

CRIME AND JUSTICE INSTITUTE

Senate Bill 367 Performance
Measurement Framework

January 2017



Crime and Justice Institute at CRJ | Boston, MA | www.crj.org/cj

Presentation Overview

- Importance of Performance Measures
- SB 367 Policy-Specific Performance Measures and Data Collection Gaps
- Measuring Recidivism



Importance of Performance Measures



Why Measure Performance in Juvenile Justice?

- Can we answer key questions about the juvenile justice system in Kansas?
 - What are the relevant outcomes in the juvenile justice system?
 - How have things changed over time?
 - How can we tell if the system is improving?

Examples of System Indicators

- Number of referrals, intakes, arrests
 - Pre-file diversions
- Number of court cases
 - Post-file diversions
 - Adjudications
- Number of dispositions
 - Court services
 - ISP
 - Custody (Case Management, JCF)
- Youth in placement
 - Length of stay

Limitations of System Indicators

- Don't identify underlying drivers of trend
 - For example, if there are fewer youth in KDOC-JS custody on a given day, is that because of a reduction in admissions, length of stay, or both?
- Don't identify underlying population changes
 - For example, if the average length of stay in placement is changing, is that because the type of youth being sent to placement is changing? Or not?
- Don't identify specific policy changes or policy drivers

SB 367 Policy-Specific Performance Measures and Data Collection Gaps



School Referrals

Policy Change	Performance Measures	Agency Responsible
School district & local stakeholders develop MOU to guide referrals to law enforcement & juvenile justice system	Number of juvenile intakes from schools	TO BE DETERMINED:
	Number of MOUs established between school districts and law enforcement agencies	State Board of Education data? KBI data? Attorney General data?

Temporary Custody

Policy Change	Performance Measures	Agency Responsible
Eliminate temporary custody for JOs	Number of JO youth who enter temporary custody as CINC	TO BE DETERMINED:
	Number of JO youth who enter temporary custody as JO (under invalid order)	DCF data? FullCourt data?

Diversion/Immediate Intervention Program

Policy Change	Performance Measures	Agency Responsible
Authorize two-step diversion process	List of entities providing IIP services, broken down by county	Multiple sources:
1. First step diversion	Number of youth diverted in 1st step, and number of youth successful	Court Services annual report data for diversion supervision cases
2. Second step diversion: multi-disciplinary team	Number of youth diverted in 2nd step, and number of youth successful	OJA statewide court data from annual reports for number of post-file diversions
	Number of court petitions from unsuccessful diversions	TO BE DETERMINED: Pre-file diversion – Intake? Court Services?

Detention

Policy Change	Performance Measures	Agency Responsible
Notice to appears can be used as an alternative to detention	Number of notice to appears filed	TO BE DETERMINED: Law enforcement data for NTA?
Detention eligibility based on detention risk assessment tool	Number of detention admissions (breakdown by DRAI score)	KDOC-maintained spreadsheets for DRAI data
Detention should only be for high risk youth		Court data for youth on Court Services probation?
Establish fund for detention alternatives	Funding for detention alternatives	

Transfers to Adult Court

Policy Change	Performance Measures	Agency Responsible
No youth under age 14 may be prosecuted as an adult; presumption of adulthood burden is now on the prosecution	Number of cases transferred to adult system (break down by offense and age)	TO BE DETERMINED: Transfers tracked in OJA statewide annual report data
Extended jurisdiction juvenile (EJJ) prosecution eliminated for all but the highest severity offenses	Number of EJJ cases filed (break down by offense)	Court order for EJJ cases tracked in FullCourt data?

Dispositions: Risk and Needs Assessment

Policy Change	Performance Measures	Agency Responsible
Statewide use of validated risk & needs assessment in all cases to inform: supervision level, referrals to programs & services, and case planning	Number of YLS assessments conducted by KDOC	TO BE DETERMINED: KDOC YLS data in CASIMS
	Number of YLS assessments conducted by OJA	YLS data eventually will be linked to FullCourt - YLS tracking across Court Services is all paper
Court Services probation and ISP to serve targeted risk profile	Number of dispositions to each supervision type, breakdown by risk level (Court Services probation, ISP probation)	



13

Dispositions: Limits on Custody

Policy Change	Performance Measures	Agency Responsible
Limitations of out of home placement (Case Management)	Number of youth placed in non-secure setting (YRCII, TFC, other) by offense and risk level	TO BE DETERMINED: KDOC YLS data in CASIMS
	Number of youth placed in JCF by offense (Serious I; Serious II; Serious III, Serious IV; Chronic I) and risk level	YLS data eventually will be linked to FullCourt - YLS tracking across Court Services is all paper
Limitations on JCF eligibility based on offense severity		



14

Violations: Graduated Responses

Policy Change	Performance Measures	Agency Responsible
Continuum of community-based graduated responses statewide allows probation officers to respond swiftly and appropriately to technical violations	Development of graduated sanctions protocol/matrix	KDOC CASIMS system needs to require reporting for Violations tab
	Number of Court Services probation violations reported to court	Court Services youth should have FullCourt revocation outcome
	Number of ISP violations reported to court	

Violations: Court Intervention

Policy Change	Performance Measures	Agency Responsible
Court intervention upon 3rd technical violation if graduated responses have failed	Outcome of Court Services probation violations reported to court	KDOC CASIMS system needs to require reporting for Revocation tab
	Outcome of ISP violations reported to court	Court Services youth should have FullCourt revocation outcome
	Outcome of violations for JCF conditional release youth	
	Average length of stay in detention for conditional release violators	

Length of Supervision: Earned Discharge

Policy Change	Performance Measures	Agency Responsible
	Number of youth eligible for credits	KDOC should add to CASIMS tracking for ISP youth
Earned discharge credit for juveniles doing well on probation & in KDOC custody (based on eligibility criteria established by KDOC and OJA)	Number of youth awarded credits Number of youth not awarded credits (track reason for not receiving credit)	How can this be tracked in FullCourt or Court Services data?
	Average probation time credited for eligible youth	

Length of Supervision: Probation Length

Policy Change	Performance Measures	Agency Responsible
	Number of youth who have probation length petitioned for extension	KDOC CASIMS system can track ISP length by risk level
Probation length cap by offense and risk level	Number of youth with probation length extensions Average length of probation by offense and risk level categories for youth whose probation is not extended Average length of probation by offense and risk level categories for youth whose probation is extended	Aggregate caseload data OJA tracks from Court Services can offer interim solution, but does not distinguish by risk level - this may not be possible until YLS data is tracked in FullCourt

Length of Supervision: Overall Case Length

Policy Change	Performance Measures	Agency Responsible
Case length cap by offense and risk level	Average length of total supervision by offense and risk level categories	KDOC CASIMS system can track this
Case length limit may reset for new offense adjudication	Average time spent OOH by offense and risk level categories Number of youth with extended case cap due to new offense	KDOC CASIMS system can track this Detention data can be tracked for KDOC custody youth and ISP youth
Total detention time cap: 45 days	Average LOS in detention over case	What about for Court Services youth detained?



CRIME AND JUSTICE INSTITUTE

Measuring Recidivism

CRIME AND JUSTICE INSTITUTE

Importance of Measuring Recidivism

- Examine impact of SB 367 policy changes
- Evaluate effectiveness of newly funded programs
- Validate risk assessment tools
 - Detention risk assessment
 - Post-adjudication risk assessment
 - Screening tools

Considerations for Defining Recidivism

- Definitions of recidivism
 - Re-arrest
 - Re-adjudication
 - Re-incarceration/return to custody
- Different definitions for different parts of the system
 - Pre-adjudication vs. post-disposition interventions
- Outcome period
 - 1 year, 2 years, 3 years
 - During supervision vs. post-supervision
 - Tracking into adult system

Considerations for Defining Recidivism

- Tracking underlying changes in the population
 - For example, if the risk profile of youth on community supervision changes, and a higher proportion of youth on community supervision are high risk, then the recidivism rate for youth placed community supervision may increase
- Measuring consistently over time



23

Measuring Recidivism

- Role of Juvenile Justice Oversight Council
 - Define recidivism measure
 - Ensure proposed recidivism measure can be tracked
 - If proposed recidivism measure cannot be tracked with current data, identify plan for relevant agencies to collect data prospectively



24

Questions?

Contact information:

Jen Christie

Associate, Crime and Justice Institute

jchristie@crj.org

Pamela Lachman

Senior Associate, Crime and Justice Institute

plachman@crj.org



25

Disclaimer

This project was supported by Grant # 2014-ZB-BX-K011 awarded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this presentation are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Justice.



26

