

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT JUDGES

JUVENILE SANCTIONS CENTER

TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

M O N O G R A P H I :

**PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT
AND
FUTURE INITIATIVES**



**NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT JUDGES**



Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention

Helping Communities Respond to Youth and Families in Need!

National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges

P.O. Box 8970

1041 North Virginia

Third Floor

Reno, NV 89557

775.784.6012 / fax 775.784.6628

www.ncjfcj.unr.org

Spring 2003

This project is supported by grant #2001-JI-BX-K001 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the Juvenile Sanctions Center and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Justice.

Introduction

Dear Colleagues:

The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges is proud to announce the successful completion of the first phases of service by its **Juvenile Sanctions Center** to the nations courts. The **Center** continues the Council's venerated sixty-six year tradition of excellence in education, training and technical assistance to advance the work of juvenile and family courts across the country.

Ten Demonstration Sites for graduated sanctions are already operational under this multi-year grant from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Lasting partnerships with distinguished colleagues at the national level have generated a new, highly responsible and cost-effective approach to planning for delinquent youth- including special needs offenders- at the local level. Principal partners in this endeavor are the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, the Developmental Services Group, and the research arm of NCJFCJ, the National Center for Juvenile Justice.

This Monograph: *The Juvenile Sanctions Center: The First Eighteen Months*, documents the planning and early operational phases of the project. During this period, subject matter emphasis was placed on Immediate and Intermediate Sanctions at the front end of the juvenile justice system. In succeeding years, the Juvenile Sanctions Center will expand its scope to include Secure Care and Reentry (Aftercare).

In keeping with the generative spirit of the National Council, several of its OJJDP-funded initiatives dovetail around the critical issue of graduated sanctions. The *Juvenile Court Guidelines for Reentry* will be used as a resource text during the next round of Juvenile Sanctions Center training, and the Juvenile Sanctions Center's annual *Monographs* will contribute to the relevant chapter of the *Delinquency Guidelines*, scheduled for publication in 2005.

While it would be premature to characterize the Juvenile Sanctions Center's first eighteen months of operation as exemplary of "best practices" in action planning and implementation, we are confident that the Demonstration Sites will serve as models for true collaboration and resource sharing in the interests of youth and families.

If this Monograph stimulates your interest in replicating the strategies described here, or if you have questions about joining forces with the growing family of Demonstration Sites, we encourage you to contact the Juvenile Sanctions Center directly. If you are already a Demonstration Site, we heartily congratulate you on the leadership you are providing to juvenile justice professionals in urban, suburban and rural jurisdictions in every region of the country!

Sincerely,

Hon. David Mitchell, Executive Director

and _____
David Gamble, Director Juvenile Sanctions Center

Table of Contents

1. Letter from the Executive Director	
2. Table of Contents	i
3. Executive Summary	ii
4. Introduction	1
5. Juvenile Sanctions Center Background and Project Start-up	2
Advisory Committee Policy Direction	
Launching the Project	
Regional Training Workshops	
Intensive Screening and Applicant Selection	
Interim Activities	
6. Training at Demonstration Sites	12
Training Curriculum and Planning Guide	
Training Evaluation and Future Faculty Development	
Interim Post-Training Activities	
7. Technical Assistance Delivery to Demonstration Sites.....	15
8. Next Steps	16
9. Preliminary Conclusions and Recommendations from Phases I and II	17
Appendices	22
Appendix A: Planning Matrix	
Appendix B: Team Members from Ten Demonstration Sites	

I. Executive Summary

While the term “graduated sanctions” generally implies the application of a continuum of calibrated responses to delinquent behavior at four sanctioning levels: immediate, intermediate, secure care and aftercare, Monograph I will focus on immediate and intermediate sanctions, and Monograph II will concentrate on secure care and aftercare.

Additionally, Monograph I covers program planning and implementation, from the time of the grant award to the completion of local Action Plans by the first ten Demonstration Sites, and the initiation of technical assistance to support plan implementation.

This document will set out the lessons learned during the first eighteen months of Juvenile Sanctions Center operation (Phases I and II of the multi-year project); articulate promising approaches, and offer recommendations to the field as future sites are established. Conclusions and preliminary recommendations are summarized below.

A. Summary Recommendations

The Juvenile Sanctions Center offers the following recommendations to future sites preparing to initiate a front-loaded juvenile sanctioning system. These recommendations are drawn from Phases I and II of the Graduated Sanctions Project (2001-2003), and will be supplemented in Monograph II:

1. Each participating jurisdiction should field a core team, led by a juvenile court judge. The core team should be capable of sustaining stable leadership throughout the planning and implementation phases of a Graduated Sanctions project.
2. The team should be balanced between systems and community representatives, and public and private service providers. Additional “stakeholders” (including the local business leaders, opinion makers, the media and the faith community) should be convened to provide input into and to promote broad participation in local needs assessment.
3. All modules of the Juvenile Sanctions Center’s training curriculum: **Graduated Sanctions for Juvenile Offenders: A Training Curriculum Guide** should be offered at all Demonstration Sites as a foundation for action planning. The planning publication: **Graduated Sanctions for Juvenile Offenders: A Program Model and Planning Guide** should be the primary reference source.
4. By the conclusion of each local training session, the core team should formulate its own Action Plan, based on locally identified needs and service gaps. Project goals should be substantially achievable during the first project year.
5. All elements of the Action Plan should be generated by training participants (with stakeholder input), to encourage local “ownership” of juvenile and family problems and proposed solutions.
6. The plan should include practical, cost efficient approaches to implementation that *do not rely on external funding*.

7. The plan should provide for reallocation of local resources and existing block grant funds.
8. The facilitated planning process should promote interagency collaboration, address intake barriers, funding streams, staff training, and a wraparound approach to service delivery.
9. The Juvenile Sanctions Center should maintain an informational web site and web based discussion group to foster technology transfer among participating sites.
10. The Juvenile Sanctions Center should provide continuing training and technical assistance targeted to assist the sites in achieving their identified goals within the specified timeframe.
11. The Juvenile Sanctions Center should prepare the sites to assist one another, both before and *after* the grant period concludes. Grantor may supplement and strengthen the process through its National Training and Technical Assistance Center.
12. During the implementation stage, a colloquium should be convened to bring Demonstration Sites together for purposes of sharing problem solving strategies.
13. Sites should be supported in the expansion of their efforts beyond the parameters of the Phase II Action Plan, as initial goals are achieved.
14. By the conclusion of the project, a continuum of graduated responses should be in place at all levels of graduated sanctioning.
15. By the conclusion of Phase III, in 2004, issues pertaining to secure custody and reentry should be addressed.
16. Impact evaluation should demonstrate the Graduated Sanctions Project's effect on detention and diversion rates, recidivism rate, and successful diversion, placement and treatment rates.

B. Uniqueness of the Project

The Juvenile Sanction Center's Graduated Sanctions Project is distinguishable from previous initiatives because:

- It relies on local competence to identify and address local issues.
- It facilitates (not directs) local action planning, and provides long-term support for project implementation.
- It requires extensive local cooperation in shifting or consolidating existing monies to support project completion.
- It is self-perpetuating and cost effective in that local leaders are trained provide cross-site technical assistance, and to mentor future teams in second and third generation sites.

C. Conclusion

During the 2003-'04 grant year, all four levels of graduated sanctions will be applied. In "out" years, additional Demonstration Sites will be added at the rate of 3-5 per year. It is expected that twenty sites will be operational by the conclusion of the project.

III. Introduction

This publication: **Monograph I** is presented by the Juvenile Sanctions Center (JSC) of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). The Center's partners in implementing the graduated sanctions initiative during the planning and early implementation phases of the project are: the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD), Oakland, CA; the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ), Pittsburgh, PA; and the Developmental Services Group, Inc. (DSG), Bethesda, MD.

The Juvenile Sanctions Center was established in the fall of 2001 to serve as the definitive site for training and technical assistance to selected graduated sanctions Demonstration Sites across the country. The products produced by the Center: the **Regional Training Curriculum**, the master **Training Curriculum Guide**, the **Program Model and Planning Guide**, the four **Technical Assistance Bulletins**, and this **Monograph** (which sets out both challenges and successes for practitioners) are designed to assist juvenile justice professionals and communities to establish preferred practices for working together in new ways. Success is contingent on acknowledgement that traditional interagency boundaries have posed often insurmountable barriers to seamless case planning in the graduated sanctions context, and widely shared commitment to step away from "business as usual" to share ideas, resources, funds and personnel where necessary.

This **Monograph** references all of the ground-breaking written deliverables produced during the first eighteen months of the grant, and draws preliminary inferences about preferred practices in planning and implementing graduated sanctions at the immediate and intermediate levels.

Monograph II will be published in 2004, at the conclusion of Phase III of the project. It will focus on secure care and aftercare (reentry), and will incorporate the findings and recommendations of the National Council's Reentry Project, which will conclude with the publication of a **Primer for the Establishment of a Juvenile Reentry Court** in 2003.

IV. Juvenile Sanctions Center Background and Project Start-up

The Juvenile Sanctions Center convened its first Advisory Committee¹ meeting on November 13, 2001. The Advisory Committee is a multi-disciplinary group, designed to model the diversity expected of the Demonstration Sites in constituting their local core planning teams and groups of stakeholders. The Committee consists of:

- Three Juvenile Court Judges representing small, mid-size and large courts in urban and rural jurisdictions
- Three private sector executives representing the principal project partners, and
- Representatives of the National District Attorneys Association (NDAA), the National Juvenile Court Services Association (NJCSA), the Youth Law Center, the Community Justice Institute and the Pacer Center.

The Advisory Committee agreed on the general policy direction and start-up process, and determined the expected outcomes for the project.

A. Advisory Committee Policy Direction

In terms of general policy direction, the Advisory Committee, Grant Monitor and Juvenile Sanctions Center staff determined that in order to build on the OJJDP Comprehensive Strategy movement of the 1990's, the Juvenile Sanctions Center should begin by focusing on the least developed segments of the graduated sanctions continuum: immediate and intermediate sanctions at the front end of the system. In this way, the Center could address the need to broaden diversion options and reduce the inappropriate detention and escalation of certain classes of special needs offenders: females, over-represented minorities, and youth with mental health and learning problems. Immediate sanctions were defined as those administered at, or beyond juvenile probation intake. Intermediate sanctions were determined to conclude prior to court-ordered commitment to institutional out-of-home placement in a state training school or long-term inpatient treatment facility.

B. Launching the Project

In terms of start-up process, the project partners allocated responsibility for production of the numerous written deliverables required of the Juvenile Sanctions Center², and determined to disseminate descriptive marketing materials to attract a national pool of applicants from which the Demonstration Sites would be selected.

¹ Advisory Committee members include: Judge Wadie Thomas, Omaha, NB, Chair, Christopher Baird, NCCD, Madison, WI, Alan Beckelman, DSG, Inc, Bethesda, MD, Judge Aundria Foster, Newport News, VA, Lili Garfinkel, Pace Center, Minneapolis, MN, Caren Harp, National District Attorneys Association, Alexandria, VA, Hunter Hurst, NCJJ, Pittsburgh, PA, Frank Jenson, National Juvenile Court Services Association, Lincoln NB, Sandra O'Brien, Community Justice Institute, Ft. Lauderdale, FL, Judge James Payne, Indianapolis, IN, David Roush, National Juvenile Detention Association, E. Lansing, MI, Mark Soler, Youth Law Center, Washington, D.C.

² Written deliverables included: A mini-training curriculum for Regional Workshop Participants; a Program Planning Guide; a complete Training Curriculum for the Demonstration Sites; four Technical Assistance Bulletins or Briefs; and this Monograph.

The Planning Team agreed to hold four Regional Training Workshops for purposes of:

- Convening potential applicants in teams led by Juvenile court judges
- Providing substantive training in graduated sanctions to all participants
- Identifying those four special needs populations covered by the grant
- Engaging participants in team building and joint problem solving
- Securing preliminary needs assessments from participating teams
- Explaining the training and technical assistance available to Demonstration Sites, and
- Soliciting applications from qualified teams

And finally, the Planning Team determined to extend its marketing approach to include publication in the Juvenile Justice Today Magazine, and presentations in no fewer than four national conferences in each succeeding year.

C. Regional Training Workshops

Operating on the Advisory Committee's 'fast track', the Juvenile Sanctions Center convened four Regional Training Workshops in the spring of 2002³. Nearly 400 individuals and 94 teams participated. The final applicant pool consisted of 62 of the 94 teams. Although limited scholarship funds were available to qualified participants, most jurisdictions fielded teams at local expense.

The Workshops provided the first opportunity for the Juvenile Sanctions Center and project partners to assess local capacity to assemble a balanced team, (consisting of juvenile justice system and community representatives, and led by a juvenile court judge). Each team was required to consist of three or more members, and most teams were substantially larger. Judicial leadership was demonstrated by the team's ability to galvanize local support even prior to participating in a Regional Workshop.

The Workshops also honed in on relative experience and proficiencies in local needs assessment, and for prioritization of the issues posed by special needs populations, as defined by the Juvenile Sanctions Center.

All of the judge-led teams were given to understand that the role of the Juvenile Sanctions Center was to provide training and technical assistance over a multi-year period, not to provide monetary resources. Participants were requested to submit applications within 30 days of the date of the Regional Training Workshop, and to include a projection of local training and technical assistance needs to support project implementation over a multi-year period.

As noted, approximately 2/3 of participating teams submitted timely applications through their respective juvenile court judges, with the support of the presiding judge.

³ Regional Workshop sites were: Washington, D.C., Orlando, FL, Reno, NV, and Houston, TX.

D. Applicant Selection

The Juvenile Sanctions Center, its Advisory Committee and project partners met in Washington D.C. to obtain Grantor approval for a rigorous, multi-tiered screening process. The process controlled for: geographical balance, diverse population demographics, size of jurisdiction, clarity of purpose, and feasibility of addressing identified needs. The Juvenile Sanctions Center also scrutinized applications for evidence of direct judicial leadership; for inclusivity in team composition, and for evidence of positive court/community interaction. The intention was to select urban, rural and mid-sized jurisdictions across the country, and to improve their immediate and intermediate sanctioning capacity and processes during Phase II of the project. In terms of feasibility, a balance was struck between high, medium and moderate needs sites to allow for compliance with project goals and timelines.

Additionally, the Juvenile Sanctions Center designed and fine-tuned a Scoring Key for initial applications, and issued supplemental questionnaires to applicants, soliciting more detailed analyses of local needs, and efforts already undertaken to address them. Also, during this intensive screening period, the Program Manager gave explicit direction regarding expansion of Core Teams, as needed. Team leaders designated local contact persons to expedite communication, and convened a juvenile probation officer; prosecutor; public defender; health, mental health, or social services representative; one or more school officials; and in many instances, one or more representatives of the faith community and law enforcement.

Prior to selection, the first ten Demonstration Sites were the subjects of intensive scrutiny by the Juvenile Sanctions Center, project Advisory Committee and project partners. The Juvenile Sanctions Center sorted applications by region, size, and level of need. Once sorted, applications were screened for:

1. Readiness to perform as a Demonstration Site (based on timely submission of a complete and thorough application)
2. Ability to accurately assess weaknesses or gaps in existing graduated sanctions services at the immediate and intermediate sanctioning levels
3. Ability to identify and address at least two of the four special needs populations covered by the grant
4. Ability to forge a multidisciplinary court-led team, and to galvanize broad local support for a graduated sanctions effort at the front end of the system
5. Ability to anticipate and articulate training and technical assistance needs to be supported by the Juvenile Sanctions Center
6. Evidence of existing coalitions within the jurisdiction, or among jurisdictions jointly applying to become Demonstration Sites
7. A track record of leadership and innovative juvenile justice strategies.

After the Juvenile Sanctions Center's initial sorting and screening processes (using an objective **Selection Scoring Assessment Scale**), applications were ranked within each region, to achieve geographical balance. Recommendations were reviewed by the project Advisory Committee, project partners and Grantor prior to selection.

All applicants expressed commitment to participate in project planning and implementation *without external funding*, and agreed to participate in all training and technical assistance offered by the Center.

All applicants were notified of their status, whether selected or not, during November 2002. All ten selected sites were trained by May 2003. The ten first-round Demonstration Sites are:

- Las Vegas, NV
- Missoula, MT
- La Grange, GA
- Omaha, NB
- Hartford, CT
- Nashville, TN
- Dayton, OH
- San Jose, CA
- St. Joseph, MO, and
- Newport News, VA

To put the process in a timeframe, Demonstration Sites were recruited and trained during Phases I and II, and Technical Assistance provided during the final quarter of Phase II, and the first quarter of Phase III (2003). During Phase III, a minimum of three additional sites will be identified, trained and provided with technical assistance.

During the final phase of the screening process, pre-selection site visits were made to the applicants who made the “final cut”. Each site visit involved the Juvenile Sanctions Center Director and Program Manager, and either an NCCD consultant or the Project Training Director. The primary purposes of the site visits were to verify applicant readiness for project participation and to test the validity of local needs assessment against direct observation. The ten sites listed *supra* were approved by the project Advisory Committee, project partners and Grantor in November 2002.

E. Interim Activities

Concurrent with the site selection process, written deliverables were prepared and published at the direction of the Juvenile Sanctions Center to support the training to be offered at each Demonstration Site. These consisted of the **Program Model and Planning Guide**, **Training Curriculum Guide** and four Technical Assistance Bulletins referenced earlier. The Technical Assistance Bulletins covered such topics as: an overview of graduated sanctions and the Juvenile Sanctions Center; Structured Decision Making; and School-based Probation and other promising and proven practices in juvenile sanctioning.

Also, during this interim period, local teams were expanded, and Core Team members completed a “visioning exercise” to prepare themselves for the rigors of action planning. The exercise required teams to articulate their broad vision, mission and measurable outcomes, and to reach preliminary consensus on at least five steps to achieve project goals and objectives.

V. Training at Demonstration Sites

Maintaining the brisk pace set during Phase I, the Juvenile Sanctions Center delivered the planning guide and curriculum, and conducted 2-3 days of structured training at each of the ten Demonstration Sites over a 3 month period. Some teams had expanded to 30 members, and the average number of local participants was 20. All sites achieved the broad goal of bridging the gap between juvenile justice system and community service providers, and most were able to secure active commitment from the faith and/or law enforcement communities and from the juvenile prosecutor's and public defender's offices. In several jurisdictions, victims of juvenile crime, or victims' advocates actively participated. In two jurisdictions, the media were included in both traditional and non-traditional roles, including as full participants in local action planning. In one jurisdiction, a planning consultant and a foundation trustee participated throughout a two-day training.

A. Training Curriculum

While the curriculum was structured to allow flexibility in the sequencing of modules, and in the emphasis placed on each according to its relevance to local goals, all sites participated in the following modules:

Module I: Background and Need for Graduated Sanctions

Providing an overview, background and context;
Definition of key terms (Immediate and Intermediate Sanctions) and role definition for participants

Module II: Leadership and Teambuilding

Building a shared understanding of contemporary leadership practices and dynamics; forming collaborative relationships and a shared sense of Team purpose

Module III: Juvenile Justice System/Community Partnerships

Exploring both principles and techniques for non-traditional system/community collaboration and demonstrating the link between collaboration and project success

Module IV: Special Needs Offenders

Identifying the needs of four special offender populations and best practices for meeting them in the graduated sanctions context

Module V: Planning for Systems Change

Preparing the team to produce its action plan; demonstrating the advantages of structured decision making and sound information management

Module VI: Implementation Issues and Action Planning

Producing the action plan and determining next Steps

The primary reference document used at each training session was the **Program Model and Planning Guide**. The **Guide** set out design specifications essential to a successful juvenile accountability-based sanctioning program at the immediate and intermediate sanctioning levels, and provided detailed implementation instructions. The preparation of the **Guide** was coordinated with that of the **Curriculum** to assure compatibility. The former publication included chapters on Promising and Proven Programs for Graduated Sanctions, Issues and Programs for Special Needs Populations, A Model Structured Decision Making System for Graduated Sanctions, and a section on Program Development and Implementation (Assessment, Planning and Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Resources). Of these, the chapters on Promising and Proven Programs and Special Needs Offenders were particularly well-received, due in part to the project's emphasis on increasing diversion options at the immediate sanctioning level, and reducing unnecessary or inappropriate detention of minority youth and other special needs populations. When special needs populations were discussed, both issues and successful interventions were described.⁴

B. Training Evaluation and Future Faculty Development

Each participant at each Demonstration Site was requested to complete a Participant Evaluation to determine the extent to which the training experience was linked to the initiation of a workable plan for change in the jurisdiction. The Evaluation included both objective and subjective questions (the latter calling for narrative comments and critique). Objective questions rated the clarity and relevance of each curriculum module. Subjective questions culled out participants' assessment of faculty (in terms of experience, quality of resource information, and ability to gain full participation in the interactive segments of the curriculum); the learning environment and the extent to which it supported successful delivery of the training; and suggested changes in content and process for future sites.

In terms of expected results of the training, participants were advised that they (as potential future faculty) were being evaluated by the Juvenile Sanctions Center in terms of the quality of their participation, understanding of and commitment to project goals, and potential interest in *pro bono* faculty service in training second-round Demonstration Sites during Phase III of the project.

While the Participant Evaluation was designed to measure immediate participant response to curriculum content, faculty and learning environment, it also set the stage for follow-up site visits to participating Demonstration Sites and for a generative role for participants through their own commitment to *pro bono* training and technology transfer to future "generations" of Demonstration Sites, teams and stakeholders.

⁴ See: *Female Offenders* (pp. 480-54), *Mental Health Issues* (pp. 55-59), *Substance Abusing Juvenile Offenders* (pp. 60-64), *Educational Disabilities and the Juvenile Justice System* (pp. 65-70), and *Minority Overrepresentation* (pp. 71-75).

C. Interim Post-Training Activities

At the conclusion of each training session, and prior to the initiation of Technical Assistance at the sites, team leaders and core team members were requested to refine and draft their Action Plan, circulate the draft to all participants for review, modification and approval; and deliver the completed plan to the Juvenile Sanctions Center within 30 days. Each Demonstration Site's Action Plan was then distilled to form an Action Planning Matrix, and the goals and objectives were used to frame a Memorandum Of Understanding to guide the delivery of future training and technical assistance. Additionally, the memoranda set performance standards for each site, maintaining the integrity of each local plan and confirming timeframes for completion of milestones.

The Action Planning Matrix⁵ displays key planning data for all ten of the first-round Demonstration Sites, and will serve as a convenient reference document for the Center, and for its project partners and technical assistance consultants and contractors during Phase III (2003-2004).

While Memoranda of Understanding set the course for the Demonstration Sites, project partners and other technical assistance providers are guided by an "Initial Assessment of Demonstration Sites for Implementation of Technical Assistance/Training". This document clarifies the roles and parameters for various Center service providers, and lays the groundwork for site assignments and service coordination during Phase III (2003-2004).

VI. Technical Assistance Delivery to Demonstration Sites

Technical Assistance consultants and contractors are selected by the Juvenile Sanctions Center, in consultation with the principal project partner, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD). Selections are based on subject matter expertise, and are made from a large consultant pool constituted by the principal project partners. Multiple consultants may be provided to each site, depending on the complexity of local goals and objectives, and on the independent progress made during the initial weeks and months following delivery of the Juvenile Sanction Center Curriculum and training. Most Action Plans include one or more of the following components:

- Initiation or improvement of *structured decision making* to assure fairness and objectivity, and to link delinquent youth to appropriate programs and services in a graduated sanctions continuum
- Expanded *diversion* options, including culturally competent and gender specific programs for special needs populations
- Reduction in *minority overrepresentation* at the front end of the juvenile justice system, particularly in secure detention

⁵ See Appendix A

- *Documentation* of existing programs and services at the immediate and intermediate sanctioning levels, and establishment of mechanisms for clearer and more consistent *communication* between collaborating agencies, across traditional policy and practice boundaries, and
- Improvement of the jurisdiction's *management information system* (MIS) to capture data and provide management reports that allow for improved decision making with respect to resource allocation. Data should justify the continuation, expansion, modification or elimination of existing graduated sanctions programs, and initiation of new ones, where indicated.

VII. Next Steps

As Phase II of the Juvenile Sanctions Center's Graduated Sanctions Project ends, and Phase III begins, technical assistance is underway to the first ten Demonstration Sites, and local efforts are in various stages of advancement. Only one urban site has reported significant setbacks due to staff turnover, leadership changes and early retirements. One other has requested a reasonable extension in start date, due to state budget impacts at the staffing and program levels.

Three new sites will be added during the 2003-2004 project year (Phase III), and the recruitment, selection and training cycle will begin again until a total of approximately twenty sites are operational at the conclusion of the multi-year project. All written deliverables will be supplemented with second volumes treating a broader interpretation of "graduated sanctions", to include secure care, reentry, reintegration and case termination. The Reentry Primer⁶ will become a principal educational resource, informing the development of a second generation planning guide and training curriculum.

VIII. Preliminary Conclusions and Recommendations from Phases I and II⁷

A retrospective look at the first eighteen months of Juvenile Sanctions Center operation suggests there are specific underlying assumptions that give rise to several unique approaches to juvenile sanctioning.

1. *Assumption*

The first underlying assumption is that the Demonstration Sites are capable of identifying and addressing their own problems and systems issues, and are willing to take ownership of them.

⁶ Developed under a separate OJJDP grant to the NCJFCJ.

⁷ Included in Executive Summary

Response

The Juvenile Sanctions Center provides facilitation rather than direction during the action planning process, and responds to requests for technical support during the implementation phase.

2. *Assumption:*

The juvenile justice system and its surrounding community (including public and private sector service providers) are capable of reducing or eliminating traditional barriers to communication and collaboration.

Response

The Juvenile Sanctions Center convenes the parties under judicial leadership, and builds effective working teams that engage in practical action planning.

3. *Assumption:*

Local jurisdictions are willing and able to shift or consolidate existing monies to support project completion.

Response:

The Juvenile Sanctions Center, from the outset, made it clear that the grant focused on provision of on-going training and technical assistance rather than external funding. A condition of participation was expressed willingness to work with existing funds, even in states experiencing severe budget cutbacks, and

4. *Assumption*

A graduated sanctions initiative can be self-perpetuating when local leaders mentor future “generations” of project participants, freely sharing challenges, successes and methods of addressing or achieving them.

Response

The Juvenile Sanctions Center provides various methods to promote cross-site training and web-based communication. It convenes intergenerational colloquia to demonstrate local projects; promote promising programmatic approaches, and avoid institutionalization of strategies that do not work.

Recommendations

At this juncture, recommendations may be considered preliminary, and primarily address start-up and early implementation approaches to juvenile graduated sanctioning at the immediate and intermediate levels. The recommendations offered here are suggested by winning strategies employed during the first eighteen months of a graduated sanctions initiative that was designed for an extended five year implementation period. As noted, Monograph II (2004) will set out recommendations pertaining to the full range of graduated sanctions: immediate, intermediate, secure care, aftercare/reentry, and case closure.

Preliminary recommendations are as follows:

1. Secure stable leadership, whenever possible, from project start-up to completion. At a minimum, the juvenile court judge should maintain continuing involvement and leadership of the core team.
2. The core team should have balanced representation, including the juvenile justice system, mental health, social services, education, victims or victim advocates, law enforcement, the public prosecutor and public defender, local service providers, and the faith community.
3. When gaps are identified in core team membership, they may be addressed by expanding the team, or if more practical, by convening key persons and groups as “stakeholders”, to advise the core team and review, support, and promulgate the team’s Action Plan. It is suggested that “stakeholders” include the county executive officer, a county commissioner, a state legislator, a member of the media, a foundation representative, parents and youth.
4. The Juvenile Sanctions Center’s curriculum: **Graduated Sanctions for Juvenile Offenders: A Training Curriculum Guide** should be offered at all Demonstration Sites. All modules of this highly interactive curriculum should be delivered, but the curriculum is flexible in terms of sequencing and emphasis. The text entitled: **Graduated Sanctions for Juvenile Offenders: A Program Model and Planning Guide** should be used as a reference document at each training session. Consistency in this regard assures that each site begins its work from the same information baseline, and sets out with its own Action Plan in hand.
5. The Action Plan should derive from shared community values regarding youth and families, and should express locally developed goals and objectives that can be achieved (or substantially achieved) during the first implementation year.
6. Within the graduated sanctions framework, all elements of the local Action Plan should be conceived by participants, rather than generated elsewhere. This encourages local “ownership” of juvenile and family problems and proposed solutions.
7. The Action Plan must not rely on new monies or external funding to support implementation.
8. The Plan may call for the consolidation or reallocation of local resources, block grants, private sector grants, and/or other funding streams.
9. The Juvenile Sanctions Center, through its training arm, should promote close interagency collaboration that addresses pre-existing problems (intake barriers, incompatible policies, program/service gaps), communications issues, cross-disciplinary training, and a wraparound approach to service delivery to youth and families.
10. To facilitate on-going communication among the Demonstration Sites, the Juvenile Sanctions Center should maintain an informational website, a structured online discussion group, a monthly newsletter, quarterly technical assistance bulletins, and updated planning guides, curricula and monographs.

11. The Juvenile Sanctions Center should provide continuing training and technical assistance responsive to the needs identified by each participating site. This support should assist the Demonstration Sites in achieving project goals and objectives within the timeframe established by the Grantor.
12. The graduated sanctions initiative should become self-perpetuating. To achieve that end, the Juvenile Sanctions Center should prepare participating jurisdictions to provide cross-site mentoring and technical assistance, *pro bono*, both before and *after* the grant period concludes.
13. The Juvenile Sanctions Center should annually convene a colloquium of the Demonstration Sites for purpose of demonstrating successes, and sharing strategies for overcoming obstacles. As a result, the sites can avoid institutionalization of unworkable approaches.
14. The Juvenile Sanctions Center should support Demonstration Sites in expanding their efforts beyond those anticipated by their Action Plans. As initial goals and objectives are achieved, new ones should be established in a natural progression from specific problem solving to full implementation of graduated sanctions.
15. By the conclusion of this multi-year graduated sanctions initiative, a continuum of graduated responses to delinquent behavior should be in place. All programming should be responsive to special needs offenders, and should demonstrate cultural competence. Sufficient gender-specific programming should be available to female offenders.
16. By the conclusion of Phase III of the Graduated Sanctions project, issues pertaining to secure custody, institutionalization, reentry, aftercare and case closure should be addressed, completing the four levels of graduated sanctioning at each Demonstration Site.
17. Each site should be prepared for impact evaluation at the conclusion of grant funding. Impact evaluation should demonstrate the project's effect on the overall juvenile crime rate in participating jurisdictions, the reduction in detention rates and corresponding increase in diversion rates for special needs offenders, including minority youth, female offenders, and youth with mental health and learning problems. Additionally, evaluation should reveal a reduction in recidivism and an increase in successful case outcomes.

For purposes of accountability, Grantor requires impact, as well as process evaluation of current grants. It is critical, especially in an era of diminished resources and increasing fiscal constraints, to demonstrate that investments in systems change produce expected results. This promotes increasing reliance on local jurisdictions to articulate their own issues and needs, and to guide the planning process for addressing them. The Graduated Sanctions Center suggests that this approach is not only workable, but is *preferable*.

Preliminary recommendations will be reviewed and modified, as needed, in Monograph II, to be published in 2004.

APPENDICES

A. Demonstration Site Matrix

B. Team Leader Directory

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT JUDGES

Juvenile Sanctions Center Demonstration Site Matrix • 2003

Clark County / Las Vegas, Nevada

Vision	Mission Statement	Action Plan	Anticipated Training / T.A.
<p>To be a national model that will provide an exemplary array of graduated sanctions for delinquent youth that takes into account community safety and special needs of individual youthful offenders.</p>	<p>To reduce juvenile crime by providing a planned continuum of responses to delinquent behavior that will include treatment, rehabilitation, accountability, victim services, and sanctions while not compromising community safety.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop resources as alternatives to detention. 2. Identify mental health providers in the community and state agencies with training to work with special needs offenders. 3. Develop plan by which staff is familiarized with graduated sanctions programming in order to accomplish consensus on participation. 4. Reallocation of funds to accomplish the above goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult on structured decision making • Consult on detention removal & population reduction. • Consult on development of mental health services & evaluation of providers. • Training for community stakeholders, key decision makers, staff & judiciary on Graduated Sanctions. • Consult on staff and resource reallocation to result in program enhancement.

Montgomery County / Dayton, Ohio

<p>Our children deserve a community where children and their families are valued and have access to needed resources.</p>	<p>To evaluate delinquent youth who come in contact with the courts and provide ongoing restorative programming that meets the needs of the youth and the needs of the community</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Give female offenders every opportunity to succeed. 2. Ensure the prompt delivery of appropriate mental health services to our youth and families. 3. Improve collaboration between court and community to provide better services to youth and families. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult on gender specific program development. • Consult on development of mental health services & evaluation of providers. • Training programs for community stakeholders and key decision makers.
---	--	--	---

Note/Key: Memoranda of Understanding are being negotiated with each Site based on the anticipated amounts of training and technical assistance required.

The Vision Statement, Mission Statement and Action Plan descriptions are all taken from Action Plan materials drafted by the Demonstration Site Team in their JSC training sessions.

The Anticipated Training and Technical Assistance descriptions list the current estimate of the topics to which training and Technical Assistance will be directed to each site.

4th Judicial District / Missoula, Montana

Vision	Mission Statement	Action Plan	Anticipated Training / T.A.
<p>Early intervention and graduated sanctions will result in a better use of limited resources and positive outcomes for youth, their families, community and victims.</p>	<p>To refine the continuum of services in juvenile sanctioning within our community by paying particular heed to youth with mental health issues, female offenders, and minority over representation issues which pose problems for the juvenile justice system. We will develop an action plan for addressing those issues.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify services, programs and service gaps; broadly disseminate information to the community; increase collaboration and information sharing among all service providers; and shorten delays between referrals and service delivery. 2. Coordinate/blend fiscal and other resources among youth-serving agencies; review financial eligibility requirements for service; and handle cases at the appropriate service level. 3. Conduct earlier assessments targeted to youth with mental health needs and other special needs offenders to reduce placements in detention. 4. Direct service delivery to the needs of the entire family, not just the youthful offender. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training for community, stakeholders & key decision makers. • Consult on staff & resource reallocation to result in program enhancement. • Consult on structured decision making. • Consult on development of mental health services & evaluation of providers. • Consult on creation of juvenile & family services with emphasis on special need offenders. • Consult on detention removal.

Hartford, Connecticut

<p>The future lies in the hands of all children, who as an integral part of our community are entitled to be nurtured, supported, and guided to their full potential. Building and sustaining collaborations between local, state, and community agencies will achieve diversion, reduction in recidivism, and safe communities.</p>	<p>The mission of a system of graduated sanctions is to put into place a continuum of services for children and families based on state, local, and community agency collaboration that will achieve diversion, reduce recidivism, and promote safer communities.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify programs available for Special Needs Offenders. 2. Reduce the length of stay and use of detention for Special Needs Offenders. 3. Promote professional communication through education and training. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult on creation of juvenile & Family services with emphasis on special needs offenders. • Consult on detention removal & population reduction. • Training for community, stakeholders, staff, judiciary & key decision makers.
--	---	--	--

Nashville / Franklin, Tennessee

Vision	Mission Statement	Action Plan	Anticipated Training / T.A.
<p>Every child can be a success and deserves services that will help them to be a productive citizen. They have the right to access these services in response to need and level of risk.</p>	<p>Through partnerships among agencies, supporting children and families, our mission is to develop and maintain a consistent and fair system of immediate and intermediate sanctions. These sanctions are to be accessed at the earliest intervention level, thereby keeping children in the community while keeping the community safe.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct a survey to determine services available and sanctions currently in use. 2. Evaluate, improve and train on current risk/needs assessment efforts 3. Develop and improve interagency communications systems and build a juvenile sanctions coalition 4. Build resources based on identified gaps in services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training for community, stakeholders, staff, judiciary, and key decision makers on graduated sanctions. • Consult on structured decision making. • Consult on creation of juvenile & family services with emphasis on special needs offenders. • Consult on staff & resource reallocation to result in program enhancement.

Newport News, Virginia

<p>To create and maintain a comprehensive continuum of graduated sanctions programs and services for delinquent youth and their families in the City of Newport News, Virginia.</p>	<p>We believe in the development of a collaborative support system that utilizes a holistic approach for the treatment and supervision of youth while promoting positive developmental assets. We believe this support system should emphasize the accurate assessment and effective addressing of problems experienced by the youth and family at the least intrusive level of the system. We believe this support system should empower families, assist youth in achieving their full potential in becoming self sufficient and productive citizens, and should focus on special needs populations while maintaining community safety.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To create a policy that facilitates the efficient, effective, and equitable application of graduated sanctions programming for all youth to include special needs populations. 2. To develop and implement a system-wide integrated information management system. 3. To identify and provide appropriate graduated sanctions programming for youth to include special needs populations, and reduce reliance on secure detention while maintaining community safety and re-enforcing youth accountability. 4. To develop and uniformly utilize a comprehensive standard assessment instrument that identifies family and child risks and needs to aid in structured decision making at crucial points in the juvenile justice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training for community, stakeholders, staff, judiciary, and key decision makers on graduated sanctions. • Consult on MIS development. • Consult on creation of juvenile & family services with emphasis on special needs offenders. • Consult on detention removal & population reduction. • Consult on structured decision making.
---	---	--	---

Santa Clara County / San Jose, California

Vision	Mission Statement	Action Plan	Anticipated Training / T.A.
<p>We believe we have the power to help young people (youthful offenders) become contributing, engaged members of society.</p>	<p>The juvenile justice system and its partners will use their resources to deliver fair and effective decision-making for our Santa Clara County community.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Needs Assessment – Build consensus around effective Risk Assessment tools that are comprehensive and encompass a holistic view of the juvenile that can be used to develop immediate and intermediate sanctions. 2. Gaps Analysis – within 45 days analyze gaps from community, child & systems standpoints. 3. Education of community – Work with providers, Board of Supervisors, et. Al. to demonstrate effects of graduated sanctions. 4. Develop an effective plan to make systematic changes to appropriately meet the unique needs of female offenders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult on structured decision making. • Consult on creation of juvenile & family services with emphasis on special needs offenders. • Training for community stakeholders, staff, judiciary and key decision makers on graduated sanctions. • Consult on gender specific program development.

St. Joseph, Missouri

<p>We believe all youth are valuable and worthwhile and that it is important to empower youth and families to be responsible and accountable to self and to their community through a system of graduated sanctions.</p>	<p>Through a system of graduated sanctions, youth and families will be provided a continuum of assessments and evaluative services designed with increasing intensity to connect behaviors with interventions, restoration to victims and develop opportunities for accountability. Therefore reducing or eliminating the need for future interventions and services, reconciling youth, families and communities.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Education of the community regarding graduated sanctions. 2. To create strong, resilient, productive girls by building an array of adolescent female services. 3. To connect youth and families with mental health services pre and post petition. 4. Establish a culturally competent service delivery program. 5. Develop a probation in schools program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training for community, stakeholders, staff, and judiciary and key decision makers on graduated sanctions. • Consult on gender specific program development. • Consult on development of mental health services & evaluation of providers. • Consult on cultural competence development across a broad range of programs. • Consult on probation in schools program development.
--	--	---	--

Troup County / LaGrange, Georgia

Vision	Mission Statement	Action Plan	Anticipated Training / T.A.
<p>We believe that all at-risk youth of Troup County, regardless of race, ethnicity or gender, are valuable individuals who, with the full utilization of community resources, have the potential to develop into productive contributors to society with a legacy of loving families, safe neighborhoods and a strong and united community.</p>	<p>Our mission as a collaborative network is to ensure that every youth who comes within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court receives, preferably in the community, the level of intervention and services appropriate to meet their individuals needs, in a timely and on-going manner, based on objective assessment criteria, to reduce delinquency, ensure community safety and create a culture within the community to condition every youth for success.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To establish immediate and ongoing mutual education and information sharing regarding the at-risk youth of Troup County to interested stakeholders and to the community at large. 2. To develop and implement a training program for mentors and other volunteers, who will be involved in multi-dimensional services provided to at-risk delinquent youth and their families. 3. To develop emergency shelter services after surveying existing resources and meeting with stakeholders. 4. To fill identified gaps in services regarding interdisciplinary assessment, mentoring program and transportation services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training for community stakeholders, key decision makers, staff and volunteers on graduated sanctions. • Consult on creation of juvenile and family services with emphasis on special needs offenders. • Consult on detention removal and population reduction. • Consult on staff and resource reallocation to result in program enhancement.

Douglas County / Omaha, Nebraska

<p>A safe community that supports every child and family's capacity to learn, grow and become productive citizens when provided essential opportunities and nurturing in the context of community safety.</p>	<p>To create and maintain or identify and enhance partnerships and comprehensive support and accountability systems that focus on youth and families that are collaborative, strength-based, and culturally competent, and conducted with a timely integrated approach driven by individualized risk and needs assessment.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comprehensive assessment, which will facilitate diversion of all juvenile offenders from the detention and juvenile system. 2. Reduce detention population by impacting overcrowding and reducing the length of stay. Increase services for special needs offenders. 3. Parental involvement and accountability; education and public awareness of the juvenile system; improve and strengthen interagency collaboration and communication. 4. Establish a culturally competent service delivery program. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult on structured decision making. • Consult on detention removal & population reduction with emphasis on special needs offender population. • Training for community, stakeholders, staff, judiciary and key decision makers on graduated sanctions. • Consult on cultural competence development across a broad range of programs.
---	--	---	---

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT JUDGES

JUVENILE SANCTIONS CENTER

Demonstration Site Team Leader Directory

2003



Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention

**JUVENILE SANCTIONS CENTER
STAFF**

M. James Toner, Dean, NCJFCJ
J.toner@ncjfcj.org
775.784.1960

David J. Gamble, Project Director
dgamble@ncjfcj.org
775.784.6631

David E. Humke, Project Attorney
dhumke@ncjfcj.org
775.784.6907

Catherine S. Lowe, Training Director
c.s.lowe@worldnet.att.net
775.322.1306

Joey, Binard, Technical Assistance Manager
jbinard@ncjfcj.org
775.784.1665

Mary Scott, Project Coordinator
mescott@ncjfcj.org
775.784.6811

Executive Director
Judge David B. Mitchell
dmitchell@ncjfcj.org
775.784.6012

**JUVENILE SANCTIONS CENTER
PARTNERS**

Alan Bekelman
Development Services Group, Inc.
Bethesda, MD
abekelman@dsgonline.com
301.951.0056

Robert DeComo
National Center on Crime and Delinquency
Indianapolis, IN
DeComo@aol.com
317.570.8416

E. Hunter Hurst, III
National Center for Juvenile Justice
Pittsburg, PA
Hurst3@ncjj.org
412.227.6950

Program Manager
Thomas Murphy
OJJDP
murphyt@ojp.usdoj.gov
202.353.8734



Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention



**NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT JUDGES**

San Jose CALIFORNIA

Team Leader:

Judge Raymond Davilla

Supervising Judge, Juvenile Delinquency
Division
191 North First St.
San Jose, CA 95110
408.299.4740
FAX: 408.808.6291
rdavilla@sct.co.santa-clara.ca.us

Jerry Neary

Deputy Chief Probation Officer
Probation Services
Jerry.Neary@jpd.co.santa-clara.ca.us

Hartford CONNECTICUT

Team Leader:

Judge Michael Mack

Superior Court for Juvenile Matters at
Willimantic
81 Columbia Avenue
Willimantic, CT 06226
860.456.5700
FAX: 860.456.5702
Michael.Mack@Jud.State.Ct.Us

Team Leader:

Joel C. Riley

Program Manager
Juvenile Services
CSSD Operations
2275 Silas Deane Highway
Rocky Hill, CT 06067
860.529.1316
FAX: 860.721.9474

LaGrange GEORGIA

Team Leader:

Judge R. Michael Key

Troup County Juvenile Court
308 Ridley Avenue
LaGrange, GA 30240
Michael@kmglawfirm.com

St. Joseph MISSOURI

Team Leader:

Judge Dan Kellogg

Buchanan County Juvenile Court
411 Jules
St. Joseph, MO 64501
816.271.1477

Team Contact:

Chad Campbell

Chief Juvenile Officer
Buchanan County Juvenile Office
411 Jules
St. Joseph, MO 64501
816.271.1421
FAX: 816.271.1566
Chad_Campbell@OSCA.St.Mo.US

Missoula MONTANA

Judge John W. Larson

District Court Judge
200 W. Broadway
Missoula, MT 59802
406.523.4773
FAX: 406.523.4739
jl Larson@co.missoula.mt.us

Missoula MONTANA (contd.)

Team Contact:

Brenda C. Desmond
Standing Master
bdesmond@co.missoula.mt.us

Omaha NEBRASKA

Team Leader:

Judge Wadie Thomas, Jr.
Juvenile Court Judge
600 Hall of Justice
Omaha, NE 68183
402.444.7889
FAX: 402.444.3444
wthomas@co.douglas.ne.us

Las Vegas NEVADA

Team Leader:

Judge Dianne Steele
Presiding District Judge
Eighth Judicial District Court
Family Division
601 North Pecos Rd.
Las Vegas, NV 89101-2408
702.455.6940
FAX: 702.455.2394
steeldi@co.clark.nv.us

Team Contact:

Beth Marek
Assistant Manager, Juvenile Probation
601 N. Pecos Rd.
Las Vegas, NV 89101
702.455.5290
FAX: 702.455.5454
marekb@co.clark.nv.us

Dayton OHIO

Team Leader:

Judge Michael Murphy
Administrative Judge
303 W. Second St.
Dayton, OH 45426
937.225.4780
FAX: 937.496.7843
murphym@montcnty.org

Team Contact:

David Lyons
Director, Probation Services
Montgomery Co. Juv. Court
Lyonsd@mcoho.org
Susan Melvin
Grants Coordinator/Planner
MCJC
melvins@mcoho.org

Nashville/Franklin TENNESSEE

Team Leaders:

Referee Mike O'Neil
Davidson County Referee
100 Woodland St.
Nashville, TN 37213
615.862.8000
Michael.ONeil@jjs.nashville.org

Referee Robbie Beal
Williamson County Referee
615.790.5812

Newport News VIRGINIA

Team Leader:

Judge Aundria D. Foster

Chief Judge, Newport News Juvenile and

Domestic Relations Court

2501 Huntington Avenue

Newport News, VA 23607

757.926.3628

FAX: 757.926.3598

AFoster@Courts.State.Va.Us

Team Contact:

Sheena Christian-Howard

Program Administrator – DOJJ

Schristian-howard@nngov.com



Publications from Juvenile Sanctions Center

The following publications are available from the Juvenile Sanctions Center:

Bulletins:

- Training and Technical Assistance Bulletin
“Introducing the New Juvenile Sanctions Center”
Vol. 1 No. 1, 2002
- Training and Technical Assistance Bulletin
“Structured Decision Making For Graduated Sanctions”
Vol. 1 No. 2, 2002
- Training and Technical Assistance Bulletin
“School-Based Probation: An Approach Worth Considering”
Vol. 1 No. 3, 2003
- Training and Technical Assistance Bulletin
“Promising Sanctioning Programs in a Graduated System”
Vol. 1 No. 4, 2003

Training Manuals:

- Graduated Sanctions for Juvenile Offenders: A Training Curriculum Guide 2003
- Graduated Sanctions for Juvenile Offenders: A Program Model and Planning Guide 2003

Newsletters:

- First Monday

To obtain copies, call or write:

Juvenile Sanctions Center
National Council of Juvenile and
Family Court Judges
1041 No. Virginia Street 3rd Floor
Reno, NV 89557
775. 784.6012 • FAX: 775.784.6628
E-mail: Mescott@ncjfcj.org
Website: Ncjfcj.org • E-mail: JSC@ncjfcj.org

JUVENILE SANCTIONS CENTER



NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT JUDGES

P.O. Box 8970
Reno, Nevada 89507

OJJDP

Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention