>State/Local Private Funds</u>
FY08	\$0	\$0
FY09	\$0	\$0
FY10	\$0	\$0

ISSUE SIX: STATE ADVISORY GROUP ALLOCATION

Standard Program Area Code and Title:

31 State Advisory Group Allocation

Problem Statement:

CJJP continues to provide staff support to Iowa's JJAC and its related Committees. As the JJAC attachment reflects, we comply with related membership requirement, and have an active and engaged group. Issues are actively debated – and funding decisions reflect the JJAC's priorities. **The 2008 JJAC allocation is \$30,000.**

Program Goal – Assistance with Overall JJAC Function:

To provide an advisory body capable of assisting in the dissemination of information concerning juvenile justice problems, providing input into the allocation of federal funding for programming, and evaluating the adequacy of the juvenile justice system and planning for its improvement.

Program Objective – Information for Governor and Legislature:

- A) Submit to the Governor and the Legislature recommendations with respect to matters relating to its functions, including State compliance with the requirements of the JJDP Act.

Activities and Service Plan – Information for Governor and Legislature:

- Disseminate information concerning juvenile justice issues and/or initiatives.

Program Objective – Information for Governor and Legislature:

- B) Engage the JJAC and its Committees to development of the three year plan and its budget as well as the annual updates.

Activities and Service Plan – JJAC Review:

- Utilize the JJAC to review and update the Three-Year Plan to maintain a current priority of problems and areas for funding.

Program Objective – Compliance Monitoring:

- C) Monitor State compliance with the requirements of the JJDP Act.

Activities and Service Plan – Compliance Monitoring:

- Review monitoring data collected for the purposes of assessing JJDP Act compliance, as well as other related information to evaluate progress in addressing Plan goals.
- Review and respond to State legislative proposals that affect the policies and procedures related to the jailing and detention of juveniles.

Program Objective – Progress Reporting and Visits:

- D) Review the progress and accomplishments of formula grant projects funded under the State plan.

Activities and Service Plan – Progress Reporting and Visits:

- Conduct site visits of funded programs for "first-hand" review of implementation problems and procedures.
- Review subgrantee submitted fiscal and programmatic reports.

Program Objective – Input from Youth in the Juvenile Justice System:

- E) Regularly seek comments and opinions from juveniles currently under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system.

Activities and Service Plan – Input from Youth in the Juvenile Justice System:

- Utilize the DMC Committee to get input from youth in the juvenile justice system.

Performance Measures CJJP will provide all measures as required by OJJDP via the DCTAT system.

Outputs:

- 1) Number of grants funded with FG funds.
- 2) Number of grant applications reviewed and commented on.
- 3) Number of JJAC committee meetings held.
- 4) Number of JJAC subcommittee meetings held.
- 5) Number and percent of activities/meetings that involve youth.
- 6) Annual report submitted to the Governor.
- 7) Number of programs using evidence based models.
- 8) Number and percent of JJAC members trained.

Outcomes:

- 1) Number and percent of plan recommendations implemented.
- 2) Number of FG-funded programs sustained after 3 years.
- 3) Number and percent of JJAC members show increased knowledge of their program areas (for which they have oversight).

Budget:

	<u>JJDP Funds</u>	<u>State/Local Private Funds</u>
FY08	\$30,000	\$0
FY09	\$0	\$0
FY10	\$0	\$0

ISSUE 7: PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM AREA 23 - PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION

Problem Statement:

Iowa continues to maintain a comprehensive system to administer JJDP Act related funding, provide fiscal oversight, and staff the JJAC and its related committees. "P and A" funding is critical to the maintenance of that system. **The allowable funding level for the "P and A" function is \$60,000.**

Program Goal:

To ensure that Iowa continues to comply with all JJDP Act core requirements and all federal administrative requirements while providing a mechanism for juvenile justice planning research and system improvement.

Program Objective – Administrative, Planning and Reporting Functions:

- A) To provide administrative, planning, and reporting functions required by the JJDP Act, which are beyond the state requirements of CJJP.

Activities and Service Plan – Administrative, Planning and Reporting Functions:

- Provide all necessary reports to OJJDP, including the annual monitoring report, the annual performance report, and the three-year plan annual updates.

Program Objective – System to Allocate Funds:

- B) Maintain a financial assistance mechanism to state agencies, local government and private non-profit organizations utilizing OJJDP formula funds to address the problems identified in our plan.

Activities and Service Plan – System to Allocate Funds:

- Maintain a system for allocating federal funds to state juvenile justice agencies and localities.
- Employ the present financial accounting system to ensure accurate and speedy records of financial transactions involving federal and state funds.

Program Objective – Staff Support to JJAC:

- C) To provide staff support to enable the State Advisory Group (JJAC) to function in an effective and efficient manner.

Activities and Service Plan – Staff Support to JJAC:

- Staff JJAC and JJAC Committee meetings including providing information for JJAC planning and oversight functions.
- Attend and participate in various state planning functions on behalf of the JJAC.

Program Objective – Research and Assessment:

- D) Assist system officials with various research and assessment activities.

Activities and Service Plan – Research and Assessment Activities

- Continue the existing planning, research, assessment, program development, technical assistance, and training capabilities.

Performance Measures CJJP will provide all measures as required by OJJDP via the DCTAT system.

Outputs:

- 1) FG funds awarded for planning and administration.
- 2) # of subgrants awarded.
- 3) Number of FTEs funded with FG\$.
- 4) Number of JJAC Committee and subcommittee meeting staffed.
- 5) Number of planning activities conducted.
- 6) Number and percent of program using evidence-based models.

Outcomes:

- 1) Number and percent of programs funded directly in line with the 3-year plan.
- 2) Number and percent of formula grant programs evaluated.
- 3) Average time from receipt of subgrant application to date of award.

Budget:

	<u>JJDPA Funds</u>	<u>State/Local Private Funds</u>
FY08	\$60,000	\$60,000
FY09	\$0	\$0
FY10	\$0	\$0