

**District of Columbia
Juvenile Justice Advisory Group (JJAG)**



**Annual Report
2009-2012**

Justice Grants Administration (JGA)

January 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chair's Letter	3
Director's Letter	5
Introduction	6
Juvenile Justice Advisory Group	
Structure and Membership	6
Committees	7
Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act and Funding Streams	8
Title II Formula Grant Program	9
Funded Programs	10
Title V Community Prevention Grants Program	12
Juvenile Accountability Block Grants	13
Overview of Juvenile Justice Advisory Group and District Accomplishments	15
JJDP Act and Compliance Monitoring and Disproportionate Minority Contact	17
Spotlight on D.C.'s Efforts to Reduce Disproportionate Minority Contact	18
Total Youth Population	19
Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative	19
Recommendations to the Mayor and Council of the District of Columbia	20
Acknowledgments	21

JUVENILE JUSTICE ADVISORY GROUP
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Dear Mayor Gray and Members of the Council of the District of Columbia:

On behalf of the Juvenile Justice Advisory Group, I am pleased to present the 2009–2012 Report. This report describes the District's efforts during these years to create a juvenile justice system that addresses the needs of children from a rehabilitative rather than a punitive approach. It also describes the District's effort to provide a robust system of care for our juveniles and stay in compliance with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJJPA)—from mental health services to truancy reduction efforts. The District has historically been in compliance with the four core requirements of the JJJPA: *deinstitutionalization of status offenders (DSO)*; *separation of juveniles from adult offenders*; *jail removal of juveniles*; and *reduction of disproportionate minority contact (DMC)*. Notwithstanding our compliance, the District can and should go beyond minimum requirements and strive for innovative services for these youth to truly have a reformed juvenile justice system.

While many of the programs and initiatives discussed in this report further the core requirements of the JJJPA, the funding provided through this federal grant program is not enough to create a lasting change in juvenile justice in the District of Columbia. Many of the funded programs must rely on collaborative and creative strategies to work with other District agencies and partners to successfully rehabilitate our youth. Many of these collaborative efforts are detailed in this report.

Recognizing the disconnect between need and resource availability, the first recommendation we propose is to advocate at the federal level for the reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJJPA). Reauthorization is critical to strengthen the federal-state partnership created by the JJJPA, to ensure states and the District of Columbia receive the federal resources needed to sustain current, and birth new, evidence-based practices and programs, and to help states and local jurisdictions fulfill both the letter and the spirit of the JJJPA. For the states, and the District, the funding streams created by this act are essential for the success of our juvenile justice programs.

The second recommendation, which is reflected in the current JJAG Policy Committee work plan and Three-Year State Plan, is to strengthen access to mental health services for youth. This issue has been discussed at local conferences, in annual reports from the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, and in community conversations. As we move into the District's Three-Year State Plan, we hope to gather baseline data on youth in need of mental health services and identify the appropriate agencies to provide such services.

The third recommendation reflects the need for a collaborative strategy to address school suspensions and expulsions. While the District successfully implemented a truancy reduction task force and devoted funds to address truancy at the elementary school level, many initial contacts with the system begin at the middle and high school levels through suspensions and expulsions. With the expansion of public education options in the District, we must do a better job of capturing school push-out data and creating Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Timely (SMART) goals to address such issues.

Finally the JJAG recommends creating a comprehensive plan for delinquency diversion that includes a variety of diversion options for each point of entry into the justice system. Currently, there is a dearth of diversion options for youth who come into initial contact with the police.

Diversion has played a vital role in improving outcomes and rehabilitating youth across the country. The purposes of diversion include relief to the courts, police departments, and probation offices; as well as better outcomes for diverted youth compared to those involved in the court system, including the opportunity for youth to avoid prosecution by completing program requirements.

The District's juvenile justice system has come a long way since the Jerry M. case was filed, but there is much work to be done in order to ensure that youth do not come into contact with the system in the first place, and if they do make a mistake, to then determine the best treatments and placement for them. The Juvenile Justice Advisory Group continues to meet monthly to gather information on the depth of opportunities for juveniles and on where improvements both in and out of the juvenile justice system are needed. The above recommendations reflect the input of the JJAG stakeholders and the understanding that more work is needed. We appreciate the continued collaboration with state officials, youth, and juvenile justice stakeholders, and we look forward to the work ahead and analysis of the 2009-2012 Three-Year Plan.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Carmen E. Daugherty". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Carmen E. Daugherty

Juvenile Justice Advisory Group Chair

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Executive Office of the Mayor



OFFICE OF VICTIM SERVICES
OFFICE OF JUSTICE GRANTS ADMINISTRATION

Dear Mayor Gray and Members of the Council of the District of Columbia:

I am pleased to present to you the Juvenile Justice Advisory Group (JJAG) Report for 2009-2012. This publication is not only a summary of the JJAG activities, but also a tribute to all the juvenile justice stakeholders who work to address the needs of youth and families in the District.

Throughout the years, programs have been implemented throughout the District that focus on preventing youth from becoming involved with the juvenile justice system. The JJAG has served as a vital voice in the process of funding programs that are dedicated to reducing truancy, addressing mental health, and curbing juvenile delinquent behaviors.

I am pleased with the accomplishments and progress summarized within this report. Furthermore, I hope you will find it to be informative and a demonstration of the dedication to service shown by the JJAG members. I look forward to your continued commitment to support the JJAG, youth, and families of the District of Columbia.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Melissa Hook". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Melissa Hook, Director
Justice Grants Administration

Introduction

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP Act) of 1974 created a federal-state partnership to “provide national leadership, coordination and resources to prevent juvenile victimization and respond appropriately to juvenile delinquency.” As the State Administering Agency, the Justice Grants Administration (JGA) is responsible for securing and managing federal grant funds related to juvenile and criminal justice for the District of Columbia. The Mayor’s order establishes the Juvenile Justice Advisory Group (JJAG) as the required State Advisory Group (SAG) to receive Federal Formula funds, Title II, Part B, per section 223(a) (3) of the JJDP Act.

Juvenile Justice Advisory Group

Structure and Membership

In accordance with the JJDP Act, the JJAG may consist of 15 to 33 members appointed by the Mayor. The members have training and subject matter expertise in delinquency prevention; treatment of juveniles in the delinquency system; youth behavior, health, and education needs; and juvenile justice system administration. The composition and membership of the JJAG are specified by the JJAG by-laws.

JJAG Membership Roster Terms end September 15, 2013

Name	Represents ¹	Full-Time Government	Company/Agency/Group
Carmen Daugherty (Chair)	D	N	Campaign for Youth Justice
Adam Aljoburi	B	Y	Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services
James Ballard	C	Y	Department of Mental Health
Arnolda Beaujuin	D	N	Community Member
Ileana Benitez	I	N	Youth
James Berry	C	N	The Public Defender Service
Lisette Burton	F	N	Community Member
Zoe Bush	B	Y	D.C. Superior Court
Hilary Cairns	C	Y	Department of Mental Health
Ivan Cloyd	D	N	Alliance of Concerned Men
Commander William Dandridge	B	Y	Metropolitan Police Department
Melissa Garcia	I	N	Youth
Diamond Herring	I	N	Youth
Neil Irvin	D	N	Men Can Stop Rape
Terri Odom	B	N	Court Social Services
R. Daniel Okonkwo	D	N	D.C. Lawyers for Youth
Tonya Pickett	D	N	Youth Court
Dave Rosenthal	B	Y	Office of the Attorney General
Gitana Stewart-Ponder	C	Y	Deputy Mayor’s Office for

			Public Safety and Justice
Patrice Sulton	D	N	Community Member
Leroy Thorpe	E	N	Community Member
Ram Uppuluri	D	N	FOCUS
Unique Williams	I	N	Youth

¹ Key:

- A. Locally elected official representing general purpose government (none currently on roster).
- B. Representatives from law enforcement and juvenile justice agencies, including juvenile and family court judges, prosecutors, counsel for children and youth, and probation workers. While Family Court and Public Defender Service representatives regularly attend monthly JJAG meetings, representatives from these agencies have not been officially reappointed as JJAG Members.
- C. Representatives of public agencies concerned with delinquency prevention or treatment, such as welfare, social services, mental health, education, special education, recreation, and youth services
- D. Representatives of private, nonprofit organizations, including persons with a special focus on preserving and strengthening families, parent groups and parent self-help groups, youth development, delinquency prevention and treatment, neglected or dependent children, the quality of juvenile justice, education, and social services for children
- E. Volunteers who work with at-risk youth
- F. Persons involved with alternative incarceration programs, including programs providing organized recreation activities
- G. Persons with special experience and competence in addressing problems related to school violence and vandalism and alternatives to suspension and expulsion (none currently on roster).
- H. Persons with special experience and competence in addressing problems related to learning disabilities, emotional difficulties, child abuse and neglect, and youth violence (none currently on roster).
- I. Youth

Committees

The JJAG is currently organized into five committees: Executive Committee, Monitoring Committee, Youth Committee, Grants Committee, and Policy and Legislative Committee. An ad-hoc Ethics Committee was also created.

The Executive Committee consists of the Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, Parliamentarian, and the other Committee Chairs. It is charged with setting the direction of the JJAG, ensuring accountability and continuity within the group, and making decisions on matters that require immediate attention between JJAG meetings. The Executive Committee assists the Chair with setting the agenda for each meeting. This committee is also responsible for assisting JGA staff with development of the Three-Year State Plan as mandated by the JJDPA. Upon acceptance of the Plan, the committee is responsible for developing, in conjunction with staff, solicitations for proposals for administering the programs in the Plan, as permitted by the Administration. Finally, the committee is responsible for planning the JJAG's budget on an annual basis.

The Monitoring Committee duties include, but are not limited to, addressing the mandates of the JJDP Act. The Committee develops and presents the priority problem issues addressed in the 3 Year Plan along with a budget for recommended funding. This committee is responsible for the monitoring of any reports or issues that affect the mandates and goals for the JJAG as needed. Finally, the Criminal Justice Coordinating Counsel participates on this committee and provides updates on the District's compliance monitoring efforts.

The Youth Committee provides a youth perspective on JJAG planning and decision-making, and contributes recommendations on issues as delegated by the JJAG. The Committee is set up to be co-chaired by one of the JJAG youth members and a non-youth member appointed by the Chair. Membership of the committee is open to the full JJAG. The Committee's activities include contributing to the development of the Three-Year Plan and organizing youth focus groups.

The Grants Committee reviews the procedures and qualitative and quantitative assessment tools used by JGA for all grant applications and may make recommendations to improve the grant-making process. With the assistance of the JGA Juvenile Justice Specialist, it compiles at least quarterly a list of all grants that failed to commence project operations within 60 days of grant award acceptance. Where warranted, the reports include staff recommendations to terminate the project. Any project that has not commenced operations within 90 days of the date of grant award acceptance is notified by Committee staff that the JJAG may recommend project termination. The Committee also monitors the progress of programs and supports staff activities where needed.

The Policy and Legislative Committee duties include identifying and analyzing the need for special services for youth in the District; making recommendations about corrective measures needed within agencies and proposing grant-funded programs to address these needs; establishing priorities for District-wide implementation of the Title II, JABG, and Title V grant programs; advising the District on developing and maintaining a coordinated and comprehensive approach to juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention; and advising the District on improvements to public safety.

The Ethics Committee is tasked with addressing ethical considerations as a prelude to and in conjunction with the drafting of a new set of by-laws. The Ethics Committee ensures complete transparency within the JJAG's processes and advises on potential conflict of interest concerns during grant-making decisions.

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act and Funding Streams

The federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) of 1974, as amended, P.L. 93-415; 42 U.S.C. 5601 et. seq., serves as a vehicle for Congressional directives aimed at improving the effectiveness of the juvenile justice system. In this amended Act, 42 U.S.C. 5602 [Sec. 102] states that "the purpose of this subchapter ... are -- (1) to support State and local programs that prevent juvenile involvement in delinquent behavior; (2) to assist State and local governments in promoting public safety by encouraging accountability for acts of juvenile delinquency; and (3) to assist State and local governments in addressing juvenile crime through the provision of technical assistance, research, training, evaluation, and the dissemination of information on effective programs for combating juvenile delinquency."

The JJAG is responsible for creating and reviewing the District's Three-Year Plan, and for advising the Mayor on progress by submitting an annual report that provides recommendations regarding the District's compliance with the four core requirements of the JJDP Act. In response to the JJDP requirement for the Title II Formula Grants Program, this report provides a summary of progress made FY 2009-2012, and offers direction for the District and JJAG on future juvenile justice funding priorities. Additionally, this report provides an overview of multiple OJJDP funding streams sub-awarded to District partners through JGA. Over a three-year period, JGA awarded approximately \$2,228,700 in Federal Formula Grants to target five purpose areas. From 2009-2012, JGA awarded \$4,282,669 from other juvenile justice funding streams.

Total JGA Funding for Juvenile Justice 2009-2012

Juvenile Justice Grant Programs	2009 Award Grant Period	2010 Award Grant Period	2011 Award Grant Period	2012 Award Grant Period
Formula Grant (Title II) ²	\$600,000 10/08-9/11	\$600,000 10/09-9/12	\$600,000 10/10-9/13	\$400,000 10/11-9/14
Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG) ³	\$294,100 6/09-5/12	\$281,500 7/10-6/13	\$221,273 7/11-6/14	\$100,965 7/12-6/15
Title V Delinquency Prevention ⁴	\$ 33,486 10/08-9/11	\$ 84,945 10/09-9/12	\$ 50,000 10/10-9/13	\$0
Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws (EUDL) Grant ⁵	\$360,000 6/09-3/12	\$356,400 6/10-5/12	\$300,000 6/11-5/13	\$0
	\$1,287,586	\$1,322,845	\$1,171,273	\$500,965
TOTAL FEDERAL	\$4,282,669			

Title II Formula Grant Program

This program supports state and local efforts in planning, establishing, operating, coordinating, and evaluating projects directly or through grants and contracts with public and private agencies to develop 1) more effective education, training, research, prevention, diversion, treatment, and rehabilitation programs for delinquent juveniles, and 2) programs to improve the juvenile justice system.

Title II Program Area Focus

Purpose Area Title	2009	2010	2011	2012	Federal Total
#6/#10: Compliance Monitoring/ DMC	\$100,000	\$109,700	\$109,000	\$109,000	\$427,700
#9: Delinquency Prevention	\$0	\$420,000	\$0	\$231,000	\$651,000
#19: Systems Improvement	\$0	\$0	\$410,000	\$0	\$410,000
#23: Planning and Administration ⁶	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$40,000	\$220,000
#29: Serious Crime	\$420,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$420,000
#32: State Advisory Group Allocation	\$30,000	\$30,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$100,000
Total	\$610,000	\$619,700	\$599,000	\$400,000	\$2,228,700

² See five purpose areas identified in the Three Year Plan for FY 2009-2011.

³ The JJAG is further delegated authority as the supervisory policy board for JABG. Prior to 2003, the JABG program was known as the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants program (Department of Justice [DOJ] Authorization Act of FY 2003, Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act). JABG funding focuses on youth offender and systems reform activities that promote increased accountability.

⁴ Title V (Community Prevention) is funded under the Department of Justice.

⁵ EUDL is funded under the Department of Justice.

⁶ In addition to the \$60,000 state match.

**Funded Programs
Title II**

Organization	Grant Amount	Project Description
FY 2009		
Progressive Life Center	\$365,000	Provided Functional Family Therapy (FFT) services to youths and their families in Wards 1-6. PLC built institutional capacity to support four FFT therapists who will work with approximately 100 youth and families.
Criminal Justice Coordinating Council	\$100,000	The CJCC houses the Compliance Monitor and Disproportionate Minority Contact coordinator. These funds would (1) assist the District in developing and implementing a compliance monitoring plan which achieves the four objectives of compliance monitoring: 1. Identification of the monitoring universe; 2. Classification of the monitoring universe; 3. Inspection of facilities; and 4. Data collection and data verification and (2) support the DMC assessment.
FY 2010		
PCS Center for Student Support Services	\$400,00	Provided Functional Family Therapy services to youth and families in Wards 7 & 8.
Criminal Justice Coordinating Council	\$109,700	The CJCC houses the Compliance Monitor and Disproportionate Minority Contact coordinator. These funds would (1) assist the District in developing and implementing a compliance monitoring plan which achieves the four objectives of compliance monitoring: 1. Identification of the monitoring universe; 2. Classification of the monitoring universe; 3.

		Inspection of facilities; and 4. Data collection and data verification and (2) support the DMC assessment.
FY 2011		
Access Youth	\$103,000	Diverted first-time offenders away from the juvenile justice system by having them participate in victim-offender mediation, life skills, and community services.
Criminal Justice Coordinating Council	\$109,000	The CJCC houses the Compliance Monitor and Disproportionate Minority Contact coordinator. These funds would (1) assist the District in developing and implementing a compliance monitoring plan which achieves the four objectives of compliance monitoring: 1. Identification of the monitoring universe; 2. Classification of the monitoring universe; 3. Inspection of facilities; and 4. Data collection and data verification and (2) support the DMC assessment.
Mentoring Today	\$127,000	Provided mentoring and legal advocacy and youth leadership to 35 young men who are returning to the District from New Beginnings, juvenile residential placements, and D.C. Department of Corrections facilities.
Youth Court of the District of Columbia	\$170,000	Provided diversion services to first-time juvenile offenders in four areas: court/restorative justice, positive youth development, education, and wrap-around services.
FY 2012		
Access Youth	\$146,000	Diverted first-time offenders away from the juvenile justice system by having them participate in victim-offender mediation, life skills, and community services.

Criminal Justice Coordinating Council	\$109,000	The CJCC houses the Compliance Monitor and Disproportionate Minority Contact coordinator. These funds would (1) assist the District in developing and implementing a compliance monitoring plan which achieves the four objectives of compliance monitoring: 1. Identification of the monitoring universe; 2. Classification of the monitoring universe; 3. Inspection of facilities; and 4. Data collection and data verification and (2) support the DMC assessment.
Urban Ed	\$85,000	Aimed to reduce risky behavior and developed relevant technology and career skills to help youth become self-sustaining leaders and members of society.

Title V Community Prevention Grants Program

The Title V Incentive Grants Program focuses on reducing risks and enhancing protective factors to prevent youth at risk of becoming delinquent from entering the juvenile justice system and to intervene with first-time and non-serious offenders to keep them out of the juvenile justice system.

**Funded Programs
Title V**

Organization	Grant Amount	Project Description
FY 2009		
Helping Inner City Kids Succeed	\$32,948	Supported program activities to effectively engage youth in sustainable developmental opportunities that will lead to personal empowerment.
FY 2010		
LifeSTARTS	\$80,000	Accepted referrals from the PINS program and expanded its capacity to provide truancy intervention efforts and programming at Ron Brown and Kelly Miller Middle Schools.
FY 2011		

Department of Mental Health	\$47,300	Evidence Based Practices: Functional Family Therapy Initiative. Through a subcontract with FFT, Inc. 15 staff will receive site certification training to expand delivery of FFT to the Department of Human Services, Parent and Adolescent Support Services (PASS) program.
FY 2012		
<i>The U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs did not appropriate funds this year.</i>		

Juvenile Accountability Block Grants

The goal of the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants (JABG) program is to reduce juvenile offending through accountability-based programs focused on juvenile offenders and the juvenile justice system.

Funded Programs Juvenile Accountability Block Grants (JABG)

Organization	Grant Amount	Project Description
FY 2009		
Metropolitan Police Department	\$174,432	Enhanced and evaluated juvenile justice efforts within MPD. MPD and CJCC will develop a Juvenile Case Management System to track information on a juvenile offender throughout the criminal justice system, allowing better communication with individual offices and across physical and agency boundaries.
Criminal Justice Coordinating Council	\$99,000	The CJCC, in partnership with the MPD, will enhance and evaluate juvenile justice efforts within MPD. MPD and CJCC will develop a Juvenile Case Management System to track information on a juvenile offender throughout the criminal justice system.
Vera Institute of Justice, Inc.	\$5,143	Helped the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services

		developed and implemented performance measures in four key areas: secure confinement, reentry, multi-systemic therapy, and case processing.
FY 2010		
Office of the Attorney General	\$58,001	Enhanced and evaluated juvenile justice efforts within MPD. MPD and CJCC will develop a Juvenile Case Management System to track information on a juvenile offender throughout the criminal justice system, allowing better communication with individual offices and across physical and agency boundaries.
Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services	\$115,636	Piloted an electronic monitoring program to supervise and monitor high-risk and non-compliant youth who reside in the community. This improved public safety and reduced youth delinquency.
FY 2011		
Urban Ed	\$85,000	Aimed to reduce risky behavior and develop relevant technology and career skills that will help youth become self-sustaining leaders and members of society.
Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services	\$114,100	Piloted an electronic monitoring program to supervise and monitor high-risk and non-compliant youth who reside in the community. This improved public safety and reduced youth delinquency.
FY 2012		
Mentoring Today	\$61,960	Provided mentoring and legal advocacy and youth leadership to 35 young men who are returning to the District from New Beginnings, juvenile residential placements, and

		D.C. Department of Corrections facilities.
Office of the Attorney General	\$60,900	Enhanced and evaluated juvenile justice efforts within MPD. MPD and CJCC will develop a Juvenile Case Management System to track information on a juvenile offender throughout the criminal justice system, allowing better communication with individual offices and across physical and agency boundaries.

Overview of Juvenile Justice Advisory Group and District Accomplishments

Significant progress has been made by the JJAG toward implementing a seamless, consolidated award process to benefit the juvenile justice community and partners. The JJAG is pleased to provide an overview of its juvenile justice accomplishments in the District of Columbia between 2009-2012.

- In 2009, the District of Columbia’s juvenile justice system continued to support the priorities of the Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI). The first JDAI newsletter was distributed in August, highlighting the work of the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (DYRS), Court Social Services (CSS), and the leadership of JDAI.
- In 2009, the District of Columbia hosted the annual National JDAI Inter-Site Conference.
- The Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (DYRS) opened New Beginnings in 2009. New Beginnings is a secure residential treatment facility for young males. Youth participate in the D.C. Model program, which provides supervision, rehabilitation, and planning for the youth’s return to his community. For more information on this facility and DYRS’ programs, see www.dyrs.dc.gov.
- In September 2009, under the leadership of the Honorable Zoe Bush and in partnership with the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, the D.C. Superior Court Family Court convened a day-long retreat for juvenile justice and child welfare stakeholders focused on race and its effects on the justice system. Khattib Waheed, M.Ed., Senior Fellow, Center for the Study of Social Policy, served as the facilitator for the Disproportionate Representation of Minorities (DRM) Collaborative’s “Courageous Conversation about Institutional and Structural Racism.” The Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC) developed a training evaluation for the retreat.
- JJAG members attended the first CJCC Juvenile Justice Summit in Washington, D.C. in 2009. The JJDPA core requirements were reviewed, and agencies discussed strategies to meet those requirements. The summit paid particular attention to absconding and other pre-adjudication issues facing youth.

- In 2010, JGA awarded funds to the Department of Human Services to implement the Parent & Adolescent Support Services (PASS) program. PASS engages families, community partners, and government agencies to reduce status offender behaviors among youth ages 10-17.
- In 2010, JJAG members assisted in planning and attended the second CJCC Juvenile Justice Summit in which mental health needs of system-involved youth were discussed. Additionally, the participants learned more about confidentiality requirements and the importance of sharing information between agencies.
- The D.C. Superior Court Family Court's Model Court Collaborative on the Disproportionate Representation of Minorities (DRM), under the leadership of the Honorable Zoe Bush and in partnership with CJCC, convened a retreat in July 2010 to further develop Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Timely (SMART) goals for each stakeholder agency aimed at reducing disproportionate minority contact. During the retreat, stakeholders were asked to consider the development of SMART goals across agencies.
- In 2010, JDAI launched a new Quality Assurance Committee, which initially focused on the delivery of services at shelter homes for absconding youth.
- On March 8, 2010, D.C. Mayor Adrian Fenty signed the Mayor's Order 2010-43, which designated the Justice Grants Administration as the sole authority in implementing the provisions of the JJDP Act.
- The CJCC convened a Juvenile Justice Summit on September 30, 2010, with a focused discussion on Compliance Monitoring. Kristie Brackens, from OJJDP, presented on the issue of disproportionate minority contact (DMC).
- JJAG members attended the OJJDP Conference 2011 at the National Harbor in Maryland.
- In 2011, Member Dave Rosenthal worked with JGA on the OJJDP audit.
- In March 2011, the D.C. Superior Court Family Court DRM Collaborative held trainings on the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges' Courts Catalyzing Change (CCC) Benchcard Initiative. Training included judicial officers, prosecutors, court-appointed counsel, social workers, and law enforcement agency representatives.
- JJAG became a member of the Coalition for Juvenile Justice (CJJ) in 2012.
- JJAG members received juvenile justice training from OJJDP and Development Services Group in February 2012.
- JJAG representatives attended the Annual Interdisciplinary Cross Training Conferences conducted by the D.C. Superior Court Family Court on topics relevant to the children and families served by the D.C. Superior Court Family Court:
 - 2009 – Domestic Violence in Families: Strengthening the Community Response
 - 2010 – Child Sexual Abuse and Exploitation: Education, Empowering & Transforming Lives
 - 2011 – Empowering Fathers: One Size Does Not Fit All

- 2012 – Opening Minds...Opening Doors for LGBTQ Youth in Family Court
- JJAG members also attended meetings of the D.C. Superior Court Family Court DRM Collaborative.
- In 2012, the JJAG held one of its monthly meetings at the Youth Services Center, a pre-adjudication residential facility, and spoke with youth residents and staff to determine levels of programming and opportunities for improvement in serving youth.

JJDP Act and Compliance Monitoring and Disproportionate Minority Contact

The Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC) for the District of Columbia is an independent agency dedicated to continually improving criminal justice administration. CJCC provides compliance monitoring as mandated by the JJDPA. Since 2006, the District has been in full compliance with the core requirements.

The Four Core Requirements of the JJDPA are as follows:

- Deinstitutionalization of status offenders (DSO). A status offender (a juvenile who has committed an act that would not be a crime if an adult committed it) or nonoffender (such as a dependent or neglected child) cannot be held, with statutory exceptions, in secure juvenile detention or correctional facilities, nor can they be held in adult facilities for any length of time.
- Separation of juveniles from adult offenders (separation). Alleged and adjudicated delinquents cannot be detained or confined in a secure institution (such as a jail, lockup, or secure correctional facility) in which they have sight or sound contact with adult offenders.
- Adult jail and lockup removal (jail removal). As a general rule, juveniles (individuals who may be subject to the original jurisdiction of a juvenile court based on age and offense limitations established by state law) cannot be securely detained or confined in adult jails and lockups.
- Disproportionate minority contact (DMC). States are required to address juvenile delinquency prevention and system improvement efforts designed to reduce the disproportionate number of juvenile minorities who come into contact with the juvenile justice system.

Spotlight on D.C.'s Efforts to Reduce Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)⁷

The 2007-2008 annual report by the JJAG discussed the strides that were made during this time period to address DMC in the juvenile justice system. During 2009-2010, the D.C. Superior Court Family Court Disproportionate Representation of Minorities (DRM) Collaborative convened several meetings to implement the Model Courts National Agenda Implementation Guide. The Honorable Zoe Bush, the DRM Collaborative Chair, convened juvenile justice and child welfare stakeholders to address the following five steps: 1) developing collaboration; 2) hosting an informational and information-sharing meeting; 3) initiating a "Courageous Conversation" about institutional and structural racism; 4) developing a strategic plan; and 5) following up and following through. These meetings facilitated discussions among key stakeholders, and focused on reviewing data regarding local disparities in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems, as well as efforts to reduce disproportionality.

In 2009, the D.C. Superior Court Family Court DRM Collaborative initiated a "Courageous Conversations" series about institutional and structural racism. The discussions addressed the history of structural and institutional racism in order to understand the context of disproportionality and disparity in child welfare systems. The forum was facilitated in 2009 by Khattib Waheed, M.Ed., Senior Fellow, Center for the Study of Social Policy. This resulted in a full-day retreat on September 23, 2009, where juvenile justice and child welfare stakeholders watched *Race – the Power of an Illusion: The House We Live In*, as part of the Towards SMART Goals training. In the afternoon, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges engaged the stakeholders in a conversation called "Courts Catalyzing Change." The Criminal Justice Coordinating Council developed training and feedback opportunities for the attendees.

The DRM Collaborative and CJCC convened another retreat titled Towards SMART Goals II on July 9, 2010 to continue work with stakeholders to establish goals for each participating agency. The Collaborative set three goals for the participants: 1) data collection; 2) training focused on cultural competency; and 3) examining and developing agency practices to address disparities and disproportionate representation of minorities within each agency.

During the retreat, the audience of upper level management used the suggestions from frontline workers to solidify their SMART goals. One SMART goal advanced by MPD involved changing youth arrest paperwork (PD379) to capture race and ethnicity accurately. This change prevents MPD staff from making assumptions as to race, cultural or ethnic background that may be incorrect. A Court Social Services (CSS) SMART goal heightened awareness of the disparate treatment of minorities and its implications, as well as the need for CSS to ensure that their duties are carried out consistently on a race-, class-, and value-neutral basis. DYRS' SMART goals included analyzing outcomes from programs and decision points by race, ethnicity and gender. Participants also focused on creating cross-agency SMART goals to address cross-systems problems.

The D.C. Superior Court Family Court DRM Collaborative also conducted cultural competency training for Collaborative members. Tawara Goode, National Center for Cultural Competence at Georgetown University Center for Child and Human Development, gave a presentation on the concept of cultural competency, as it relates to disproportionate representation of minorities in the Family Court.

In September 2011, D.C. Superior Court Family Court DRM Collaborative received a presentation from the D.C. Superior Court's Court Social Services Division on the Alternative to Detention

⁷ Source: 2012 Disproportionate Minority Contact Plan, The Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC).

Continuum developed by CSSD. This presentation focused on front-end measures designed to permit youth, who might otherwise be detained or placed in shelter pending adjudication, to remain in the community with appropriate supervision. The December 2011 meeting of the Collaborative featured a presentation from Joseph Fedeli of the Development Services Group, Project Director, State Advisory Group Training Grant and Marcia Cohen, Vice President for Research and Evaluation. This presentation included a demonstration of OJJDP's Model Programs Guide (MPG), designed to assist juvenile justice practitioners and communities in implementing evidence-based prevention and intervention programs covering the continuum of youth services.

The major undertaking of the DRM Committee in 2011 was the training of 90 frontline staff, supervisors, and judges about the Courts Catalyzing Change Benchcard. Under the leadership of co-chairs Magistrate Judge Lori Parker and DMC Coordinator Joel Braithwaite, the training was facilitated by the Honorable Wadie Thomas, Jr., Judge of the Separate Juvenile Court, Douglas County, Nebraska, and Omaha Model Court Lead Judge. Technical assistance was provided by the National Council of Juvenile & Family Court Judges.

Total Youth Population 2009-2010⁸

The statewide DMC spreadsheet data for 2008-2010 show that minority youth are overrepresented in the District's juvenile justice system. These are the 2008 and 2009 population figures of youth, under the age of 18 in the District of Columbia according to the U.S. Census Bureau Estimates for 2005-2007. These numbers were provided by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's Relative Rate Index (RRI) Spreadsheet. The 2010 Census shows some changes in the population of youth in the District and is displayed below.

The RRI is used to calculate DMC. The RRI compares and analyzes the rates of minority youth contact divided by the rates of white youth contact at different points within the juvenile justice system. However, DMC in the District of Columbia requires a special analysis. African American youth account for approximately two thirds of all youth in the city, making the percentage of minorities much higher and the percentage of white youth much lower than in other jurisdictions.

**District of Columbia
Total Youth Population**

	2010	2009	Δ	Δ%
Total	113150	113273	-123	-0.1%
Black	75471	77454	-1983	-3%
White	25346	19477	5869	30%
Latino	12899	11324	1575	14%
Asian	2263	2152	111	5%

Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative⁸

Since 2006, the District of Columbia has been a part of the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI), a nationwide, data-driven effort focused on eliminating the unnecessary detention of juveniles, and providing them with strong community-based services. The juvenile agencies involved include: Court Social Services (CSS); Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (DYRS); Public Defender Service (PDS); Office of the Attorney General (OAG); Metropolitan Police

⁸ Source: 2012 Disproportionate Minority Contact Plan, The Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC).

Department (MPD); Children's Family Service Agency (CFSA); Department of Mental Health (DMH); and the Addiction Prevention and Recovery Administration (APRA).

There has been a substantial reduction in the detained youth population at the Youth Services Center (YSC), a pre-adjudication facility that has a capacity of 88 youth. The average daily population (ADP) at YSC during 2011 was 77 youth, compared to 79 in 2010 and 95 in 2009. This reduction can be credited to the effective collaboration between agencies and their ability to pinpoint areas of delay and expedite cases. Moreover, the average length of stay (LOS) has not exceeded 25 days since February 2010.

Recommendations to the Mayor and Council of the District of Columbia

While there has been extensive progress, it is still imperative that the District be a leader in youth justice reform. Below are recommendations to further that position.

- Support and increase diversion by creating and implementing a comprehensive plan that includes multiple diversion options for each entry point into the justice system.
- Fund juvenile justice programs that should not rely solely on JJDP A funds since federal funds have decreased each year.
- Advocate reauthorization of the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act and increase District funding and support for JJDP A grant programs.
- Increase and expedite mental health services for court-involved youth.
- Continue identifying gaps in services and accountability from youth-serving agencies, including, but not limited to, DYRS, CSS, and District of Columbia Public Schools and Public Charter Schools.
- Assess the impact of evidence-based programs and find ways to increase visibility of these programs to prevent duplication.
- Reduce the number of children and youth in the District who are at risk of ending up in prison due to their lack of engagement in a high-quality, structured, educational or vocational training or workforce development program. This can be done in three ways: 1) Identify collaborative strategies to provide supportive services for children and youth and their families identified as at risk of dropping out of school; 2) Support the development of alternative, high-quality educational opportunities for children and youth who do not, or are unable to, remain in school; and 3) Develop re-engagement and workforce development programs for older youth who have dropped out of school.
- Increase and continue inter-agency coordination for youth served by different service agencies in the District.
- Increase collaborative strategies to address adverse school discipline practices.

Acknowledgments

The JJAG would like to thank Paul A. Quander, Jr. Esquire, Deputy Mayor for Public Safety and Justice, and the Justice Grants Administration (JGA) for their participation and assistance in producing this report, specifically, Carmen Daugherty, JJAG Chair, Melissa Hook, JGA Director, Bridgette Royster, Juvenile Justice Specialist, Brenda Smith, EUDL Coordinator, and Mary Abraham, Senior Grants Manager. We thank the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) for editing this report. Lastly, JGA would like to acknowledge JJAG member contributions to the report.