Collaboration Works
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Community Planning for Juvenile Services

Community Planning is once again underway! During the last Juvenile Justice & Provider Forum the Backbone Staff began collecting input relative to the Douglas County Comprehensive Juvenile Services Plan. The purpose of creating a Juvenile Services Plan is to set priorities for communities receiving Community-based Juvenile Services Aid (CBA) through the Nebraska Crime Commission to ensure funds are used to help the community in an agreed-upon manner.

During the information gathering phase, OYS is asking: 1) What bold goals exist for juvenile justice; 2) What services currently available are essential; 3) What is showing promise but might need more resources to reach full potential; 4) What should be replicated or expanded to make a bigger impact to more youth/communities; 5) What is missing.

Throughout the upcoming months, OYS will meet with OYS, JDAI & Youth Impact! work group members, stakeholders, and community groups to collect feedback and build strategies for the next plan, due July, 2018.

The process of collecting feedback will continue over the next several months. We encourage the public to participate and share ideas. The 2015-2018 Douglas County Community Plan is available online at: https://ncc.nebraska.gov/sites/ncc.nebraska.gov/files/doc/Douglas-County-Comp.pdf

2015-2018 Douglas County Priority Areas

- Reduce barriers to school attendance for youth in Douglas County and the Omaha Metro.
- Identify and address behavioral health issues for youth at risk of coming to the attention of the formal justice system, and for those youth who present behavioral health needs within the juvenile justice system address these needs efficiently and through trauma informed practice.
- Utilize evidence based strategies to restructure policy and practice to create strategic, collective system improvements and reform to most efficiently use resources to most effectively serve youth who become system-involved, while maintaining focus on preventing youth from entering the formal justice system.
- Identify and develop strategies to address issues of Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) within the identified target populations.
- Reduce the number of unstably housed youth in the Metro Area.
- Reduce recidivism by eliminating barriers to success for youth re-entering following disruptions in home, school, and community as a result of formal legal actions.
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JJPF Community Planning Activities
Impact Spotlight: School-based Arrest Task Force

The OYS School-based Arrest (SBA) task force provided a status report on activities to-date to the Steering Committee in April, 2017. Steering Committee member Deputy Chief Gonzalez, Omaha Police Department, and SBA Co-chairs Dr. Amy Williams, Omaha Public Schools, and Sarah Hayek, Nebraska Families Collaborative presented.

The SBA task force’s overarching goal is to reduce the incidences of youth placed out-of-school as a consequence for behavior.

The task force identified two specific concerns which impact school push-out:

1) A disconnect between the youth-serving systems operating within the school—Disconnect was defined as the point-of-view each party had about the responsibilities of one another and of themselves. 2) A lack of consistent and effective communication. Communication breakdown was evident from the top down, from the bottom up, and across systems.

The task force identified two goals for improving school-justice partnerships:

1) Cross-training – to expand awareness of one another’s roles; to increase understanding about the consequences of school exclusion & arrest; to increase knowledge, skills, and competencies related to school behavior management.

2) Collaboration – creating proactive & formalized processes for the sharing of relevant information.

The SBA work group identified a lack of consistency regarding how to address difficult student behaviors.

Each entity - School Administrators, School Security, Police, Probation, and Teachers understood school discipline in different ways.

Each has a responsibility in resolving issues related to school push-out.

Rather than excluding the student from the school community for misbehaving, which potentially can cause resentment, disrupt educational progress, and lead to recidivism and/or dropping out of school, one of the primary goals of restorative practices is to integrate the student back into the school community.

Marilyn Armour, Director of the Institute for Restorative Justice and Restorative Dialogue at the University of Texas at Austin, has described restorative practices as "a relational approach to building school climate and addressing student behavior that fosters belonging over exclusion, social engagement over control, and meaningful accountability over punishment."

PRELIMINARY IMPACT: A decrease of 50% in the total number of arrests by OPD School Resource Officers Semester 1, 2016-2017 compared to Semester 1 of 2015-2016.

Next Steps

- Juvenile Justice Jeopardy - Improving Police-Youth Interactions
- Restorative Justice & Peer Mediation in Schools
- School Administrator Training
- Advanced NASRO Training for School Resource Officers
- NASRO School Safety Personnel Training for School Security Officers
- Train-the-Trainer for Patrol & Probation
- Increase opportunities for positive law enforcement-youth interactions.
Therapeutic vs. Control Treatment Philosophies

Control techniques include programs aimed to deter negative behavior through fear of consequences (e.g., jail tours, court tours) and programs emphasizing surveillance to detect negative behavior.1 Other deterrence and surveillance type techniques include inappropriate drug testing (i.e., when youth does not have substance abuse issues), electronic monitoring, and excessive monitoring or supervision. Therapeutic techniques include programs aimed to increase positive behavior change through personal development, including2: Restorative (e.g., restitution, victim-offender mediation) Skill building (e.g., cognitive behavioral techniques, social skills, academic/vocational skills) Counseling (e.g., individual, group, family; mentoring) Multiple coordinated services (e.g., case management) The Nebraska Crime Commission, with support from the Juvenile Justice Institute, does not recognize the use of deterrence and surveillance type approaches as effective practices in juvenile diversion programs. Furthermore, bringing youth into an adult jail facility may violate the separation requirement of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002 and Nebraska Jail Standards. Programs implementing practices such as scared straight, jail tours, observing court proceedings, and other surveillance programs have good intentions, however, the research indicates that these practices could be causing more harm than good.

Risk-Needs-Responsivity

A risks-needs-responsivity (RNR) model of juvenile intervention suggests that targeted therapeutic interventions are the most effective method for programs to deter future criminal behaviors.3 Research and evaluation supports the therapeutic approach, both theoretically and empirically.4 “The risk principle states that the intensity of interventions should reflect the level of criminogenic risk exhibited by the youth5”; that is, the most intensive services should be reserved for highest risk youth, and least intensive services should be directed at lower risk youth. Diversion programs in Nebraska are available for youth with low and moderate levels of risk, consequently, “it is vital that the level of intervention is adjusted to the youth’s level of risk.” Of particular importance is ensuring that youth presenting low levels of risk are provided minimal levels of intervention or none at all” As such, diversion programs in Nebraska should not use high-risk level interventions, such as electronic monitors, on youth who are low risk. Furthermore, programs should use caution when drug testing youth. According to the RNR model, only youth with identified substance use needs should be drug tested. By testing youth without substance abuse issues, programs may be net-widening the youth served. Moreover, the goal of drug testing should be therapeutic, rather than punitive, so that youth with a positive drug screens are provided with graduated responses for services. This Evidence-Based Practices Brief, EB-NE Brief #1: May 2017, was published by the UNO, Juvenile Justice Institute in conjunction with the Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Research indicates that these programs may be net-widening the youth served. Moreover, the goal of drug testing should be therapeutic, rather than punitive, so that youth with a positive drug screens are provided with graduated responses for services. This Evidence-Based Practices Brief, EB-NE Brief #1: May 2017, was published by the UNO, Juvenile Justice Institute in conjunction with the Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.