



Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2012-2014

2013 UPDATE

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act

Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services
2013



www.dcjs.virginia.gov

| | |
|---|----|
| Project Abstract | 3 |
| System Description: Structure and Function of the Juvenile Justice System | 4 |
| Analysis of Juvenile Crime Problems and Juvenile Justice Needs | 4 |
| Plan for Compliance: First Three JJDP Act Core Requirements | 4 |
| Plan for Compliance Monitoring: First Three JJDP Act Core Requirements | 7 |
| Plan for Compliance: Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) | 7 |
| Coordination of Child Abuse and Neglect and Delinquency Programs | 21 |
| Disaster Preparedness Plan | 21 |
| Suicide Prevention | 21 |
| Collecting and Sharing Juvenile Justice Information | 22 |
| Statement of the Problem/Program Narrative | 22 |
| SMART | 36 |
| SAG Membership | 36 |
| Formula Grants Program Staff | 38 |
| Performance Measure Data | 38 |

PROJECT ABSTRACT

Funds made available through the Title II Formula Grants Program support various state and local efforts throughout Virginia to address the issue of juvenile delinquency and prevention, and improve the juvenile justice system. The Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services works with the Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice (the state advisory group) to develop goals and objectives, and specific actions for meeting the objectives, which address needs and result in the development of more effective education, training, research, prevention, diversion, treatment, and rehabilitation programs. Funding is provided directly or through sub-grants and contracts with public and private agencies for the following purpose areas as identified in Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2012-2014: maintaining compliance with core requirements; reducing behavioral health issues of at-risk and system-involved youth; reducing disproportionality in the juvenile justice system; serving at-risk and system-involved youth in their home communities; increasing and strengthening family engagement and community involvement for youth; state advisory group support; and administration.

Progress towards each goal outlined in Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2012-2014 is regularly monitored and status reports are provided to state advisory group members. All sub-grantees are required to submit quarterly reports to DCJS documenting progress towards goals and providing data as required for performance measure reporting.

SYSTEM DESCRIPTION: STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION OF THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

There are no changes to this section of Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2012-2014.

ANALYSIS OF JUVENILE CRIME PROBLEMS AND JUVENILE JUSTICE NEEDS

There are no changes to this section of Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2012-2014.

PLAN FOR COMPLIANCE: FIRST THREE JJDP ACT CORE REQUIREMENTS

The Office on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) has consistently found Virginia in compliance with the first three core requirements of the JJDP Act. Compliance determination letters sent to the Department of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) during the past three years indicate that Virginia has been found in compliance for federal fiscal years 2010 through 2013. The first three core requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act include:

1. Deinstitutionalization of status offenders
2. Separation of juveniles from adult offenders
3. Removal of juveniles from adult jails and lock ups

Plan for Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders (DSO)

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(11) of the JJDP Act, states must develop plans to ensure that status and non-offenders are not placed in secure detention or secure correctional facilities, except as allowed under the exceptions set forth in Section 223(a)(11)(A). Virginia law is specific regarding the detention of juveniles and has been amended over the years to ensure compliance with the JJDP Act core provisions. Sections 16.1-248.1 and 16.1-249 of the Code of Virginia outline the criteria for detention or shelter care, and the places of confinement of juveniles. Options for courts to use with status offenders are the same as those for children considered "in need of services" and do not include secure detention. (§16.1-278.4, Code of Virginia) Virginia law also allows only those adjudicated delinquent to be committed to a juvenile correctional center operated by the Department of Juvenile Justice. (§16.1-278.7, Code of Virginia) In order to further protect status and non-offenders, the statewide risk assessment instrument (DAI) utilized by intake officers does not prescribe pre-trial detention for status offenses.

Virginia continues to maintain full compliance (with de minimis exceptions) with the deinstitutionalization of status offenders (DSO) provision of the JJDP Act. Occasional violations of the DSO provision are recorded¹:

| | FY2009 | FY2010 | FY2011 ² |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|---------------------|
| Number of DSO violations | 71.81 | 59 | 40 |
| DSO violation rate | 3.94 | 3.23 | 2.19 |
| Held for VCO violations | 272 | 264 | 297 |

As seen in the table above, the number and rate of DSO violations has declined over the past three years. Continuous monitoring and education are credited for Virginia's compliance with the DSO provision.

Maintaining Compliance

Virginia's compliance monitor carefully reviews DSO violations and maintains data to help identify potential problem areas. This information is provided to the juvenile justice manager and the juvenile justice specialist. Together, the three develop appropriate strategies in addressing concerns which could jeopardize Virginia's overall compliance standing.

¹Figures reported for FY2009 and FY2010 are based on amended compliance reports submitted to OJJDP and may not agree with figures reported for the same years in other reports.

²In 2012, OJJDP changed their monitoring requirements in order to put all states on the same reporting schedule. Virginia is one of several states transitioning to calendar year reporting, therefore, data for FY2012 will not be reported.

DCJS and the Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice (ACJJ) closely monitor legislation that could impact Virginia's compliance with the DSO provision of the JJDP Act. Should legislation be introduced in the Virginia General Assembly that could impact compliance, DCJS prepares a legislative action summary which is forwarded to the Secretary of Public Safety for the Governor's Policy Office. Information may also be provided to legislative committees. The ACJJ, which serves as the state advisory group, will provide input as necessary.

No legislation which could negatively impact the DSO provision has been introduced in Virginia in recent years. However, reauthorization of the JJDP Act could jeopardize Virginia's DSO compliance should the valid court order (VCO) exception be eliminated. Judges are accustomed to using detention for status offenders who violate court orders, such as in truancy cases when the youth continues to be truant from school. In FY2011, there were 3,860 intakes where truancy was the most serious offense. Of all truancy cases (including those where truancy was not the most serious offense), 56% were petitioned to court. Many judges believe that a bit of time in detention for these cases produces positive results. Should the VCO exception be eliminated, it will take time and resources to bring about state-wide change in judicial practices. Efforts are underway by DCJS and the Department of Education to encourage judges, Court Service Units (juvenile probation offices), and schools to use options other than detention for truancy cases.

Plan for Separation of Juveniles from Adult Offenders

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(12) of the JJDP Act, states must develop plans to ensure that juveniles alleged or found to be delinquent and status offenders do not have contact with adult inmates, whether convicted or awaiting trial on criminal charges. Virginia has established legislative and operational policy safeguards that prohibit contact between juveniles and adults held in the same facility (§16.1-249, *Code of Virginia* and *Virginia Administrative Code* sections 6VAC15-40-1190, 6VAC15-40-1193, 6VAC15-40-1280, and 6VAC15-40-1290). The state is in full compliance with the separation provision of the JJDP Act:

| | FY2009 | FY2010 | FY2011 ³ |
|--|--------|--------|---------------------|
| Number of separation violations | 0 | 0 | 0 |

In 2003 the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) revised sight and sound separation guidelines requiring that juveniles transferred, certified or waived into the adult criminal justice system while detained in juvenile facilities, be separated from the juvenile population within six months of reaching the age of full criminal responsibility (18 in Virginia, thus requiring separation by age 18.5). OJJDP concluded that those convicted in juvenile court could stay with the under 18 population until their release, but those convicted in circuit court must be separated. This represented a change from the "continuous stay" language of previous guidelines and created a significant sight and sound compliance challenge for Virginia, as convicted juveniles can be confined in a juvenile correctional facility until they reach the age of 21 regardless of whether they are convicted in juvenile or circuit court.⁴ In 2008, OJJDP reinterpreted their definition of "adult inmate" and now allows for juveniles held under "continuous stay" to be held in juvenile facilities until they reach age 21. Placement policies are now under review in Virginia to ensure compliance with the Prison Rape Elimination Act.

Maintaining Compliance

Virginia's ongoing compliance monitoring, which includes the provision of information and on-site technical assistance, is a critical component of maintaining compliance with the sight and sound provision of the JJDP Act. To ensure continued compliance, when the compliance monitor inspects facilities, staff is reminded of sight and sound separation requirements, potential places that the requirements could be breached are identified, and facility policies and procedures regarding separation are reviewed. Additionally, the compliance monitor provides training at meetings and conferences. Virginia's jail administrators are cognizant of the potential problems that can occur when sight and sound separation is not maintained between adults and juveniles and therefore take appropriate measures to ensure the separation, often going beyond what

³ In 2012, OJJDP changed their monitoring requirements in order to put all states on the same reporting schedule. Virginia is one of several states transitioning to calendar year reporting, therefore, data for FY2012 will not be reported.

⁴In Virginia, juveniles can be held in juvenile correctional facilities until the age of 21 if they are convicted in juvenile or circuit court. Virginia allows for "blended sentencing" which gives circuit court judges authority to determine the best sentencing placement for juveniles which may be a juvenile facility, an adult facility, or an adult facility following a term in a juvenile facility.

is minimally required.

In regard to collocated facilities, Virginia has included criteria that must be met in order for collocated facilities to be approved in *Virginia's Compliance Monitoring Policy and Procedures Manual*. DCJS is unaware of any instances in which the collocated facilities in Virginia share staff serving both adult and juvenile populations. Therefore, no statewide policies regarding joint training are in effect. Juvenile facilities, including those that may be collocated with an adult facility, must follow regulations approved by the Board of Juvenile Justice (6VAC35-140, *Virginia Administrative Code*).

DCJS and the ACJJ also closely monitor legislation that could impact Virginia's compliance with the sight and sound provision of the JJDP Act. Should legislation be introduced in the Virginia General Assembly that could impact compliance, DCJS prepares a legislative action summary which is forwarded to the Secretary of Public Safety for the Governor's Policy Office. Information may also be provided to legislative committees. During the 2010 General Assembly Session, legislation was passed regarding the pretrial placement of juveniles. The new language specifies that juveniles transferred to adult criminal court "shall be placed in a juvenile secure facility, unless the court determines that the juvenile is a threat to the security or safety of the other juveniles detained or the staff of the facility, in which case the court may transfer the juvenile to a jail or other facility for the detention of adults and need no longer be entirely separate and removed from adults" (SB259). Prior language simply stated that the court may transfer the juvenile to a jail or other facility for the detention of adults and need no longer be entirely separate and removed from adults. The legislation was signed by the Governor and went into effect July 1, 2010.

Plan for Removal of Juveniles from Adult Jails and Lockups

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(13) of the JJDP Act, states must develop plans to ensure that juveniles are not detained or confined in any adult jail or lockup, except as the *OJJDP Guidance Manual for Monitoring Facilities Under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002* (revised October 2010) allows. Virginia legislation is consistent with the provisions and requirements of the JJDP Act (§§16.1-247, 16.1-248.1, 16.1-249, *Code of Virginia*).

Virginia is in compliance with the jail removal provision of the JJDP Act, allowing for the numerical de minimis exceptions. Virginia does not use the rural removal exception. A small number of violations have occurred over the past several years:

| | FY2009 | FY2010 | FY2011 ⁵ |
|--|--------|--------|---------------------|
| Number of jail removal violations | 19.81 | 2 | 39 |
| Jail removal violation rate | 1.09 | 0.11 | 2.14 |
| # of Jails in Monitoring Universe | 77 | 77 | 77 |
| # of Lockups in Monitoring Universe | 83 | 85 | 84 |

As seen in the previous table, the number of jail removal violations in FY2011 is noticeably higher than those reported for the prior two years. The number of lockups in Virginia's monitoring universe has increased significantly in recent years, going from 9 in FY2006 to 85 in FY2010. Most facilities were not keeping data prior to 2008. Virginia's compliance monitor has worked closely with the lockups since 2007 to improve reporting practices and educate these facilities and localities on the proper housing of juveniles. In 2011 the number of law enforcement lockups reporting data for the first time greatly increased. For the first time, data were received from 100% of the lockups. Logically, the additional data led and to additional violations being reported. Of the 39 jail removal violations reported for FY2011, all but a few were from law enforcement lockups and were status offenders held securely in these facilities.

Maintaining Compliance

Virginia's ongoing compliance monitoring, which includes the provision of information and on-site technical assistance, is a critical component of maintaining compliance with the jail removal provision of the JJDP Act. Additionally, the compliance monitor provides training during meetings and conferences. DCJS and the ACJJ also closely monitor legislation that could

⁵ In 2012, OJJDP changed their monitoring requirements in order to put all states on the same reporting schedule. Virginia is one of several states transitioning to calendar year reporting, therefore, data for FY2012 will not be reported.

impact Virginia's compliance with the jail removal provision of the JJDP Act. Should legislation be introduced in the Virginia General Assembly that could impact compliance, DCJS prepares a legislative action summary which is forwarded to the Secretary of Public Safety for the Governor's Policy Office. Information may also be provided to legislative committees. No legislation which could negatively impact the jail removal provision has been introduced in Virginia in recent years.

PLAN FOR COMPLIANCE MONITORING: FIRST THREE JJDP ACT CORE REQUIREMENTS

There are no changes to the following areas of this section of *Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2012-2014*:

- (1) Policies and Procedures
- (2) Monitoring Authority
- (4) Violation Procedures
- (5) Barriers and Strategies
- (6) Definition of Terms
- (7) Identification of the Monitoring Universe
- (8) Classification of the Monitoring Universe
- (9) Inspection of Facilities
- (10) Data Collection and Verification

OJJDP is requiring all states to utilize the calendar year for compliance monitoring purposes. Virginia is among several states transitioning from a fiscal year basis to a calendar year basis. As part of this transition, changes in the monitoring timeline (area #3 of this section) are being made.

In order to comply with the changed reporting requirements, the monitoring schedule is being modified. Scheduling monitoring visits is a complicated task, and with the number of facilities the compliance monitor must visit each year, approximately 130, rescheduling visits is not practical. To avoid travel during months when weather conditions are unpredictable, the compliance monitor will now need to make two trips around the state – one trip to review jails, lockups, and courthouses before the winter months – and a second trip to review detention centers in the spring. Juvenile correctional centers will be visited during either trip. This is the first year for the new travel schedule. Adjustments will be made as needed based on this year's experience before the schedule is formalized for future years.

The annual monitoring schedule in *Virginia's Compliance Monitoring Policy and Procedures Manual* will be updated to reflect the changes. The compliance monitor will continue to maintain an annual calendar outlining the monitoring schedule. Included in this schedule is the identification of facilities to inspect. Dates and locations for site visits are scheduled throughout the monitoring year.

PLAN FOR COMPLIANCE: DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONTACT (DMC)

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(22) of the JJDP Act of 2002, states and territories must address specific delinquency prevention and system improvement efforts designed to reduce, without establishing or requiring numerical standards or quotas, the disproportionate number of minorities who come into contact with the juvenile justice system. Disproportionate minority contact (DMC) exists if the rate of contact with the juvenile justice system of specific minority groups is significantly different than the rate of contact for non-Hispanic whites or other minority groups. The purpose of this core requirement is to ensure equal and fair treatment for every youth, regardless of membership in any minority or majority population group, involved in the juvenile justice system.

A state achieves compliance with this core requirement when it addresses DMC on an ongoing basis through:

- Identification of the extent to which DMC exists;
- Assessment to examine and determine the factors that contribute to DMC, if it exists;
- Intervention by developing and implementing strategies to reduce DMC;

- Evaluation of the efficacy of intervention strategies; and
- Monitoring changes in DMC trends over time.

Phase I: Identification

DMC is a complicated issue. A key method that OJJDP has selected for use in determining the presence and extent of DMC is the relative rate index (RRI). This method involves comparing the relative rate of activity for each major stage of the juvenile justice system for minority and majority youth. A single index number indicates the extent to which the rate of a particular contact or activity differs for minority and majority youth. It does not calculate the odds of particular types of contact. Rates above 1.0 indicate that the incidence ratio is higher for the given population group than for the comparative group; rates below 1.0 indicate that the incidence ratio is below that for the comparative group. Results may be skewed or unable to be calculated due to low raw numbers. The RRI is a helpful indicator in measuring DMC. It is important to remember that it is an indicator. Changes in data reporting over years, including how juveniles are classified in regard to race and ethnicity, may influence how the measure looks over time.

Updated DMC Identification Spreadsheets

OJJDP maintains a web-based DMC Data Entry System which produces RRI and several other related calculations from data entered by states receiving JJDP Act Title II funding. States are required to enter the statewide data and at least three jurisdictions at least every three years.

Virginia has entered data for several localities, as well as the state as a whole, into the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System annually since 2008, as well as in 2005, adding additional localities each year. Our goal is to maintain data entry on an annual basis. For FY2011, data was entered for 29 different cities and counties. Data for localities was entered if: data for the locality had been entered for a previous year; the youth population (ages 10-17) is 10,000 or higher for the locality; or the number of juveniles admitted to a DJJ correctional center from a particular locality was 5 or more for the year.⁶ Localities with focused DMC-reduction efforts are included. White youth are the default majority population in Virginia. FY2012 data will be entered when it becomes available.

Data is entered for seven contact points. Intake data collected by Court Service Units are considered a more accurate reflection of juveniles entering the criminal justice system therefore, arrest data is not entered into the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System. Cases transferred to adult court are also not entered due to limited availability. Efforts are underway to improve data on transfer cases.

DMC Data Discussion

As noted previously, Virginia enters data for seven contact points into OJJDP's DMC Data Entry System. Intake data (court referral) is considered a more accurate reflection of juveniles entering Virginia's justice system therefore, arrest data is not entered. Juvenile transfer data is also not entered at this time.

All system contact data used is provided by the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) and is a duplicate count. Data used is case based. One intake ("juvenile court referral") can include multiple complaints and one case can include multiple offenses if they apply to the individual juvenile. However, if the juvenile comes back to intake at a later time for new offenses, a new intake is initiated.

Continued evidence of DMC and a growing understanding of it led to the prioritization of DMC in Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2009-2011 and again in Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2012-2014. The RRI and related data was also used to help evaluate and make funding decisions for a DMC discretionary grant solicitations, and identify localities for inclusion in the statewide DMC assessment process during the past few years.

Three localities were profiled for DMC in Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2006-2008: Fairfax County/City, Norfolk, and Virginia Beach. Following the plan's publication, Norfolk and Newport News became part of a targeted DMC effort. In 2009, Fairfax, Norfolk and Newport News were highlighted in Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2009-2011 due to then-current efforts. After the

⁶ Data entered into the DMC Data Entry System is provided to the Department of Criminal Justice Services by the Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice. In order to comply with data entry requirements and DMC analysis guidelines, data for Hispanic is used. For all other reporting purposes in this document, Hispanic is considered an ethnicity and therefore, figures reported for race may not agree with those included in the DMC discussion.

plan's publication, a new DMC effort was initiated by DCJS based on the DMC priority included in the plan. Fairfax County/City, Norfolk, and Petersburg were selected for this new effort and were awarded sub-grants for locality-specific projects. In 2010, DCJS initiated a statewide assessment with plans to target three localities. Richmond City, Norfolk, and Fairfax County/City were identified for inclusion.

Prior to selecting the target DMC localities for the various projects, RRIs for the different contact points were reviewed for each of Virginia's cities and counties. In 2009, 11 localities were identified as the most feasible target populations for activities designed to reduce DMC due to their RRI scores and related raw data and percentile distributions. A solicitation for participation in the DMC effort was sent out and the three jurisdictions were selected based on their identified need and willingness to participate. Though Petersburg was not initially considered a target site based on RRI and juvenile justice system figures alone, other local and population factors were taken into consideration in its selection. The same review process was utilized for the assessment site selection. Though not part of previous specified DMC efforts, a strong desire to address DMC expressed by the judiciary in Richmond City led to their inclusion in the assessment project.

Norfolk and Fairfax have been continuously included in Virginia's DMC data discussion portion of the three-year plan. Though profiled localities have changed over the years, those previously profiled continue to be included in DMC Data Entry System entries and reviews. Data and relative rate index tracking sheets are included here for the three sites participating in the current assessment. Data for Petersburg is also included due to their inclusion in a current DMC targeted project.

Statewide Data

U.S. Census Bureau 2010 population estimates of Virginia's juvenile population ages 10-17 were used as the base from which the RRIs were developed. As seen on the following table, there has been an overall increase in the youth population ages 10-17 in Virginia and a decrease in the percentage representation of white juveniles between the 2008 and 2010 estimates.

| Classification | Census Population Estimates—Juveniles 10–17 | | | |
|-----------------|---|-------|---------|-------|
| | 2008 | | 2010 | |
| Asian | 34,153 | 4.3% | 42,840 | 5.2% |
| Black | 183,322 | 22.8% | 182,987 | 22.0% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 59,543 | 7.4% | 79,415 | 9.5% |
| American Indian | 2,072 | 0.3% | 2,212 | 0.3% |
| White | 501,853 | 62.5% | 490,434 | 58.9% |
| Other | 22,000 | 2.7% | 34,260 | 4.1% |
| TOTAL | 802,943 | 100% | 832,148 | 100% |

DMC has been an ongoing issue identified in prior three-year plans and disproportionality continues to be evident at many key contact points for multiple minority groups. When examining statewide data for the past three years, an improvement in the RRI for referrals to juvenile court of all minorities and of black juveniles is seen in FY2011. The RRI for minorities as a whole and black juveniles committed to a juvenile correctional facility is the most improved over the three year period and included in the following table. Statewide RRI data for all groups will continue to be monitored annually.

| Statewide RRIs for All Minorities | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|
| | FY2009 | FY2010 | FY2011 |
| Refer to Juvenile Court (Intake) | 1.98 | 1.98 | 1.73 |
| Cases Diverted | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.91 |
| Cases Involving Secure Detention | 1.81 | 1.71 | 1.72 |
| Cases Petitioned | 1.02 | 1.04 | 1.07 |
| Cases Resulting in Delinquent Finding | 1.23 | 1.21 | 1.29 |
| Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | 0.82 | 0.87 | 0.78 |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|
| Cases Resulting in DJJ Commitment | 2.13 | 1.95 | 1.59 |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|

RRI calculations are from the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System.

| Statewide RRIs for Black Juveniles | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|
| | FY2009 | FY2010 | FY2011 |
| Refer to Juvenile Court (Intake) | 2.66 | 2.73 | 2.59 |
| Cases Diverted | 1.02 | 0.95 | 0.91 |
| Cases Involving Secure Detention | 1.84 | 1.76 | 1.79 |
| Cases Petitioned | 1.01 | 1.03 | 1.06 |
| Cases Resulting in Delinquent Finding | 1.20 | 1.19 | 1.29 |
| Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | 0.79 | 0.85 | 0.76 |
| Cases Resulting in DJJ Commitment | 2.33 | 2.13 | 1.82 |

RRI calculations are from the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System.

The relative rate index tracking sheet shows the RRIs by minority group and contact point. As can be seen, all contact points Virginia includes are deemed statistically significant for black juveniles, thus rendering all points statistically significant when examining all minorities.

| Statewide Relative Rate Index Tracking Sheet | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| FY2011 | Black | Hispanic /Latino | Asian | Amer Indian | Other | All Minorities |
| Arrests | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Referrals to Juvenile Court (intake) | 2.59 S,M,V,C | 1.03 M | 0.27 S,M | * | 0.66 S,M | 1.73 S,M,V,C |
| Cases Diverted | 0.91 S,V,C | 0.81 S,M,C | 1.24 S,M | * | 1.07 M | 0.91 S,V,C |
| Cases Involving Secure Detention | 1.79 S,M,V,C | 1.50 S,M,C | 1.06 M | * | 1.30 S,M | 1.72 S,M,V,C |
| Cases Petitioned | 1.06 S,V | 1.12 S | 0.93 M | * | 1.04 | 1.07 S,V |
| Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings (adjudicated) | 1.29 S,M,V | 1.38 S,M | 1.14 M | * | 1.18 S,M | 1.29 S,M,V |
| Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | 0.76 S,M,V,C | 0.89 S,C | 1.02 | * | 0.83 C | 0.78 S,M,V,C |
| Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities (commitment) | 1.82 S,M,V,C | 0.69 S,M,C | Cannot calculate | * | 0.79 | 1.59 S,M,V,C |
| Cases Transferred to Adult Court | - | - | - | - | - | |

RRI calculations are from the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System.

* Though there is an American Indian population in Virginia, the group is less than 1% of the youth population; therefore, results are not calculated.

Key: S=Statistically Significant; M=Magnitude of RRI; V=Volume of Activity; C=Contextual Considerations (more feasible target populations for activities designed to reduce DMC)

Changes to the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System produced new information for FY2011 data. One of the newer tables is titled "Changes Needed to Reach Statistical Parity with Reference Group Rates of Contact". This table generates a number at each contact point needed to bring parity between the minority group and the majority reference group. This data will be a helpful reference point for future state and local planning use, and will certainly prove useful in educational efforts surrounding DMC. In order to reach statistical parity with white juveniles in Virginia, this table shows that:

- Referrals to intake will need to decrease by 12,972 black juveniles and 113 Hispanic/Latino juveniles;
- Diversions from court need to increase by 510 black juveniles and 191 Hispanic juveniles;

- Cases involving secure detention need to decrease for both black and Hispanic juveniles by 1,998 and 216 cases respectively;
- Cases resulting in a probation placement need to increase by 754 black juveniles and 67 Hispanic juveniles; and
- Cases resulting in DJJ commitment need to decrease by 170 black juveniles.

This information will be examined for multiple years and continue to be tracked. Actual numbers will vary from year to year; however, they indicate trends and can assist in setting DMC reduction targets.

Comparing Virginia’s RRI values with national data or other states is not applicable to the state’s DMC planning efforts.

Fairfax County/City

Fairfax is home to over 14% of juveniles ages 10-17 in Virginia (n=119,287; 2010 Census estimate). White youth make up approximately 50.8% of those ages 10-17. The county’s minority juvenile 10-17 population distribution is much different than the state’s as a whole. The percentage of juveniles classified as Asian or Hispanic is significantly higher than the statewide figure (34% vs. 14.7%), but those classified as black is less than half (10% vs. 22%).

There has been little consistent change in RRIs for contact points when looking at Fairfax data for FY2009, FY2010, and FY2011.

| Fairfax RRIs for All Minorities | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | FY2009 | FY2010 | FY2011 |
| Refer to Juvenile Court (Intake) | 1.87 | 1.85 | 1.80 |
| Cases Diverted | 0.69 | 0.72 | 0.67 |
| Cases Involving Secure Detention | 2.19 | 1.69 | 2.26 |
| Cases Petitioned | 1.17 | 1.21 | 1.34 |
| Cases Resulting in Delinquent Finding | 1.32 | 1.24 | 1.36 |
| Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | 0.67 | 0.85 | 0.71 |
| Cases Resulting in DJJ Commitment | ** | 1.38 | ** |
| Fairfax RRIs for Black Juveniles | | | |
| | FY2009 | FY2010 | FY2011 |
| Refer to Juvenile Court (Intake) | 3.48 | 3.43 | 3.78 |
| Cases Diverted | 0.62 | 0.67 | 0.64 |
| Cases Involving Secure Detention | 2.30 | 1.77 | 2.45 |
| Cases Petitioned | 1.22 | 1.23 | 1.39 |

| | | | |
|--|------|------|------|
| Cases Resulting in Delinquent Finding | 1.19 | 1.17 | 1.32 |
| Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | 0.61 | 0.84 | 0.59 |
| Cases Resulting in DJJ Commitment | ** | 1.06 | ** |

RRI calculations are from the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System
 **Insufficient number of cases for analysis

| Fairfax RRIs for Hispanic/Latino Juveniles | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|
| | FY2009 | FY2010 | FY2011 |
| Refer to Juvenile Court (Intake) | 2.38 | 2.24 | 2.22 |
| Cases Diverted | 0.69 | 0.68 | 0.60 |
| Cases Involving Secure Detention | 2.25 | 1.89 | 2.37 |
| Cases Petitioned | 1.16 | 1.25 | 1.35 |
| Cases Resulting in Delinquent Finding | 1.43 | 1.33 | 1.49 |
| Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | 0.68 | 0.80 | 0.75 |
| Cases Resulting in DJJ Commitment | ** | 1.65 | ** |
| Fairfax RRIs for Asian Juveniles | | | |
| | FY2009 | FY2010 | FY2011 |
| Refer to Juvenile Court (Intake) | 0.41 | 0.45 | 0.45 |
| Cases Diverted | 0.88 | 0.77 | 0.91 |
| Cases Involving Secure Detention | 1.65 | 0.82 | 1.20 |
| Cases Petitioned | 1.09 | 1.16 | 1.18 |
| Cases Resulting in Delinquent Finding | 1.45 | 1.25 | 1.02 |
| Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | 0.74 | 0.90 | 1.06 |
| Cases Resulting in DJJ Commitment | ** | ** | ** |

RRI calculations are from the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System
 **Insufficient number of cases for analysis

The following relative rate index tracking sheet shows the RRIs by minority group and contact point for FY2011 data.

| Fairfax County Relative Rate Index Tracking Sheet | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|
| FY2011 | Black | Hispanic/Latino | Asian | Amer Indian | Other | All Minorities |
| Arrest | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Referrals to Juvenile Court (intake) | 3.78 S,M,V,C | 2.22 S,M,C | 0.45 S,M | * | 1.05 | 1.80 S,M,V,C |
| Cases Diverted | 0.64 S,V,C | 0.60 S,M,C | 0.91 | * | 0.97 | 0.67 S,V,C |
| Cases Involving Secure Detention | 2.45 S,M,V,C | 2.37 S,M,V,C | 1.20 M | * | 1.65 M,V,C | 2.26 S,M,V,C |
| Cases Petitioned | 1.39 S,V | 1.35 S | 0.18 M | * | 1.16 | 1.34 S,V |
| Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings (adjudicated) | 1.32 S,M,V | 1.49 S,M,V | 1.02 M | * | 1.18 M | 1.36 S,M,V |
| Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | 0.59 S,M,V,C | 0.75 S,V,C | 1.06 | * | Cannot calculate | 0.71 S,M,V,C |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|---|------------------|------------------|
| Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities (commitment) | Cannot calculate | Cannot calculate | Cannot calculate | * | Cannot calculate | Cannot calculate |
| Cases Transferred to Adult Court | - | - | - | - | - | - |

RRI calculations are from the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System.

* Though there is an American Indian population in Virginia, the group is less than 1% of the youth population; therefore, results are not calculated.

Key: S=Statistically Significant; M=Magnitude of RRI; V=Volume of Activity; C=Contextual Considerations (more feasible target populations for activities designed to reduce DMC)

As shown in the previous table, RRIs for juveniles committed to juvenile correctional centers cannot be calculated due to low numbers. The number of youth committed from Fairfax has decreased significantly in the past three years, from 37 in FY2009 to 15 in FY2011. Minorities make up the majority of juveniles committed and account for 12 of the 15 commitments in FY2011.

Norfolk City

Norfolk is home to approximately 2.4% of juveniles ages 10-17 in Virginia (n=20,043; 2010 Census estimate). The total juvenile 10-17 population distribution in Norfolk is quite different from the statewide distribution. Approximately 56.5% of juveniles are classified as black in Norfolk and 28.7% are classified as white, whereas the statewide distribution is 22% and 58.9% respectively. Though the total youth population ages 10-17 has increased in Virginia, Norfolk's comparable population has decreased. There has also been a shift in the distribution for Norfolk when comparing 2010 estimates with those from 2008, with a smaller proportion of juveniles ages 10-17 classified as white (28.7% in 2010 vs. 35.6% in 2008) and larger proportions in some minority groups.

| Classification | Norfolk Census Population Estimates—Juveniles 10–17 | | | |
|-----------------|---|--------|--------|-------|
| | 2008 | | 2010 | |
| Asian | 570 | 2.4% | 524 | 2.6% |
| Black | 12,470 | 52.2% | 11,327 | 56.5% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 1,314 | 5.5% | 1,348 | 6.7% |
| American Indian | 92 | 0.4% | 42 | 0.2% |
| White | 8,501 | 35.6% | 5,758 | 28.7% |
| Other | 959 | 4.0% | 1,044 | 5.2% |
| TOTAL | 23,906 | 100.1% | 20,043 | 99.9% |

Totals may not equal 100 due to rounding.

As shown on the following tables, there has been some consistent change in the RRI for the intake contact point when looking at Norfolk data for the past few years. This will continue to be monitored in future years. The RRI data for Norfolk will also be calculated and monitored using black as the majority population. (The RRI data contained herein uses Virginia's default majority population for historical comparison purposes.)

| Norfolk RRIs for All Minorities | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| | FY2009 | FY2010 | FY2011 |
| Refer to Juvenile Court (Intake) | 2.75 | 2.60 | 2.34 |
| Cases Diverted | 0.85 | 0.90 | 0.79 |

| | | | |
|--|------|------|------|
| Cases Involving Secure Detention | 1.58 | 2.15 | 1.04 |
| Cases Petitioned | 1.65 | 1.54 | 1.14 |
| Cases Resulting in Delinquent Finding | 1.13 | 1.25 | 1.01 |
| Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | 0.68 | 1.24 | 0.88 |
| Cases Resulting in DJJ Commitment | ** | ** | 0.71 |

RRI calculations are from the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System

**Insufficient number of cases for analysis

| Norfolk RRIs for Black Juveniles | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|
| | FY2009 | FY2010 | FY2011 |
| Refer to Juvenile Court (Intake) | 3.19 | 3.01 | 2.76 |
| Cases Diverted | 0.84 | 0.89 | 0.77 |
| Cases Involving Secure Detention | 1.60 | 2.14 | 1.06 |
| Cases Petitioned | 1.67 | 1.56 | 1.15 |
| Cases Resulting in Delinquent Finding | 1.12 | 1.27 | 1.01 |
| Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | 0.67 | 1.19 | 0.89 |
| Cases Resulting in DJJ Commitment | ** | ** | 0.73 |

RRI calculations are from the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System

**Insufficient number of cases for analysis

The following relative rate index tracking sheet shows the RRIs by minority group and contact point for FY2011 data. (Note that white is used as the default majority population.)

| Norfolk Relative Rate Index Tracking Sheet | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------|
| FY2011 | Black | Hispanic /Latino | Asian | Amer Indian | Other | All Minorities |
| Arrests | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Referrals to Juvenile Court (intake) | 2.76 S,M,V,C | 0.65 S,M | 0.35 S | * | 1.04 | 2.34 S,M,V,C |
| Cases Diverted | 0.77 S,M,V | 0.62 M,C | Cannot calculate | * | 1.07 | 0.79 S,V,C |
| Cases Involving Secure Detention | 1.06 M,C | 1.03 M,C | Cannot calculate | * | 0.74 M | 1.04 M,C |
| Cases Petitioned | 1.15 S,V | 1.30 | Cannot calculate | * | 1.05 | 1.14 S,V |
| Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings (adjudicated) | 1.01 | Cannot calculate | Cannot calculate | * | Cannot calculate | 1.01 M,V |
| Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | 0.89 M,V | Cannot calculate | Cannot calculate | * | Cannot calculate | 0.88 M,V,C |
| Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities (commitment) | 0.73 S,M | Cannot calculate | Cannot calculate | * | Cannot calculate | 0.71 S |
| Cases Transferred to Adult Court | - | - | - | - | - | - |

RRI calculations are from the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System.

* Though there is an American Indian population in Virginia, the group is less than 1% of the youth population; therefore, results are not calculated.

Key: S=Statistically Significant; M=Magnitude of RRI; V=Volume of Activity; C=Contextual Considerations (more feasible target populations for activities designed to reduce DMC)

Richmond City

Richmond City is home to approximately 1.8% of juveniles ages 10-17 in Virginia (n=14,939; 2010 Census estimate) The total juvenile 10-17 population distribution in Richmond is quite different from the statewide distribution. Over 73% of juveniles are classified as black in Richmond and approximately 17.8% are classified as white, whereas the statewide distribution is 22% and 58.9% respectively. As in Norfolk, Richmond has experienced a decrease in the juvenile 10-17 population and some changes population distribution.

| Classification | Richmond Census Population Estimates—Juveniles 10–17 | | | |
|-----------------|--|-------|--------|--------|
| | 2008 | | 2010 | |
| Asian | 147 | 0.8% | 92 | 0.6% |
| Black | 12,489 | 70.4% | 10,929 | 73.2% |
| Hispanic/Latino | 830 | 4.7% | 864 | 5.8% |
| American Indian | 59 | 0.3% | 27 | 0.2% |
| White | 3,915 | 22.1% | 2,659 | 17.8% |
| Other | 291 | 1.6% | 368 | 2.5% |
| TOTAL | 17,731 | 99.9% | 14,939 | 100.1% |

Totals may not equal 100 due to rounding.

As can be seen on the following table, Richmond City has experienced a noticeable change in RRIs for several contact points in FY2011 when compared to the prior two years. This will continue to be monitored. The RRI data for Richmond will also be calculated and monitored using black as the majority population. (The RRI data contained herein uses Virginia’s default majority population for historical comparison purposes.)

| Richmond City RRIs for All Minorities | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|
| | FY2009 | FY2010 | FY2011 |
| Refer to Juvenile Court (Intake) | 6.63 | 6.84 | 3.09 |
| Cases Diverted | 0.73 | 0.69 | 1.18 |
| Cases Involving Secure Detention | 1.60 | 1.01 | 2.94 |
| Cases Petitioned | 1.26 | 1.48 | 0.92 |
| Cases Resulting in Delinquent Finding | 1.30 | ** | 2.95 |
| Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | ** | ** | ** |
| Cases Resulting in DJJ Commitment | ** | ** | ** |
| Richmond City RRIs for Black Juveniles | | | |
| | FY2009 | FY2010 | FY2011 |
| Refer to Juvenile Court (Intake) | 7.12 | 7.39 | 3.37 |
| Cases Diverted | 0.73 | 0.69 | 1.19 |

| | | | |
|--|------|------|------|
| Cases Involving Secure Detention | 1.59 | 1.00 | 2.91 |
| Cases Petitioned | 1.25 | 1.48 | 0.91 |
| Cases Resulting in Delinquent Finding | 1.30 | ** | 2.99 |
| Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | ** | ** | ** |
| Cases Resulting in DJJ Commitment | ** | ** | ** |

RRI calculations are from the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System
 **Insufficient number of cases for analysis

The following relative rate index tracking sheet shows the RRIs by minority group and contact point for FY2011 data. (Note that white is used as the default majority population.)

| Richmond City Relative Rate Index Tracking Sheet | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|
| FY2011 | Black | Hispanic | Asian | Amer Indian | Other | All Minorities |
| Arrests | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Referrals to Juvenile Court (intake) | 3.37 S,M,V,C | 1.14 M | Cannot calculate | * | Cannot calculate | 3.09 S,M,V,C |
| Cases Diverted | 1.19 S,M,V,C | 0.81 M,C | Cannot calculate | * | Cannot calculate | 1.18 S,V,C |
| Cases Involving Secure Detention | 2.91 S,M,V,C | 3.61 S,M,C | Cannot calculate | * | Cannot calculate | 2.94 S,M,C |
| Cases Petitioned | 0.91 S,V | 1.14 | Cannot calculate | * | Cannot calculate | 0.92 S,V |
| Cases Resulting in Delinquent Findings (adjudicated) | 2.99 S,M,V | Cannot calculate | Cannot calculate | * | Cannot calculate | 2.95 S,M,V |
| Cases Resulting in Probation Placement | Cannot calculate | Cannot calculate | Cannot calculate | * | Cannot calculate | Cannot calculate |
| Cases Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities (commitment) | Cannot calculate | Cannot calculate | Cannot calculate | * | Cannot calculate | Cannot calculate |
| Cases Transferred to Adult Court | - | - | - | - | - | - |

RRI calculations are from the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System.

* Though there is an American Indian population in Virginia, the group is less than 1% of the youth population; therefore, results are not calculated.

Key: S=Statistically Significant; M=Magnitude of RRI; V=Volume of Activity; C=Contextual Considerations (more feasible target populations for activities designed to reduce DMC)

Petersburg City

Petersburg is a small city and home to less than 0.4% of juveniles ages 10-17 in Virginia (n=2,869; 2010 Census estimate). The total juvenile 10-17 population distribution in Petersburg is unlike any other jurisdiction in Virginia, with almost 85% classified as black and only 7.2% classified as white.

Because of the low number of cases, RRIs cannot be calculated for most contact points by the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System. However, the RRI for juveniles petitioned and classified as black was quite high in FY2009 (3.34). This dropped to 1.28 in FY2011. Approximately 1.9% of all commitments to juvenile correctional centers in FY2010 were from Petersburg (11 of 591).

Interest from Petersburg led to its inclusion as a target site for recent DMC efforts. In 2009, Petersburg was identified as having the lowest on-time high school graduation rate in the state, as well as the highest dropout rate. As expected, this received a great deal of media attention, as well as that of various agencies. Several other key indicators of child well being, such as children in foster care, are also of concern in this area and were taken into consideration. Multiple agencies, including the Virginia Departments of Education and Social Services, Virginia State University, and the area CSU expressed interest in taking steps to improving the success of youth in this area.

Due to an insufficient number of cases for analysis, the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System did not calculate RRIs. Therefore, a relative rate index tracking sheet could not be developed.

Phase II: Assessment/Diagnosis

When a state determines DMC exists, OJJDP requires the state to conduct an assessment. Additionally, targeted assessments should be conducted when significant changes in the RRI are noted at particular decision points or after the implementation of significant changes in laws, procedures, or policies within the juvenile justice system that may negatively impact DMC.

A DMC assessment is a comprehensive analysis utilizing advanced research methodologies to identify the contributing factors, examine minority over-representation, and explain differences at all contact stages of the juvenile justice system. It should also include recommendations for specific delinquency prevention, intervention, and systems improvement strategies.

Virginia recently completed a statewide DMC assessment. DCJS awarded a contract to Development Services Group (DSG) on July 1, 2010 to conduct the study. The project included two major components: (1) qualitative interviews with juvenile justice practitioners in three jurisdictions and (2) a quantitative analysis on the processing of juveniles at various juvenile justice contact points in the participating jurisdictions. A review of RRI data for various jurisdictions and collaboration with Virginia's DMC coordinator led to the selection of Fairfax, Norfolk, and Richmond City for the assessment.

Site visits were conducted in each participating jurisdiction and various stakeholders were interviewed. Interviewees included those who routinely make decisions about arrests, detention, diversion, referral to court, prosecution and defense, adjudication, probation sanctions, and correctional commitments. A total of 55 interview sessions were held across the three sites with approximately 88 individuals.

Many months of meetings and conference calls were held with DSG, DCJS, and DJJ to obtain the needed data. Due to sensitivities surrounding juvenile data, agency procedures, and staffing issues, it took longer than initially planned to obtain the necessary data from DJJ. Case-level quantitative data was obtained in November 2011. The data include all juveniles processed in the three participating jurisdictions during fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010. Approximately 28,000 intake cases are represented, including snapshots of the intake, detention, probation, and commitment contact points.

Findings and recommendations are included in the DMC assessment which is available from the Department of Criminal Justice Services upon request.

Phase III: Intervention

Virginia recognizes that DMC exists within the juvenile justice system and has prioritized funding for projects regarding DMC for several years. Data, RRI calculations, and other research and information, including the professional expertise of ACJJ members, are used to develop strategies targeting DMC. Progress for the past year and plans for the remainder of the plan period follow.

Progress made in 2012

Reducing disproportionality in the juvenile justice system was identified as a priority in *Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2012-2014*. Several goals, objectives, and activities were identified for the period. The DMC Subcommittee of the ACJJ continues to meet and ACJJ members voted to make the funding of DMC initiatives through JJDP Act Title II funds the top priority during the first year of the plan period. The issue remained a priority throughout the year will continue into the next year. The ACJJ completed or made progress on all activities. Below is a list of objectives and the related activities completed in the past year as they relate to the DMC reduction goal:

Objective 1: Continue the statewide DMC juvenile justice assessment process and implement recommendations.

Activities:

- Received final DMC assessment
- Reviewed recommendations from consultants
- Presented DMC assessment to Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice

Objective 2: Provide funding to implement recommendations from the DMC assessment(s) as identified in Objective 1.

Activities:

- None. This activity is planned for the coming year.

Objective 3: Provide funding to implement alternatives to the use of school disciplinary and zero-tolerance policies which result in arrest and/or school suspension or expulsion.

Activities:

- None. This activity is planned for state fiscal years 2014 and 2015 pending funding availability.

Objective 4: Provide continuation funding for eligible sub-grantee projects approved prior to 2012 which have demonstrated compliance and progress with their grant objectives.

Activities:

- Identified sub-grantees eligible for continuation funding.
- Reviewed project progress to determine if continuation is appropriate.
- Recommended continuation of funds to the Criminal Justice Services Board as appropriate
Continuation funding was awarded.

Objective 5: Provide training and information on DMC.

Activities:

- Included DMC information in annual Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention Conference: Making a Difference in Juvenile Justice.
- Supported DMC Conference at Virginia State University.

DMC Reduction Sites

The state does not have identified specified DMC reduction sites.

Phase IV: Evaluation

Not applicable.

All intervention strategies to reduce DMC are managed through sub-grants to localities or other state agencies. Each intervention project includes specific goals, objectives, activities, and selected performance measures. Data relating to performance measures for each sub-grant is entered into a data system (DCTAT) as directed by OJJDP. No formal process and/or outcome evaluations are conducted at the state level other than monitoring RRI's.

Mandatory output and outcomes performance measures include:

- Number/percent of program staff trained
- Number of program staff training hours
- Number of planning activities conducted
- Number of assessment studies conducted
- Substance use (short term/long term)
- School attendance (short term/long term)
- Family relationships (short term/long term)
- Antisocial behavior (short term/long term)
- Number of data improvement projects implemented
- Number of objective decision-making tools developed
- Number of program youth served
- Number/percent of program youth who offend (short term/long term)
- Number/percent of program youth who re-offend (short term/long term)

Phase V: Monitoring

Time-limited Plan to Monitor/Track

Virginia has several data sources that improve each year in terms of quality and quantity of data. DJJ accommodates data requests from DCJS that provide us with data helpful in monitoring and tracking changes in DMC trends over time. During the course of the last three-year plan period, DCJS developed a more detailed DMC monitoring and tracking process by reviewing figures annually and entering data into the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System for target localities and reviewing the system reports.

Most activities related to the annual review of DMC data are tied to the development of the three-year plan and DMC compliance report. These annual activities include:

- Review of data submitted to DCJS by DJJ;
- Identification of localities for inclusion in data entry into OJJDP's DMC Data Entry System;
- Review and analysis of statewide data (done as part of DMC compliance plan) for current year and comparison with past years;
- Review and analysis of data from at least three localities (done as part of DMC compliance plan) for current year and comparison with past years; and
- Provide copies of OJJDP DMC Data Entry System results to localities upon request (should a locality request RRI data, but they are not already entered into the system, special effort will be made to enter their data and run the report).

Virginia has entered data for several localities, as well as the state as a whole, into the OJJDP DMC Data Entry System annually since 2008, as well as for 2005, adding additional localities each year. For FY2011, data was entered for 29 different cities and counties. Data for localities was entered if: data for the locality had been entered for a previous year; the youth population (ages 10-17) is 10,000 or higher for the locality; or the number of juveniles admitted to a DJJ correctional center from a particular locality was 5 or more for the year.⁷ Localities with focused DMC-reduction efforts are included. White youth are the default majority population in Virginia.

In addition to annual activities, the following related activities will occur in the coming months:

- April/May: Receive/review FY2012 data from DJJ; enter into OJJDP DMC Data Entry System.
- May/June: Reset majority population in OJJDP DMC Data Entry System for Richmond City, Norfolk and Petersburg to identify and differences.
- May/June: Work with DJJ analyst to further collaborative activities for data reporting.
- June/July/August: Review other entries from FY2011 and FY2012, reset majority population if applicable, and re-review.
- September/October: Identify localities for consideration in future assessment process if applicable.

Activities Monitoring

DCJS formally monitors all sub-grants it awards through progress reports and site visits, including those delinquency prevention, intervention, and systems improvement activities implemented. Sub-grantees are required to submit quarterly progress reports to update DCJS staff on the status of the project. Grant monitors conduct at least one site visit during the project's grant funded lifespan.⁸ Sub-grantees showing little or no progress are offered technical assistance by program staff. The DMC coordinator monitors all DMC-specific sub-grant projects, as well as others with the potential of impacting DMC.

The DMC coordinator tries to stay informed of related projects, not funded by DCJS, underway in other state agencies or localities which may reduce DMC in the justice system through websites, articles, meetings, and individual contact.

Responsibility

The majority of DMC monitoring efforts will fall to the designated DMC Coordinator. This position is not considered full time as it does not include benefits, is paid hourly, and is limited to 1500 hours per year (full time employees are based on 2080 hours/year). Due to federal funding reductions, DCJS could not fill the vacant position as full time position. The agency is exploring options that would allow the position to move to full time.

The position will have some duties which may not be specific to DMC, but relate to juvenile justice as a whole and impact DMC as we work towards justice fairness for all youth. The designated juvenile justice specialist provides data analysis and support for DMC efforts.

⁷Data entered into the DMC Data Entry System is provided to the Department of Criminal Justice Services by the Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice. In order to comply with data entry requirements and DMC analysis guidelines, data for Hispanic is used. For all other reporting purposes in this document, Hispanic is considered an ethnicity and therefore, figures reported for race may not agree with those included in the DMC discussion.

⁸Site visits may or may not be conducted on one-time funded grants, especially those in involving evaluations for amounts of less than \$10,000.

Timeline

Monitoring activities occur throughout the year:

- January-December: Conduct site visits as needed (DMC Coordinator and/or Grants Monitor).
- January-December: Monitor other state agencies for DMC related activities; attend meetings and make contacts as needed.
- January: Receive/review sub-grant progress reports.
- TBD annually (requested by February 1): Receive annual data.
- TBD annually (ideally in February): Enter data into OJJDP's DMC Data Entry System.
- TBD annually (ideally in March): Analyze statewide data and select site data in comparison to prior years for three-year plan and DMC compliance report.
- April: Receive/review sub-grant progress reports.
- July: Receive/review sub-grant progress reports.
- October: Receive/review sub-grant progress reports.

DMC Reduction Plan for FY2012-2014

In preparation for developing Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2012-2014, the ACJJ held a planning retreat and follow up meetings to identify priorities and review proposed activities. Priorities were re-reviewed for the second year of the plan period. Reducing disproportionality in the juvenile justice system continues to be a priority for the ACJJ.

The following objectives and activities are specific to the DMC reduction goal and will guide activities for state fiscal years 2013-2015 (July 1, 2012-June 30, 2015). Timelines and funding information is included:

Objective 1: Continue the statewide DMC juvenile justice assessment process and implement recommendations.

Activities:

- Review recommendations from 2011 DMC assessment and identify which ones to implement with state funds.
- Conduct a new assessment targeting at least three new localities, including at least one smaller, rural area.
- Identify which steps will be implemented in participating localities without state funds for tracking purposes.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Funding: Amount estimated at \$50,000; JABG carry-over funds or Title II

Objective 2: Provide funding to implement recommendations from the DMC assessment(s) as identified in Objective 1.

Activities:

- Solicit applications for projects which implement specified DMC reduction recommendations.
- Working within funding allowances, recommend funding for projects meeting specified criteria to the Criminal Justice Services Board.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Funding: Amount TBD; JABG or Title II

Objective 3: Provide funding to implement alternatives to the use of school disciplinary and zero-tolerance policies which result in arrest and/or school suspension or expulsion.

Activities:

- Solicit applications for projects which implement alternatives to the use of school disciplinary/zero-tolerance policies which result in school suspension or expulsion.
- Working within funding allowances, recommend funding for projects meeting specified criteria to the Criminal Justice Services Board.

Year(s): 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2014 and 2015)

Funding: Amount TBD; depending on future funding, the activities may not be achievable

Objective 4: Provide continuation funding for eligible sub-grantee projects approved prior to 2012 which have demonstrated compliance and progress with their grant objectives.

Activities:

- Identify sub-grantees eligible for continuation funding.
- Review project progress to determine if continuation is appropriate.
- Recommend continuation of funds to the Criminal Justice Services Board as appropriate.

Year(s): 2012, 2013 (state fiscal years 2013 and 2014)

Funding: Amount TBD; Title II and JABG as applicable

Objective 5: Provide training and information on DMC.

Activities:

- Review and update DCJS website.
- Identify potential new venues for additional DMC conferences, similar to that initiated by DCJS and VSU.
- Include DMC information in annual Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention Conference: Making a difference in Juvenile Justice.
- Explore police training curriculum on juvenile DMC for possible training opportunities and addition of elements to DCJS model policies.
- Explore possibility of offering OJJDP strategic planning technical assistance sessions to teams in Virginia.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Funding: \$0 from FFY2012 funds; amount TBD from FFY2013 and FFY2014 funds; Title II and JABG as applicable

COORDINATION OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT AND DELINQUENCY PROGRAMS

There are no changes to this section of Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2012-2014.

DISASTER PREPAREDNESS PLAN

There are no changes to this section of Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2012-2014.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

There are no changes to this section of Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2012-2014.

COLLECTING AND SHARING JUVENILE JUSTICE INFORMATION

There are no changes to this section of Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2012-2014.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM/PROGRAM NARRATIVE/BUDGETS

Every three years, priority areas for focus and funding are identified based on data trends, results of a constituent survey, and the experience and perspectives of expert staff and ACJJ members. The order of the priorities is established each year of the three-year plan period. The priority order for the first and second year is as follows:

1. Compliance monitoring;
2. Reducing behavioral health issues for at-risk and system-involved youth;
3. Reducing disproportionality in the juvenile justice system;
4. Serving at-risk and system-involved youth in their home communities; and
5. Increasing family engagement and community involvement for youth.

Goals, objectives and activities are identified for Administration and the ACJJ (SAG) in addition to the priority program areas. Details for each area follow.

| |
|---|
| Priority 1: Compliance Monitoring |
| <p>Federal Program Area Codes and Titles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compliance Monitoring (6) |
| <p>Program Goal:</p> <p>To maintain compliance with the following core requirements of the JJDP Act: the deinstitutionalization of status offenders, the sight and sound separation of juveniles from adult inmates, and the removal of juveniles from adult jails and lockups.</p> |
| <p>Objectives, Activities and Services:</p> <p>Objective: Monitor facilities for compliance with the JJDP Act and provide training and technical assistance to facility staff and others as necessary on achieving and maintaining compliance.</p> <p>Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify and classify all facilities for monitoring purposes and develop annual inspection and review agendas. - Perform on-site facility inspections and review data and reports as needed. - Identify, verify, and report violations. - Work with facilities to develop corrective action plans if needed. - Provide information and materials to facilities regarding compliance and the JJDP Act. - Identify trends in violations and work with Virginia’s Juvenile Justice Specialist as needed to address potential problems. - Prepare and submit the OJJDP Compliance Monitoring report to Virginia’s Juvenile Justice Specialist and OJJDP. <p>Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (calendar years 2012, 2013, 2014)</p> |
| <p>Performance Measures:</p> <p>All sub-grantees are required to report on mandatory output and outcome performance measures. Those for this program area include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number/percent of program staff trained - Number of hours of program staff training provided - Funds allocated to adhere to Section 223(a)(14) of the JJDP Act - Number of activities that address compliance with Section 223(a)(14) - Number of facilities receiving TA - Submission of complete annual monitoring report to OJJDP |

Budget:*Compliance Monitoring (6)*

| Year of Funds | Title II Funds | State Funds | Total |
|---------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|
| FFY2012 | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$100,000 |
| FFY2013 | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$100,000 |
| FFY2014 | \$100,000 | \$0 | \$100,000 |

Priority 2: Reducing behavioral health issues for at-risk and system-involved youth**Federal Program Area Codes and Titles:**

- Mental health services (20)
- Substance abuse (32)

Program Goal:

To reduce behavioral health issues of at-risk youth and those involved in the justice system.

Objectives, Activities and Services:

Objective: Provide funding for behavioral health programs for at-risk youth and those involved in the juvenile justice system addressing one or more of the following specific issues:

- mental health
- substance abuse
- co-occurring disorders
- trauma
- exposure to violence

Activities:

- Solicit applications for behavioral health programs that are evidence-based or utilize best practices in dealing with mental health, substance abuse, co-occurring disorders, trauma, and/or exposure to violence for at-risk youth and those involved in the juvenile justice system.
- Working within funding allowances, recommend funding for projects meeting specified criteria to the Criminal Justice Services Board.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Performance Measures:

All sub-grantees are required to report on mandatory output and outcome performance measures. Those for this program area include:

- Number of program youth served
- Number/percent of program youth exhibiting desired change in substance use/ targeted behavior (short term/long term)(substance use only)
- Number/percent of program youth completing program requirements (short term) (substance use only)
- Number/percent of program youth who offended (short term/long term)
- Number/percent of program youth who re-offend (short term/long term)
- Substance use (short term/long term) (mental health only)
- Antisocial behavior (short term/long term) (mental health only)
- Family relationships (short term/long term) (mental health only)
- Social competencies (short term/long term) (mental health only)
- Number/percent of program youth completing program requirements (short term)

Budget:

Mental health services (20)

| Year of funds | Title II Funds | State Funds | Total |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| FFY2012 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| FFY2013 | \$75,000 | \$0 | \$75,000 |
| FFY2014 | \$75,000 | \$0 | \$75,000 |

Substance abuse (32)

| Year of Funds | Title II Funds | State Funds | Total |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| FFY2012 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| FFY2013 | \$75,000 | \$0 | \$75,000 |
| FFY2014 | \$75,000 | \$0 | \$75,000 |

Priority 3: Reducing disproportionality in the juvenile justice system

Federal Program Area Codes and Titles:

- Disproportionate minority contact (10)

Program Goal:

To reduce disproportionality in Virginia's juvenile justice system

Program Goals, Objectives, Activities and Services:

Goal: To reduce disproportionality in Virginia's juvenile justice system.

Objective 1: Continue the statewide DMC juvenile justice assessment process and implement recommendations.

Activities:

- Review recommendations from 2011 DMC assessment and identify which ones to implement.
- Conduct a new assessment targeting at least three new localities, including at least one smaller, rural area.
- Identify which steps will be implemented in participating localities without state funds for tracking purposes.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Objective 2: Provide funding to implement recommendations from the DMC assessment(s) as identified in Objective 1.

Activities:

- Solicit applications for projects which implement specified DMC reduction recommendations.
- Working within funding allowances, recommend funding for projects meeting specified criteria to the Criminal Justice Services Board.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Objective 3: Provide funding to implement alternatives to the use of school disciplinary and zero-tolerance policies which result in arrest and/or school suspension or expulsion.

Activities:

- Solicit applications for projects which implement alternatives to the use of school disciplinary/zero-tolerance policies which result in school suspension or expulsion.
- Working within funding allowances, recommend funding for projects meeting specified criteria to the Criminal Justice Services Board.

Year(s): 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014)

Objective 4: Provide continuation funding for sub-grantee projects approved prior to 2012 which have demonstrated compliance and progress with their grant objectives.

Activities:

- Identify sub-grantees eligible for continuation funding.
- Review project progress to determine if continuation is appropriate.
- Recommend continuation of funds to the Criminal Justice Services Board as appropriate.

Year(s): 2012, 2013 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014)

Objective 5: Provide training and information on DMC.

Activities:

- Review and update DCJS website.
- Identify potential new venues for additional DMC conferences, similar to that initiated by DCJS and VSU.
- Include DMC information in annual Juvenile Justice & Delinquency Prevention Conference: Making a Difference in Juvenile Justice.
- Explore police training curriculum on juvenile DMC for possible training opportunities and addition of elements to DCJS model policies.
- Explore possibility of offering OJJDP strategic planning technical assistance sessions to teams in Virginia.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Performance Measures:

All sub-grantees are required to report on mandatory output and outcome performance measures. Those for this program area include:

- Number of program youth served
- Number/percent of program youth who offend (short term/long term)
- Number/percent of program youth who re-offend (short term/long term)
- Number/percent of program staff trained and number of training hours
- Number of planning activities conducted
- Number of assessments conducted
- Number of data improvement projects implemented
- Number of objective decision-making tools developed
- Substance use (short term/long term)
- School attendance (short term/long term)
- Family relationships (short term/long term)
- Anti-social behavior (short term/long term)

Budget:

Disproportionate minority contact (10)

| Year of Funds | Title II Funds | State Funds | Total |
|---------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|
| FFY2012 | \$110,000 | \$0 | \$110,000 |
| FFY2013 | \$174,957 | \$0 | \$174,957 |
| FFY2014 | \$125,000 | \$0 | \$125,000 |

Priority 4: Serving at-risk and system-involved youth in their home communities

Federal Program Area Codes and Titles:

- Diversion (11)
- Court services (7)
- School programs (27)
- Aftercare/reentry (1)

Program Goal:

To serve at-risk and system-involved youth in their home communities.

Program Objectives, Activities and Services:

Objective 1: Provide funding for community-based programs that divert youth from the juvenile justice system.

Activities:

- Solicit applications for community-based diversion projects.
- Working within funding allowances, recommend funding for projects meeting specified criteria to the Criminal Justice Services Board.

Year(s): 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2014, 2015)

Objective 2: Provide funding to pilot intermediate sanctioning options for juvenile probationers and parolees supervised by Court Service Units.

Activities:

- Solicit applications for projects which pilot intermediate sanctioning options for juvenile probationers and parolees under the supervision of Court Service Units.
- Working within funding allowances, recommend funding for projects meeting specified criteria to the Criminal Justice Services Board.

Year(s): 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2014, 2015)

Objective 3: Provide funding for local, community-based prevention programs that emphasize one or more of the following:

- truancy prevention
- school engagement
- conflict resolution
- bullying prevention
- gang prevention

Activities:

- Solicit applications for community-based prevention projects that emphasize one or more of the following: truancy prevention, school engagement, conflict resolution, and/or bullying prevention. Applicants must be local agencies/organizations, not state agencies.
- Working within funding allowances, recommend funding for projects meeting specified criteria to the Criminal Justice Services Board.

Year(s): 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2014, 2015)

Objective 4: Provide funding for local, community-based agencies to provide re-entry support services for youth returning from a juvenile correctional center or detention facility.

Activities:

- Solicit applications for local, community-based re-entry support services for youth returning from a juvenile correctional center or detention facility. Applicants must be local agencies/organizations, not state agencies.
- Working within funding allowances, recommend funding for projects meeting specified criteria to the Criminal Justice Services Board.

Year(s): 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2014, 2015)

Objective 5: Provide continuation funding for eligible sub-grantee projects approved prior to 2012 which have demonstrated compliance and progress with their grant objectives.

Activities:

- Identify sub-grantees eligible for continuation funding.
- Review project progress to determine if continuation is appropriate.
- Recommend continuation of funding to the Criminal Justice Services Board as appropriate.

Year(s): 2012, 2013 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014)

Performance Measures:

All sub-grantees are required to report on mandatory output and outcome performance measures. Those for this program area include:

- Number of program youth served
- Number/percent of program youth who reoffend (short term/long term)
- Number/percent of program youth completing program requirements
- Number/percent of program youth who offended (short term/long term) (for court services; diversion; school programs only)
- Substance use (short term/long term) (school programs only)
- School attendance (short term/long term) (school programs only)
- GPA (short term/long term) (school programs only)
- Social competence (short term/long term) (school programs only)

Budget:*Aftercare/reentry (1)*

| Year of Funds | Title II Funds | State Funds | Total |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| FFY2012 | \$31,409 | \$0 | \$31,409 |
| FFY2013 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| FFY2014 | \$79,029 | \$0 | \$79,029 |

Alternatives to Detention (2) [Continuation grant only]

| Year of Funds | Title II Funds | State Funds | Total |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| FFY2012 | \$9,973 | \$0 | \$9,973 |
| FFY2013 | \$4,986 | \$0 | \$4,986 |
| FFY2014 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

Court services (7)

| Year of Funds | Title II Funds | State Funds | Total |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| FFY2012 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| FFY2013 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| FFY2014 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

Diversion (11)

| Year of Funds | Title II Funds | State Funds | Total |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| FFY2012 | \$122,728 | \$0 | \$122,728 |
| FFY2013 | \$74,086 | \$0 | \$74,086 |
| FFY2014 | \$50,000 | \$0 | \$50,000 |

School programs (27)

| Year of Funds | Title II Funds | State Funds | Total |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| FFY2012 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| FFY2013 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| FFY2014 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

Priority 5: Increasing family engagement and community involvement for youth

Federal Program Area Codes and Titles:

- Aftercare/reentry (1)
- Mentoring (21)

Program Goal:

To increase and strengthen family engagement and community involvement for youth while in detention, a correctional center, on probation/parole, or in a diversion program.

Program Objectives, Activities and Services:

Objective 1: Provide funding for projects which increase and strengthen family engagement for youth who are in custody, on probation/parole, or in a diversion program.

Activities:

- Solicit applications for projects which increase and strengthen family engagement for youth who are in custody, on probation/parole, or in a diversion program.
- Working within funding allowances, recommend funding for projects meeting specified criteria to the Criminal Justice Services Board.

Year(s): 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2014, 2015)

Objective 2: Provide funding for projects which increase and strengthen community involvement for youth who are in detention, a correctional center, on probation/parole, or in a diversion program.

Activities:

- Solicit applications for projects which increase and strengthen community involvement for youth who are in custody, on probation/parole, or in a diversion program.
- Working within funding allowances, recommend funding for projects meeting specified criteria to Criminal Justice Services Board.

Year(s): 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2014, 2015)

Performance Measures:

All sub-grantees are required to report on mandatory output and outcome performance measures. Those for this program area include:

- Number of program youth served
- Number/percent of program youth who reoffend (short term/long term)
- Number/percent of program youth who offended (short term/long term) (mentoring only)
- Number/percent of program youth completing program requirements
- Substance use (short term/long term) (mentoring only)
- Antisocial behavior (short term/long term) (mentoring only)
- Family relationships (short term/long term) (mentoring only)
- Gang-related activities (short term/long term) (mentoring only)
- School attendance (short term/long term) (mentoring only)
- Social competence (short term/long term) (mentoring only)

Budget:*Aftercare/reentry (1)*

| Year of Funds | Title II Funds | State Funds | Total |
|---------------|----------------|-------------|-------|
| FFY2012 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| FFY2013 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| FFY2014 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

Mentoring (21)

| Year of Funds | Title II Funds | State Funds | Total |
|---------------|----------------|-------------|----------|
| FFY2012 | \$64,919 | \$0 | \$64,919 |
| FFY2013 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| FFY2014 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

Juvenile Justice System Improvement (19) [Continuation grant only]

| Year of Funds | Title II Funds | State Funds | Total |
|---------------|----------------|-------------|----------|
| FFY2012 | \$65,000 | \$0 | \$65,000 |
| FFY2013 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| FFY2014 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |

State Advisory Group (Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice)

Federal Program Area Codes and Titles:

- State advisory group (31)

Program Goal:

To support and promote youth development, the prevention of juvenile delinquency, and the needs of juveniles involved in the criminal justice system.

Program Objectives, Activities and Services:

Objective 1: Provide information for Advisory Committee members at each meeting on juvenile justice and delinquency prevention topics.

Activities:

- Identify topics to include on meeting agendas throughout the plan period.
- Schedule at least one of the identified topics at each meeting of the Advisory Committee for presentation and/or discussion.
- Identify and schedule presentations as needed.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Objective 2: Sponsor a conference with DCJS each year of the plan period, if funds allow, using the highest priority topics identified by the 2011 Constituent Survey as possible topics for the agenda.

Activities:

- With DCJS staff, identify topics to include on agendas of conferences.
- Provide assistance to DCJS staff as needed in planning process.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Objective 3: Broaden annual conference audience.

Activities:

- Promote conference within Advisory Committee member distribution groups.

Year(s): 2012 – ongoing (state fiscal years 2013 on)

Objective 4: Monitor the following issues and related activity in Virginia:

- juvenile waiver and transfer to adult court
- underage drinking
- youth gang prevention and intervention activities

Activities:

- Include the specified issues on meeting agendas as information becomes available.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Objective 5: Identify ways to encourage a stronger “voice” from youth.

Activities:

- Discuss at ACJJ meetings.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Objective 6: Ensure the development of new projects across the Commonwealth that address priority areas.

Activities:

- Annually review the priority areas and determine what, if any, changes are needed for funding purposes.
- Maintain a grants subcommittee to review proposals, ensure they are in line with Plan priorities, and present sub-grantee funding recommendations to the Criminal Justice Services Board.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Objective 7: Ensure that juveniles in the juvenile justice system are safe and treated in accordance with the JJDP Act.

Activities:

- Monitor reauthorization of the JJDP Act for its potential impact in Virginia.
- Make recommendations to the Governor as needed regarding the impact of changes to the JJDP Act in Virginia.
- Receive reports on Virginia’s compliance with the JJDP Act core requirements.
- Maintain a DMC subcommittee to review and make suggestions to Virginia’s DMC plan.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Performance Measures:

Mandatory output and outcome performance measures for this program area include:

- Number of SAG committee meetings held
- Number of SAG subcommittee meetings held
- Annual report submitted to Governor
- Number of grants funded with formula grant funds
- Number and percent of programs using evidence-based models
- Number/percent of plan recommendations implemented

Budget:*State advisory group (31)*

| Year of Funds | Title II Funds | State Funds | Total |
|---------------|----------------|-------------|----------|
| FFY2012 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$20,000 |
| FFY2013 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$20,000 |
| FFY2014 | \$20,000 | \$0 | \$20,000 |

Administration**Federal Program Area Codes and Titles:**

- Planning and administration (23)

Program Goal:

To administer and coordinate activities as they relate to the JJDP Act.

Program Objectives, Activities and Services:

Objective 1: Ensure that Virginia complies with all JJDP Act and federal administrative mandates and requirements.

Activities:

- Complete and submit required monitoring and performance reports to OJJDP.
- Complete and submit the Three-Year Plan, updates, and state advisory group annual reports to OJJDP.
- Provide OJJDP with required grant and sub-grantee documentation.
- Provide information regarding the JJDP Act mandates to the Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice, state and local law enforcement agencies, and other relevant agencies, organizations, and citizen groups.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Objective 2: Identify and promote effective programs and services, ensuring that all grant-funded projects have strong accountability measures and are evidence-based.

Activities:

- Develop and disseminate requests for proposals/grant application guidelines for JJDP Act funds in accordance with the Three-Year Plan priorities as funding allows.
- Include requirements for data reporting, program evaluation, and the use of evidence- or empirically-based programming and tools in requests for proposals/grant application guidelines.
- Provide technical assistance to applicants and sub-grantees on program development and management.
- Monitor funded programs for adherence to project implementation and delivery plans.
- Promote effective programming which includes model programs and promising strategies through requests for proposals/grant application guidelines and DCJS website.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Objective 3: Maintain a financial assistance process for managing JJDP Act funds responsibly.

Activities:

- Maintain a financial accounting system for federal funds dispersed to state agencies and localities.
- Develop and disseminate fiscal guidelines detailing the appropriate use of JJDP Act funds.
- Provide technical assistance to sub-grantees on the financial management of grant funds.
- Monitor compliance with grant award conditions.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Objective 4: Provide input and support to the Secretary of Public Safety, as well as other state agencies, legislative groups, and the judiciary, on efforts to improve the juvenile justice system in Virginia.

Activities:

- Participate in study committee and policy analyses activities.
- Respond to information requests.
- Review proposed state legislation for potential conflict with the JJDP Act and provide written reviews to the Secretary of Public Safety.
- Review changes to federal law, specifically the JJDP Act, for potential implications in Virginia and provide necessary information to the Secretary of Public Safety.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Objective 5: Provide information, technical assistance, and support to child-serving professionals on issues related to juvenile justice and delinquency prevention.

Activities:

- Sponsor a conference with the ACJJ each year of the plan period, if funds allow, using the highest priority topics identified by the 2011 Constituent Survey as possible topics for the agenda.
- Maintain information regarding the JJDP Act, compliance with the JJDP Act requirements, and evidence-based practices on the DCJS website.
- Post the Annual Report of the ACJJ, the Three-Year Plan and annual updates on the DCJS website.
- Provide technical assistance as requested.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Objective 6: Sustain a state advisory group (Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice, ACJJ).

Activities:

- Work with the Offices of the Secretary of Public Safety and Secretary of Commonwealth to assure that appointments to the ACJJ fulfill the position mandates of the JJDP Act.
- Convene a minimum of four meetings annually, working with the ACJJ Chair to develop each agenda.
- Convene grants subcommittee meetings as necessary to review grant proposals and make recommendations.
- Convene a planning meeting in preparation of submitting the Three-Year Plan for the 2015-2017 plan period.
- Convene other meetings as needed.
- Respond to requests from members.
- Maintain official records of meetings.

Year(s): 2012, 2013, 2014 (state fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015)

Performance Measures:

Mandatory output and outcome performance measures for this program area include:

- Federal grant funds awarded for planning and administration
- Number of FTEs funded with federal grant funds
- Number of sub-grants awarded
- Number and percent of programs using evidence-based models
- Average time from receipt of sub-grant application to date of award

Budget:*Planning and Administration (23)*

| Year of Funds | Title II Funds | State Funds | Total |
|---------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|
| FFY2012 | \$58,226 | \$58,226 | \$116,452 |
| FFY2013 | \$58,226 | \$58,226 | \$116,452 |
| FFY2014 | \$58,226 | \$58,226 | \$116,452 |

SMART

DCJS is registered with OJJDP's Socioeconomic Mapping and Resource Topography (SMART) system and has queried it.

SAG MEMBERSHIP

Pursuant to Section 223(a)(3)(A) of the JJDP Act, the state advisory group shall consist of not less than 15 and not more than 33 members appointed by the chief executive officer of the state. The JJDP Act identifies specific membership qualifications including: at least one member shall be a locally elected official representing general purpose government; at least one-fifth of the members shall be younger than 24 years at the time of appointment; at least three members shall have been or currently be under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system; and a majority of the members, including the chairperson, shall not be full-time employees of federal, state, or local government.

The ACJJ serves as the state advisory group and is established in accordance with the *Code of Virginia* (§9.1-111). The majority of members are appointed by the Governor. Ex-officio members are specified in the Code of Virginia or appointed by the state legislature.

An updated membership roster follows.

Gubernatorial Appointees (as of March 1, 2013)

| | Name | Represents+ | F/T Gov't | Youth Member | Current Appoint Date | Residence |
|----|-------------------------|-------------|-----------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| 1 | Kevin Appel, Chair | D, H | | | 7/1/09 | Arlington |
| 2 | Eileen Grey, Vice-Chair | D, E | | | 7/15/09 | Alexandria |
| 3 | Carol Adams* | B | X | | 7/21/11 | Richmond |
| 4 | Rita Bishop | C, G, H | X | | 7/21/11 | Roanoke |
| 5 | Robert Bodenhamer | B | X | | 7/2/09 | Chester |
| 6 | Chuck Brady | D | | | 7/19/10 | Midlothian |
| 7 | Richard B. Campbell | B | X | | 7/23/10 | Richmond |
| 8 | Alison Carlin | | | X | 7/21/10 | Glen Allen |
| 9 | Dave Chapman | A, B | X | | 7/1/09 | Charlottesville |
| 10 | Shaunte Daniel Jennings | | | X | 6/29/09 | Ettrick |
| 11 | Lindsay R. Fisher | | | X | 7/19/10 | Richmond |

| | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------|------|---|---|----------|--------------|
| 12 | Terone Green | D | | | 7/19/11 | Richmond |
| 13 | Hilary Griffith | G | | | 7/21/11 | Salem |
| 14 | Sarah Ann Haislip | | | X | 7/28/09 | Henrico |
| 15 | Quentin Hicks | C, G | X | | 7/21/11 | Chesapeake |
| 16 | Amanda Johnson | | | X | 7/19/10 | Midlothian |
| 17 | Dwight Jones | A | | | 7/12/10 | Richmond |
| 18 | Jerrauld Jones | B, H | X | | 7/15/11 | Norfolk |
| 19 | Steven Kast | D, F | | | 12/20/10 | Newport News |
| 20 | Andrew Slater | | X | X | 7/19/10 | Sandston |
| 21 | Antonio Sutton | B, C | X | | 7/13/07 | Norfolk |
| 22 | Catherine Watts | | | X | 7/20/10 | Yorktown |
| 23 | Kim Slayton White | B | X | | 7/21/11 | Halifax |
| 24 | Appointment Pending* | | | | | TBD |

*Also a member of the Department of Criminal Justice Services supervisory board

+Key: A-locally elected official representing general purpose local government; B-representatives of law enforcement and juvenile justice agencies; C-representatives of public agencies concerned with delinquency prevention or treatment; D-representatives of private nonprofit organizations; E-volunteers who work with juvenile justice; F-youth workers involved with programs that are alternatives to confinement, including organized recreational activities; G-persons with special experience and competence in addressing problems related to school violence and vandalism and alternatives to suspension and expulsion; persons with special experience and competence in addressing problems related to learning disabilities, emotional difficulties child abuse and neglect, and youth violence.

- Youth Representation: 29% of named individuals.
- Juvenile Justice System Representation: 3 of the above meet the juvenile justice jurisdictional provisions. For confidentiality purposes, they are not identified here.
- Full Time Government: 42% of named individuals.

Ex-Officio Members

| | Name | Represents+ | F/T Gov't | Youth Member | Current Appoint Date | Location |
|----|---|-------------|-----------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| 25 | Delegate Robert Bell | | | | Ex-Officio | Charlottesville |
| 26 | Commissioner, Dept. of Social Services, Margaret Ross Schultze (acting) | C, H | X | | Ex-Officio | Richmond |
| 27 | Director, Dept. of Juvenile Justice, Mark Gooch * | B, C | X | | Ex-Officio | Richmond |
| 28 | Commissioner, Dept. of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services, Jim Stewart, III | C | X | | Ex-Officio | Richmond |
| 29 | Senator Bryce Reeves | | | | Ex-Officio | Fredericksburg |
| 30 | Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Patricia Wright | C, G, H | X | | Ex-Officio | Richmond |

*Also a member of the Department of Criminal Justice Services supervisory board

FORMULA GRANTS PROGRAM STAFF

There are no changes to this section of Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2012-2014.

PERFORMANCE MEASURE DATA

There are no changes to this section of Virginia's Three-Year Plan 2012-2014.

