South Dakota Juvenile Justice Reinvestment Initiative Work Group

• Goals
  – Increase public safety by improving outcomes of youth and families and reducing juvenile recidivism.
  – Effectively hold juvenile offenders more accountable.
  – Reduce juvenile justice costs by investing in proven community based practices, preserving our residential facilities for serious offenders.

• The Work Group will not address:
  – Issues having to do with youth, or offenses, that result in a charge or transfer to the adult criminal justice system
  – The root causes of juvenile delinquency and federal legislation concerning the juvenile system, including the Indian Child Welfare Act.
Bipartisan, Inter-branch Process

1. Goal Setting
2. Data Analysis/System Assessment
3. Policy Development
4. Consensus Building

Stakeholder Engagement

DATA: KEY TAKEAWAYS AND DISCUSSION
Violent arrest rates are lower than the US rate, but property, drug abuse, and liquor law violation arrest rates are higher. Commitment rate is 188% higher than the US average.

![Graph showing comparison between United States and South Dakota in Violent Crime Index, Property Crime Index, Drug abuse violations, Liquor laws, and Commitment Rate.]


9 of the top 10 arrest offenses account for 77% of all FY13 arrests, and are non-violent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 10 Arrest Offenses</th>
<th>Number Arrested (Percentage of Total Arrests)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Law Violations</td>
<td>1147 (20.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/Narcotic Violations</td>
<td>828 (14.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Group B Offenses</td>
<td>661 (11.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>523 (9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Assault</td>
<td>411 (7.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaway</td>
<td>355 (6.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Conduct</td>
<td>248 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction/Damage/Vandalism of Property</td>
<td>211 (3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curfew/Loitering/Vagrancy Violations</td>
<td>173 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Offenses, Nonviolent</td>
<td>128 (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Crime in South Dakota 2013
Key Takeaways: Arrests

- Violent crime arrest rate is below the national average.
- Property crime, drug abuse violation and liquor law violation arrest rates are all above the national rates.
- Commitment rate is 188% above the US rate.

UJS Data: Probation Dispositions
24% fewer youth sent to Probation from FY04 to FY13, and 47% fewer were put on Case Services Monitoring.

There is a growing proportion of new probationers placed on low supervision.
A growing proportion of youth are coming onto Probation for misdemeanor offenses.

Length of time spent on Probation has increased by 2 months.
Youth are staying longer on Probation regardless of the degree of offense – CHINS up 37%, felony up 18%, misdemeanor up 35%.

Length of Time on Probation by Offense Class, 2005 & 2013

Length of time on Probation rose across all Circuits, with the largest increases in the 2nd Circuit (71%) and the 6th Circuit (44%).

Time on Probation for Youth Released by Circuit, 2005 & 2013
The size of the Probation population on June 3rd each year has changed little (-1%), and Case Services Monitoring has increased by 29%.

There is a growing share of misdemeanants in the Probation population.
Key Takeaways: UJS

• New admissions to probation have decreased in the last 10 years.
• During the same period, the proportion of admissions for misdemeanor offenses grew, as did the share of new probationers supervised at low levels.
• Despite this shift toward lower supervision intensity and more misdemeanor youth, the length of time spent on probation increased by two months.
• The probation population is virtually unchanged since 2005: declining admissions were offset by increasing length of supervision.

DOC Data: Commitments
Commitments to DOC have declined 20% in the last decade.

*Does not include youth re-committed on aftercare violations. Only includes those youth with a new commitment to the DOC.

17.6% of youth committed to the DOC in FY13 were 14 or younger.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at Admission</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and over</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Misdemeanors, CHINS and lower level violations make up 70% of commitments.

Youth Committed to the DOC, 2013

- Prob. Viol. DNA Not Required: 22%
- Prob. Viol. DNA Required: 5%
- CHINS: 5%
- NA: 1%
- Felony: 24%
- Misdemeanor: 43%

Over the past decade, the percentages of youth committed to DOC for drugs and persons/sex offenses have increased.

2004 Admissions for New Offense

- Property: 39%
- Drug: 13%
- Persons/ Sex: 19%
- Other: 15%
- Alc/PO/Esc: 14%

2013 Admissions for New Offense

- Property: 26%
- Drug: 28%
- Persons/ Sex: 26%
- Other: 8%
- Alc/PO/E: 12%

“Alc/PO/Esc” is a grouped category of liquor law violations, public order offenses and escapes.

“Other” in 2004 this included 90% CHINS and 4 conversions. In 2013 this included 12 CHINS, 2 purchasing alcohol, and 3 aiding, abetting or advising.
9 of the top 10 offenses are misdemeanors, Probation violations or CHINS.

### Top 10 Offenses of 2013 Commitments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation Violation</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>(26.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of Marijuana &lt;2oz</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(8.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Assault (1st or 2nd Offense)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingesting an Illegal Substance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Theft</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary 3rd Unlawful Entry Unoccupied</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingesting Substance, Not Alcohol</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Entry of MV</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage to Property 2nd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(2.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, the total length of commitment has increased.
On average, the length of time out-of-home has increased by 27%.

Felons, misdemeanants and CHINS all spend similar amounts of time out-of-home.
Lengths of stay have increased for In-State DOC-paid and Out-of-State DOC-paid placement.

Average Number of Months Youth Spent in Each Placement Type During Commitment

73% of the DOC population on 6/30/14 had been committed for misdemeanors, CHINS or lower level Probation violations.
More than three quarters of commitments are nonviolent or a Probation violation.

7 of the top 10 offenses of the DOC population on 6/30/14 are misdemeanors, Probation violations and CHINS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 10 offenses for all youth committed</th>
<th>Number of youth in DOC on 6/30/14 (% of total)</th>
<th>Mean LOS of 2013 releases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation Violation</td>
<td>152 (24.9%)</td>
<td>7 months (n=51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Assault (1st/2nd offs.)</td>
<td>51 (8.3%)</td>
<td>22 months (n=26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possess Marijuana &lt;2oz</td>
<td>43 (7%)</td>
<td>9 months (n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINS</td>
<td>35 (5.7%)</td>
<td>15 months (n=31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Theft</td>
<td>31 (5.1%)</td>
<td>16 months (n=22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary 3rd</td>
<td>19 (3.1%)</td>
<td>11 months (n=21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight-Escape</td>
<td>17 (2.8%)</td>
<td>7 months (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Theft</td>
<td>17 (2.8%)</td>
<td>16 months (n=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Contact offr. &lt;16</td>
<td>16 (2.6%)</td>
<td>14 months (n=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Damage 3rd</td>
<td>15 (2.5%)</td>
<td>23 months (n=3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOC juvenile recidivism has trended down since 2005

Includes: Revocation of aftercare as a result of a new offense or a violation of the supervision, a commitment to the DOC on new charges after supervision has ended, a remand to DOC for a new adjudication while under DOC juvenile custody, or a return to DOC custody as an adult on a conviction resulting in an admission to prison.

Source: South Dakota DOC Juvenile Recidivism Summary Report 2012

Key Takeaways: DOC

- Over the last decade, commitments to DOC fell 20%.

- A majority is committed for lower level, non-violent offenses.
  - In 2013, 7 of every 10 commitments were for misdemeanors, probation violations with underlying CHINS or misdemeanor charges, or CHINS.
  - 2/3 of commitments were for drug, property or public order offenses.

- More than ¼ of commitments in 2013 were for probation violations.

- The length of time in out-of-home placement has increased.
  - CHINS, misdemeanants and felons released in 2013 spent similar periods of time out-of-home (between 15-19 months, on average).
Key Takeaways: DOC

- Nearly ¾ of the DOC population on 6/30/14 had been committed for a misdemeanor, probation violation with an underlying CHINS violation or misdemeanor charge, or CHINS.
  - Top 5 offenses in the DOC population (accounting for 50% of all youth) are probation violation; misdemeanor simple assault, marijuana possession, petty theft; and CHINS.

- 45% of discharged youth come back to DOC within 3 years.
Key Research Areas

- Risk and Needs Assessment Tools
- Case Management and Treatment Planning
- Programming, Services and Incentives Structures
- Additional Evidence-Based Tools in Decision-Making
- Out of Home Placement and Length of Stay

Principle 1: Use validated risk and needs assessment tools

- Risk assessment instruments in juvenile justice can reliably differentiate lower risk offenders from higher risk offenders.
Key terms:

- Risk factors are variables associated with an increased likelihood of delinquency or criminal behavior.
  - **Static risk**: unchangeable/historical factors (e.g., age at first offense, history of violence, history of supervision failure)
  - **Needs**: potentially changeable factors that if targeted and addressed should reduce the risk to reoffend (e.g., low self control, antisocial attitudes, substance abuse problems, delinquent peers)

Research: Numerous studies have demonstrated that validated risk assessments accurately differentiate between high-, medium- and low-risk offenders.

South Dakota’s Alignment with Research Principle 1

• UJS and DOC employ the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI).
• Both UJS and DOC have engaged in validation studies in the past.

Key Research Areas

• Risk and Needs Assessment Tools
• Case Management and Treatment Planning
• Programming, Services and Incentives Structures
• Additional Evidence-Based Tools in Decision-Making
• Out of Home Placement and Length of Stay
Case Management and Treatment Planning: Principles

2. Match placement, supervision, and treatment to the juvenile offender’s risk and needs

3. Supervision that includes treatment or services is more effective than relying on sanctions alone

Principle 2: Match Placement, Supervision, and Treatment to the Juvenile Offender’s Risk and Needs

• Appropriately matching supervision and treatment to a youth’s risk level and needs results in a lower likelihood of future delinquent or criminal behavior.
**Research:** Correctional interventions for juveniles have their greatest public safety impact when delivered to higher-risk offenders.

![Bar chart showing mean effect size for high risk and low risk groups. High risk group has a mean effect size of 0.12, while the low risk group has a mean effect size of 0.03.](chart)


**Research:** A meta-analysis of 134 primary studies found that targeting needs has a greater effect on reducing recidivism.

![Bar chart showing mean effect size for adhering to need principle and not adhering. Adhering has a mean effect size of 0.22, while not adhering has a mean effect size of -0.01.](chart)

**Research:** One recent study found that a poor match of services to needs was associated with greater levels of reoffending.

![Graph showing probability of reoffending by match level](image)


---

**South Dakota’s Alignment with Research Principle 2**

- UJS identifies the risk levels and needs of probationers and uses that information to determine level of supervision and in case planning.
- DOC identifies the risk levels and needs of youth in their care and uses that information in making recommendations for placement, determining aftercare supervision levels, and for case planning during placement and in aftercare.
- Multiple stakeholder groups had concerns that youth are not necessarily able to access services that meet their needs when they need them.
- It is unclear to what extent SD matches treatment to youth needs and focuses its treatment resources on higher risk youth.
Case Management and Treatment Planning: Research Principles

2. Match placement, supervision, and treatment to the juvenile offender’s risk and needs

3. Supervision that includes treatment or services is more effective than relying on sanctions alone

Principle 3: Supervision that includes treatment or services is more effective than relying on sanctions alone

- Juvenile justice approaches based on therapeutic programs are more effective at preventing reoffending than those based solely on deterrence
  - The impact is greatest where the risk and needs principles are followed and services are implemented with fidelity.
**Research:** A meta-analysis of 548 primary studies found that programs taking a therapeutic approach have the greatest effect on reducing recidivism.

Mean Effects on Recidivism for the Major Intervention Approaches


---

**South Dakota’s Alignment with Research Principle 3**

- UJS expenditures for therapeutic interventions have declined in recent years.
- UJS provided community based services to 160 youth and home based services to 78 youth in FY14.
- The number of probationers receiving services paid for by an entity other than UJS is unknown.
- Stakeholders believe judges and CSOs need more services and more access to surveillance tools.
South Dakota’s Alignment with Research Principle 3 cont.

- STAR Academy provides multiple therapeutic interventions.
- DOC’s contracted residential programs also include therapeutic treatment or services.
- DOC spent $333,000 in FY14 for services for youth in aftercare, some of which are therapeutic in nature.
- DSS pays for chemical dependency services for youth on aftercare.
- Outpatient mental health treatment for youth on aftercare is largely covered by Medicaid.

Key Research Areas

- Risk and Needs Assessment Tools
- Case Management and Treatment Planning
- Programming, Services and Incentives Structures
- Additional Evidence-Based Tools in Decision-Making
- Out of Home Placement and Length of Stay
Programming, Services and Incentive Structures: Research Principles

4. Utilize evidence-based programs to reduce recidivism and delinquent behavior

5. Improve the implementation, delivery, and quality characteristics of programs

6. Align fiscal incentives

Principle 4: Utilize evidence-based programs to reduce recidivism and delinquent behavior

- Research has identified a variety of programs and practices that have been proven to reduce juvenile recidivism and have a significant return on investment.
- Evaluations have also demonstrated programs or practices that do harm and increase recidivism.
Proven Programs

- Multiple catalogs or clearinghouses include programs and strategies demonstrated by research to reduce recidivism for juvenile justice populations, such as:
  - National Institute of Justice CrimeSolutions.gov
  - Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Model Programs Guide
  - Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development
  - Washington State Institute for Public Policy

![Cost-Benefits Analysis of Evidence-Based Programs](image)

Cost-Benefits Analysis of Evidence-Based Programs
(Based on Research from the Washington State Institute for Public Policy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juvenile Justice Programs</th>
<th>Effect on Participant Crime</th>
<th>Taxpayer Benefits per Participant</th>
<th>Costs per Participant</th>
<th>Taxpayer Benefits Minus Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>$32,915</td>
<td>$6,945</td>
<td>$25,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent Diversion Project (for lower risk offenders)</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>$18,208</td>
<td>$1,913</td>
<td>$16,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Integrated Transitions</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>$19,502</td>
<td>$9,865</td>
<td>$9,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Family Therapy on probation</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>$14,617</td>
<td>$2,325</td>
<td>$12,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multisystemic Therapy</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>$9,622</td>
<td>$4,264</td>
<td>$5,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression Replacement Training</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>$6,659</td>
<td>$897</td>
<td>$5,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen courts</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>$4,238</td>
<td>$936</td>
<td>$3,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative justice for low-risk offenders</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>$3,320</td>
<td>$880</td>
<td>$2,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency coordination programs</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>$2,308</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$2,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile drug courts</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>$3,167</td>
<td>$2,777</td>
<td>$390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile boot camp to offset institution time</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-$8,077</td>
<td>$8,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile sex offender treatment</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>$8,377</td>
<td>$33,064</td>
<td>($24,687)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular surveillance-oriented parole</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,201</td>
<td>($1,201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile intensive probation supervision programs</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,598</td>
<td>($1,598)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile wilderness challenge</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,985</td>
<td>($3,985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile intensive parole supervision</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,460</td>
<td>($6,460)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared Straight</td>
<td>+7%</td>
<td>($6,523)</td>
<td>$58</td>
<td>($6,561)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Aos et. al., 2006. Victimization costs and benefits excluded from calculations.
Research: Specific programs and interventions that emphasize only control or deterrence point to poor outcomes for juvenile offenders.

- Programs that research has shown to be ineffective through multiple evaluations:
  - Scared Straight and similar programs have demonstrated a negative effect on juvenile recidivism.
  - Similarly, boot camps, absent a therapeutic component, have no measured effect on juvenile recidivism.

South Dakota's Alignment with Research Principle 4

- According to stakeholders and staff of state entities, there are few evidence based programs for juvenile offenders available in the state.
Programming, Services and Incentive Structures: Research Principles

4. Utilize evidence-based programs to reduce recidivism and delinquent behavior

5. Improve the implementation, delivery, and quality characteristics of programs

6. Align fiscal incentives

Principle 5: Improve the implementation, delivery, and quality characteristics of programs

• In addition to being matched with the needs of offenders, programs also must to be implemented with fidelity to meet recidivism reduction goals.
**Research**: Higher quality program implementation is strongly and consistently associated with bigger effects on recidivism.

- **Implementation is related to program effectiveness**:  
  - Program characteristics (i.e., the way in which a program is organized, staffed, and administered)  
  - Service amount as measured by duration of treatment  
  - Contact hours  
  - Treatment quality (program integrity)

**Research**: Interventions must be implemented well to reduce recidivism. In fact, poor delivery can actually increase recidivism for some offenders.

South Dakota’s Alignment with Research Principle 5

- DSS Correctional Behavioral Health was recently trained in quality assurance (QA) of cognitive behavioral programs and will begin to implement QA and fidelity monitoring for the evidence based programs provided at STAR Academy.
- STAR Academy evaluates its program effectiveness utilizing the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI).
- DOC has begun evaluating its contracted providers using the CPAI.
- UJS does not utilize any formal or standard evaluation process for its contracted programs.

Programming, Services and Incentive Structures:
Research Principles

4. Utilize evidence-based programs to reduce recidivism and delinquent behavior

5. Improve the implementation, delivery, and quality characteristics of programs

6. Align fiscal incentives
**Principle 6: Align fiscal incentives**

- Financial incentives encourage state and local governments to invest in effective community-based programs and to reduce reliance on confinement.

**Case Study: Ohio RECLAIM**

- In 1992, Ohio had experienced large growth in its juvenile custody population, its institutions operated at 180% of capacity, and many counties did not have the resources to supervise juveniles locally.

- In 1993, Ohio created RECLAIM Ohio. The program provides a formula based allotment to counties, which is reduced for each juvenile committed to an institution. It supports community-based alternatives for juvenile offenders.

- Since implementing RECLAIM, Ohio has seen its annual admissions decline from over 3,700 to just over 600.
Research: An Ohio study found low- and moderate-risk juveniles placed in facilities were at least twice as likely to recidivate as those in a community-based RECLAIM program.


Case Study: Ohio RECLAIM resulted in more than $55 million in county subsidies in fiscal year 2012

Ohio Invested Millions in Alternative Programs

Total: $55.6 Million in County Subsidies
South Dakota’s Alignment with Research Principle 6

- Access to community-based interventions for juveniles is driven by available UJS funding, DOC aftercare funding, Medicaid eligibility or other insurance options, serious emotional disturbance (SED) qualification through DSS, and families’ ability to pay.

- According to stakeholders and staff of state entities,
  - There is little access to local programming in rural areas.
  - Economies of scale pose a challenge to programming in rural areas.
  - DOC is the pathway to residential mental health services for court-involved youth.

Key Research Areas

- Risk and Needs Assessment Tools
- Case Management and Treatment Planning
- Programming, Services and Incentives Structures
- Additional Evidence-Based Tools in Decision-Making
- Out of Home Placement and Length of Supervision
Evidence-Based Tools in Decision-Making: Research Principles

7. Use structured decision making tools

8. Develop a system of graduated sanctions and incentives to encourage compliance

Principle 7: Use structured decision making tools

- Routine, consistent use of structured decision making tools allows for optimal sanctions and placement into programming.
- Tools can be used at a variety of decision points including pre-adjudication, disposition, case planning, placement, and release decisions.
Structured Decision Making Tools

- **Risk assessment instruments**
  - Provide an estimate of the probability of reoffending

- **Disposition matrices**
  - Guide risk-based level of supervision and treatment

- **Needs assessment instruments**
  - Support matching of programs to crime-producing needs of youth

- **Program practice guidelines and assessments**
  - Evaluate the expected effectiveness of programs for reducing recidivism

**State Example:** Florida’s DJJ has developed a disposition matrix to assist probation staff in making informed and consistent disposition recommendations.

![Disposition Matrix](image)
**Research:** A recent Florida study demonstrated that adherence to their disposition matrix in decision making was associated with lower recidivism.

South Dakota’s Alignment with Research Principle 7

- South Dakota generally does not employ structured decision making tools prior to disposition, but does use risk and needs assessments upon disposition.
  - In a small number of cases, a risk and needs assessment is conducted as part of a pre-dispositional social case history and is used at the time of disposition to determine probation conditions.
Evidence-Based Tools in Decision-Making: Research Principles

7. Use structured decision making tools

8. Develop a system of graduated sanctions and incentives to encourage compliance

Principle 8: Develop a system of graduated sanctions and incentives to encourage compliance

- Graduated sanctions provide judges and probation officials with a continuum of sanctions, intervention, and treatment options to hold offenders accountable and reduce reoffending.
- Incentives provide these officials with options to encourage positive behavior and compliance with court-ordered conditions.
Example: Missouri graduated sanctions matrix

Example: Incentives as part of a response grid

South Dakota’s Alignment with Research Principle 8

- UJS does not have a formal response system to respond to violative behavior.
- The Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI) pilot sites in Minnehaha and Pennington Counties have implemented graduated response grids in their respective jurisdictions.
- 25% of commitments to DOC are probation violators.
- DOC uses a response matrix for youth in aftercare which includes sanctions and incentives.

Key Research Areas

- Risk and Needs Assessment Tools
- Case Management and Treatment Planning
- Programming, Services and Incentives Structures
- Additional Evidence-Based Tools in Decision-Making
- Out-of-home Placement and Length of Stay
Out-of-Home Placement and Length of Supervision: Research Principles

9. Focus resources on juvenile offenders who are a higher risk to reoffend

10. Moderate length of stay and supervision

Principle 9: Focus resources on juvenile offenders who are a higher risk to reoffend

- Juvenile justice interventions have their greatest public safety impact when targeted to higher-risk offenders.
  - When the level of intervention exceeds the level needed to respond to the youth’s risk to re-offend the likelihood to recidivate may increase.
  - On average, placement in correctional facilities does not lower the likelihood of juvenile reoffending and may in fact increase the likelihood of committing a new crime for certain offenders.
**Research:** A Florida study of low-risk youth found that recidivism increased with the level of restrictiveness/placement.

![Graph showing recidivism rate for all low risk youth re-offend by placement type.](image)

*Note: Data from 2012 Comprehensive Accountability Report (CAR) final files.*


---

**Research:** A recent longitudinal study found no marginal gain from institutional placement in terms of averting future offending.

Treatment effect of placement after propensity score matching on 66 baseline variables

![Bar chart showing mean yearly rate of re-arrest by placement status after matching.](image)

South Dakota’s Alignment with Research Principle 9

- Stakeholders indicate a need for more diversion to keep youth out of the court system.
- Of the youth coming onto probation, 62% are supervised at the low and administrative levels. Supervision levels are determined by the assessed risk level and thus act as a proxy for risk level.
- The court system does not make risk-based disposition decisions.
- Out-of-home placement for youth committed to DOC costs between $118 and $322 per day.

Out-of-Home Placement and Length of Stay: Research Principles

9. Focus resources on juvenile offenders who are a higher risk to reoffend

10. Moderate length of stay and supervision
Principle 10: Moderate length of stay and supervision

- There is no consistent evidence that longer lengths of stay in juvenile facilities reduce reoffending.

Research: A recent study reported that for institutional stays lasting between 3 to 13 months, longer periods of confinement did not reduce recidivism.

South Dakota’s Alignment with Research Principle 10

- Committed youth stay in out of home placements 15 months on average.
- Length of stay out-of-home is increasing, and increasing across all offense types.

POLICY AREAS AND SUB-GROUPS
Three areas to continue to explore

• Expand pre-court and alternative disposition opportunities

• Increase access to proven community based interventions

• Focus DOC commitments and out-of-home placements on serious offenders

SCHEDULING OF SUBGROUP CALLS