

BENCHMARK 5

Sedgwick County
Juvenile Corrections Advisory Board

An Assessment of Risk Factors
and Juvenile Justice Outcomes
for the 18th Judicial District
Comprehensive Plan for Juvenile
Delinquency Prevention



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

Prepared by
Delores Craig-Moreland, Ph.D.



Sedgwick County...
working for you

Report Update
March 2021

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	<u>3</u>
Executive Summary.....	<u>6</u>
Sedgwick County Juvenile Corrections Advisory Board – Team Justice	<u>7</u>
Section 1: Risk and Protective Factors	
Introduction.....	<u>8</u>
Risk Factors Affecting Delinquency.....	<u>9</u>
RNR Risk Factor: History of Antisocial Behavior	<u>10</u>
RNR Risk Factor: Antisocial Personality.....	<u>12</u>
RNR Risk Factor: Antisocial Cognition / Thinking	<u>14</u>
RNR Risk Factor: Antisocial Associates.....	<u>16</u>
RNR Risk Factor: Family	<u>18</u>
RNR Risk Factor: School and/or Work.....	<u>20</u>
RNR Risk Factor: Leisure and/or Recreation	<u>22</u>
RNR Risk Factor: Substance Abuse	<u>24</u>
Section 2: System Overview	
Introduction.....	<u>26</u>
18 th Judicial District Court Process Flow Chart.....	<u>27</u>
Juvenile Justice Continuum Chart	<u>28</u>
Juvenile System Activity Chart.....	<u>29</u>
Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center (JIAC).....	<u>30</u>
District Attorney’s Juvenile Intervention Program (Diversion).....	<u>33</u>
Juvenile Detention Alternatives	<u>34</u>
Juvenile Detention	<u>35</u>
Detention System Admissions by Reason.....	<u>36</u>
Department of Corrections Services Costs	<u>36</u>
Section 3: Department of Corrections-Juvenile Services Outcomes	
Introduction.....	<u>37</u>
Outcome 1: Reduced Arrests.....	<u>38</u>
Outcome 2: Reduced Recidivism.....	<u>38</u>
Outcome 3: Reduced Detention Admissions	<u>39</u>
Outcome 4: Successful Completion Rates by Gender	<u>40</u>
Outcome 5: Successful Completion Rates by Race	<u>41</u>

Section 4: Prevention and Graduated Sanctions Programs	
Introduction.....	<u>42</u>
Risk-Need-Responsivity Factors –Prevention Programs Chart.....	<u>43</u>
Prevention Programs Composition of Risk.....	<u>44</u>
Prevention Programs Exit Information.....	<u>45</u>
Juvenile Court Disposition Information.....	<u>46</u>
Juvenile Court Services.....	<u>47</u>
Juvenile Field Services.....	<u>48</u>
Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program.....	<u>50</u>
Juvenile Case Management.....	<u>52</u>
Conditional Release.....	<u>54</u>
KDOC – JS Custody Youth Placements.....	<u>55</u>
Juvenile Correctional Facilities	<u>56</u>
Evening Reporting Center.....	<u>57</u>
Section 5: Racial and Ethnic Disparity & Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative .	<u>63</u>
Section 6: Special Initiatives	
Introduction.....	<u>64</u>
Efforts to Reduce Human Trafficking.....	<u>65</u>
Cross-System Youth Coordination	<u>66</u>
Accountability Panels.....	<u>67</u>

Introduction

Purpose

The purpose of the original report, published in 1998, was to provide baseline data to support the development of a comprehensive, community-based strategy for the prevention of behavioral problems among juveniles. This update is a streamlined version of the report, because, over time, it has lost its place in the planning process. The 18th Judicial District's Comprehensive Plan for Juvenile Delinquency Prevention is reviewed annually in March and approved in April, making it clear the Benchmark needs to be offered as the information supporting the update of the Comprehensive Plan. This is the first edition to be offered as preparation for the planning phase of the comprehensive plan update.

The Sedgwick County Juvenile Corrections Advisory Board (Team Justice) last updated the Comprehensive Plan on March 29, 2019. The three main objectives of the plan are: describe the extent of risk factors identified in the community, describe how risk factors will be addressed, and include a benchmark to reduce the juvenile crime rate. The Comprehensive Plan is available on the Sedgwick County Department of Corrections website.

Prevention priorities included in the updated plan were based on the Risk-Needs-Responsivity model (RNR) and included antisocial personality, antisocial cognition and antisocial associates. Programs to address these risk factors were prioritized for combination with family and school risks. Preference for funding is given to programs targeting youth who are at moderate to high risk for future delinquency.

The Setting

This year, 2020, is a year in which the actual census is conducted. Those figures are not yet available, so the most recent estimate, 2015, is used. In 2015 22.9% of the U.S. population was under the age of 18, compared to 24.7% in Kansas, 26.3% in Sedgwick County, and 26.6% in Wichita.

According to the 2015 U.S. Census, the national population is 62.6% Caucasian, 13.3% African American and 17.6% Hispanic. The population in Kansas is 76.4% Caucasian, 6.3% African American and 11.6% Hispanic. The population in Sedgwick County is 68.4% Caucasian, 9.5% African American and 14.1% Hispanic.

Median income for the United States for years 2011-2015 was \$53,889; in Kansas it was \$52,205; and in Sedgwick County it was \$50,657. For years 2011-2015, 13.5% of the U.S. population was below the poverty level; in Kansas it was 13.0%, and in Sedgwick County, 15.2%. Estimates of median income for the U.S., Kansas and Sedgwick County have increased since 2011. Poverty rates slightly decreased for the U.S, Kansas and Sedgwick County.

In 2015, an estimated 1,197,704 violent crimes occurred nationwide, an increase of 3.9% from the 2014 estimate and 0.7% below the 2011 rate. The Midwest Region, accounting for 21.1% of the population in 2015, experienced 19.6% of the national violent crime, and 19.3% of the national property crime. This region experienced a 3.9% increase in the violent crime rate per 100,000 persons; and a 4.8% decrease in the property crime rate per 100,000 persons when compared with the 2014 rate. Kansas

experienced a 10.6% increase in the violent crime rate per 100,000 persons and 1.3% decrease in the property crime rate per 100,000 persons. In 2015, Wichita experienced a 32.0% increase in violent crimes and 7.0% increase in property crimes compared to 2014.

Taken as a whole, the information on Sedgwick County shows it is a population younger, whiter, poorer, and experiencing a slight overrepresentation in violence.

Legislative Actions

Senate Bill 367 was passed in the Kansas Senate in February 2016. SB 367 made significant reforms in the Juvenile Justice system in Kansas. The bill initiated many significant changes including shorter overall case length limits for juvenile offenders, a statewide system of structured community-based graduated responses, annual training on evidence-based programs and practices in conjunction with Office of Judicial Administration (OJA), criteria for detention, modification of a sentence to the overall case length limit, and a placement matrix for commitment to a juvenile correctional facility. There was a reduction in the number of youth residential facilities for juvenile offenders and additional criteria for use of facility beds.

The 2020 Kansas Legislative session made no noteworthy changes in juvenile justice, and the 2021 Kansas Legislative session is still meeting.

The Data

Data used in this updated report came from various state and county agency statistics and reports, census projections, and crime information.

Structure of the Report

This report consists of six sections: Risk Factors, System Overview, Department of Corrections, Juvenile Services Outcomes, Prevention and Graduated Sanctions Programs, Racial and Ethnic Disparity, and Special Initiatives.

Section One, Risk Factors, contains information from the youth seen at the Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center (JIAC), as well as those receiving services and supervision from Juvenile Case Management and Juvenile Intensive Supervision. Team Justice made the decision to update the risk information every three years, since there is little change on a year-to-year basis. The information contained in this report is the first look at the three most recent years (2017, 2018, 2019). In both the JIAC information and the Juvenile Field Service information, in recent years there have been substantially fewer low risk youth.

Section Two, System Overview, provides detailed and case level data from JIAC, diversion, and the Juvenile Detention Facility (JDF), as well as information about detention alternatives. This section also includes an assessment of costs associated with detention and detention alternatives.

Section Three, Juvenile Services Outcomes, contains information on five outcomes identified by Team Justice as relevant and important to youth in Sedgwick County.

Section Four, Prevention and Graduated Sanctions Programs, provides an overview of KDOC - JS and County Crime Prevention funded programs, as well as data on graduated sanctions programs.

Section Five, Racial and Ethnic Disparity (RED), is a brief introductory statement. Provision of data was deemed not useful, since data system changes disrupted the old measures reported.

Section Six, Special Activities, gives an overview of ongoing or recently launched initiatives in Sedgwick County.

Executive Summary

This report is the twenty-first follow-up to the report describing the process of risk and resource assessment in Sedgwick County. The timing of the delivery of this report is now set to inform the process of updating the comprehensive plan.

Section One of the report addresses criminogenic risk factors based on the Risk-Needs-Responsivity (RNR) model. The reporting of the data for 2017, 2018, and 2019 shows some changes in the relative occurrence of risk factors for delinquency. The data from JIAC is presented to show the distribution of risk level among those at the entrance to the juvenile justice system, with information on male and female subjects. In the prior study youth were generally found to be at low risk in most domains. In the three years covered in this report, the individual domain information consistently showed less than a third of youth were scoring at the low risk level. Girls remain a higher percentage of the low risk group than moderate or high risk. A comparison of the risk level information from JIAC with that of youth involved deeper in the system shows consistently higher risk levels across all the domains for those deeper in the system. This suggests that efforts to filter lower risk youth out of the system are successful.

Section Two contains information about the juvenile justice system. The system activity chart and JIAC intake information indicate a continued decline across the system, with some hints of a

stabilizing of admissions, but the overwhelming influence of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020 has to be given consideration when reviewing system details. Combined with the risk information, there is evidence of a shift toward higher risk in multiple domains.

Section Three provides information on five outcomes identified by Team Justice. Overall, the outcomes show continued progress for juvenile programs in Sedgwick County.

Section Four describes programs that are on a path of continuous improvement, making adjustments toward evidence-based practices. Prevention and Graduated Sanctions programs both focus on evidence-based practice, and outcomes show the wisdom of that approach.

Section Five contains an introductory statement about efforts to reduce the impact of racial and ethnic disparity (RED). The form of data to monitor this aspect of juvenile justice in the 18th Judicial District requires some thoughtful planning. Old methods do not work with new data systems.

Section Six describes ongoing and new initiatives within the county.

Taken as a whole, this Benchmark 5 report shows shifts in both JIAC and JFS populations toward youth with greater risk in multiple domains.

Juvenile Corrections Advisory Board Team Justice

Team Justice was established by the Board of Sedgwick County Commissioners in 1999 to assist in the oversight of community planning for juvenile offenders. The 17 member Board meets monthly and makes recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners regarding the ongoing needs of juveniles in the community. The purpose, duties and guidelines for the work of Team

Justice are detailed in the Charge of the Board. The provisions of K.S.A. 75-7038 through 75-7053 establish juvenile corrections advisory boards; membership is specifically set forth in K.S.A. 75-7044. Team Justice is governed with bylaws, recently amended in 2019.

Team Justice Members

Representing	Appointed By	Name and Identification
Defense Attorney	Administrative Judge	Grant Brazill
Law Enforcement	Chief of Police	Jason Stephens
Law Enforcement	County Sheriff	Darren Ramsey
Prosecution	District Attorney	Ron Paschal
Judiciary	Administrative Judge	Judge Kellie Hogan
Probation	Administrative Judge	Peter Shay
Mental Health	Mental Health Official	Shantel Westbrook
Education	County Commission	Gilbert Alvarez
General	County Commission	Kristin Peterman
General	County Commission	Taunya Rutenbeck
General	County Commission	Terri Moses
General	County Commission	Karen Countryman-Roswurm
General	County Commission	LaShonda Garnes
General	County Commission	Taishma Owens-Council
General	City of Wichita Council Member	Mark Masterson
General	City of Wichita Council Member	Aaron Bohannon
General	City Derby Council Member	Karen Dunlap

As of January 27, 2020

1

Risk and Protective Factors

Introduction

The Risk-Needs-Responsivity model is the predominant model for understanding the roots of delinquent behavior and methods to address this conduct. There are eight risk factors which can be measured by means of a nationally normed instrument called the Youth Level of Supervision-Case Management Inventory (YLS-CMI), or by use of the JIAC Brief Screen, which has been tested multiple times for reliability in reflecting risks shown by the YLS-CMI. A revision of the JIAC Brief Screen came into use midway through 2019. It is called the Risk for Reoffending. The risk factors include one stable factor and seven risk factors amenable to modification by treatment. The stable risk factor is a history of antisocial behavior. The risk factors amenable to treatment include antisocial personality, antisocial cognition/thinking, antisocial associates, family, school and work, leisure and recreation, and substance abuse.

This section includes trend information on the observed rate of occurrence of the risk factor in low, moderate, high, and very high levels for the JIAC information, and low, moderate, and high levels for the YLS-CMI. Each risk factor is defined and described in terms of successful programs to address the risk, data results, and indicators of the risk factor. Three charts present a visual of the data obtained. The JIAC charts contain four columns for each of the three years of data (2017, 2018, and 2019). Within each of the four columns for a given year there are three colors: blue shows the percentage of males at that risk level, red shows the percentage of females at that risk level, and the green shows the percentage of that risk level when the entire population evaluated is considered. The green percentages sum to 100% when all four columns of a data year are considered. The percentages for males and females sum to 100% within each column but do not sum across columns. The YLS-CMI information informs two charts: a chart of risk level results, and a chart of domain indicator information.

Risk Factors Affecting Delinquency

For the past twenty years Sedgwick County has reviewed information related to the risk of delinquency. The main source of information is the data gathered at the Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center, as well as that from Juvenile Field Services. At JIAC the population is driven by contact with local law enforcement. Juvenile Field Services works with youth convicted of delinquent acts and in need of substantial supervision and intervention. The decision to update this section every three years reflects the awareness that change to the risk information happens over longer periods of time.

Data for the JIAC population shows a general shift away from lower levels of risk associated with the various domains. It is true for every single risk domain, and it is a continuing trend over time in the three years contained in this report. Females make up approximately 29% of the most recent JIAC year. They are consistently at or above that percentage of the low risk population in each risk domain. In years prior to this data period the percentage of JIAC youth with elevated risk for antisocial personality or antisocial cognitions/thinking was below 50%: in this data period both powerful risk indicators of future delinquency are at much higher levels. All this information supports an awareness of the changing population that enters JIAC. While there are reduced numbers, there are substantial risk issues evident.

Data for the JFS population, derived from the YLS-CMI, also shows a changing population with more severe levels of risk. Domains showing increased levels of risk include antisocial personality, antisocial cognition/thinking, antisocial peers, and substance abuse. Working with youth experiencing multidimensional moderate to high risk is a challenge and shows the powerful need for the Evening Reporting Center with a wide menu of program offerings. The increasing levels of risk support the need for substantial hours of programming each week.

Risk Factors Related to Future Delinquent Acts

RNR Risk Factor: History of Antisocial Behavior

Early and continued involvement in a variety of antisocial acts indicates a propensity to commit antisocial behavior. This risk factor is considered static because it is based on documented history of delinquency. However, in preventing further development of this factor, dynamic needs do exist.

Programs with Highest Effect Sizes


The most effective programs emphasize interpersonal skills training (-.44 effect size) and behavioral programs (-.42 effect size), and include individual counseling programs with a cognitive behavioral approach (-.46 effect size).

Comments Regarding Data Results

Persistence in delinquency and early involvement in delinquent behavior both predict future criminal behavior. The data indicates a declining percentage of low risk youth (those with no history of delinquency). The JIAC gender information shows females make up 29% of all intakes, and are therefore underrepresented in the percentages scoring at moderate to very high risk for this factor.


Indicators

The qualitative aspects of this domain pertain to prior and current offenses: elevated risk occurs as the frequency and seriousness of offenses increases.



Source: Juvenile Intake & Assessment Center


18th Judicial District YLS/CMI History of Antisocial Behavior (Prior / Current Offenses) Percent by Risk Level



These tables include youth who have been administered the YLS/CMI in the 18th Judicial District. Indicators for history of antisocial behavior (prior / current offenses) are: 3 or more prior offenses, 2 or more failures to comply, prior probation, prior custody and 3 or more current offenses. There was relatively little change in the percentages at each risk level for these three years. A

comparison with information in the prior Benchmark report shows a drop in low risk and a substantial increase in percentages at high risk. The indicators suggest this may be due to failure to comply and prior custody.

18th Judicial District YLS/CMI History of Antisocial Behavior (Prior / Current Offenses) Percent Scoring Domain Indicators



Source: Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services

RNR Risk Factor: Antisocial Personality

Adventurous, pleasure seeking behavior (at the expense of others) and reduced self-control indicate risk for this factor. The dynamic needs associated with this factor include the need to build problem-solving skills, increase positive self-management and develop coping skills.

Programs with Highest Effect Sizes

Programs with the highest effect size when working with youth exhibiting moderate to high risk of delinquency related to antisocial personality include cognitive behavioral approaches (-.46 effect size) and behavioral programs (-.42 effect size).


Comments Regarding Data Results

Females seen at JIAC were overrepresented in the low risk category, but underrepresented in the moderate to high risk levels. For both

the JIAC population and the YLS-CMI population, the largest group is at moderate risk related to antisocial personality. JIAC data showed a trend over time of increased percentage at high or very high risk, suggesting a need for available programs to address the risk. Within the population assessed by the YLS/CMI the combined percentages at moderate to high risk related to their antisocial personality reached above 80%, a very strong endorsement for the need to have programs such as aggression replacement training (ART) widely available.


Indicators

The qualitative aspects of this domain pertain to personality and behavior: risk comes from a personality of risk taking and impulsive behavior (self-described).



Source: Juvenile Intake & Assessment Center


18th Judicial District YLS/CMI Antisocial Personality Percent by Risk Level



These charts include youth who have been administered the YLS/CMI in the 18th Judicial District. Indicators for antisocial personality are inflated self-image, physically aggressive, tantrums, short attention span, poor frustration tolerance (poor coping mechanisms), inadequate guilt

feelings and verbally aggressive. Electronic engagement and social media are such a strong part of the culture and may be influencing this factor.

18th Judicial District YLS/CMI Antisocial Personality Percent Scoring Domain Indicators



Source: Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services

RNR Risk Factor: Antisocial Cognition / Thinking

Antisocial thinking is recognized as attitudes, values, beliefs and rationalizations supportive of crime. Cognitive emotional states which can indicate risk for juvenile criminal behavior can include emotional states of anger, resentment, and defiance. To address the need related to this risk factor, reduction in antisocial cognition and risky thinking must occur. The need can be met and the risk reduced by building alternative, less risky thinking patterns and feelings.

Programs with Highest Effect Sizes


Programs with demonstrated impact on this risk factor are identical to those impacting the antisocial personality; namely, cognitive behavioral approaches (-.46 effect size) and behavioral programs (-.42 effect size).

Comments Regarding Data Results

Gender differences are evident in this domain: females account for higher percentages of low risk intakes and lower percentages for elevated risk. The JIAC Brief Screen information on this risk domain showed the dominant level to be moderate, but in the past it was low risk. The YLS/CMI, administered to those already in juvenile justice supervision, showed an experience of 71% at moderate risk to reoffend due to antisocial cognition.


Indicators

The qualitative aspects of this domain pertain to attitudes and orientation: attitudes favorable to committing crime are the risk and comments that indicate neutralization of the impact of crime are a problem.



Source: Juvenile Intake & Assessment Center


18th Judicial District YLS/CMI Antisocial Cognition /Thinking Percent by Risk Level



These charts include youth who have been administered the YLS/CMI in the 18th Judicial District. Indicators shown from answers received for the YLS/CMI show that youth who are found to have antisocial

cognition have pro-criminal attitudes, do not seek help and need motivation, actively reject help, defy authority and are callous (this category requires supervisory attention).

18th Judicial District YLS/CMI Antisocial Cognition / Thinking Percent Scoring Domain Indicators



Source: Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services

RNR Risk Factor: Antisocial Associates

This risk factor is characterized by acquaintance or close association with delinquents and relative isolation from pro-social others. Addressing needs in this area must include reduction of association among delinquents and increased association with pro-social others. Such change would likely require social skill building with sufficient practice to assure skills acquisition, along with opportunities for pro-social contacts.

Programs with Highest Effect Sizes


The programs most likely to provide strong effect sizes are those that emphasize interpersonal skills training (-.44 effect size).

Comments Regarding Data Results

This domain is predominantly a male factor. Data indicates an increase in risk related to this factor among JIAC population and the same condition exists in the JFS population. This remains a critical issue in addressing continued or more serious delinquency in juveniles. Girls mainly score at lower risk related to this domain.


Indicators

The qualitative aspects of this domain pertain to peer relations: risk comes from prolonged time with antisocial peers and the greatest risk comes from copying the behavior of antisocial peers.



Source: Juvenile Intake & Assessment Center


18th Judicial District YLS/CMI Antisocial Associates (Peers) Percent by Risk Level



These charts include youth who have been administered the YLS/CMI in the 18th Judicial District. Indicators for antisocial associates are as follows: delinquent acquaintances, delinquent friends, few positive

acquaintances and few positive friends. The focus should be on reducing delinquent friends; having few positive friends is a subcategory. There have been increases in few positive acquaintances and/or friends.

18 Judicial District YLS/CMI Antisoicial Associates (Peers) Percent Scoring Domain Indictors



Source: Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services

RNR Risk Factor: Family

This risk factor considers poor parental control, degree of family attachment, parental availability and level of parental monitoring and supervision. Responses to questions in this area often reflect the impact of years of frustration of both child and parent. Key elements include nurturance and/or caring and level of monitoring and/or supervision. Positive family relationships, increased communication and better monitoring and/or supervision are important in addressing the dynamic needs associated with this risk.

Programs with Highest Effect Sizes

Programs to address delinquency risk associated with family issues typically focus on educating parents in good parenting skills, and offer models of healthy support for youth. The greatest delinquency risk is observed in families with high levels of conflict between parent and child, and low


levels of parental supervision. The Washington State Institute for Public Policy found an effect size of $-.325$ for Functional Family Therapy, which features parent training in behavior management, and ample guided practice.

Comments Regarding Data Results

This risk factor shows a continuing concern for the overrepresentation of females with elevated risk. Both genders have shifted away from low risk to moderate and high risk in the family domain. Risk levels in the JFS population occur at risk levels comparable to those seen in the past.


Indicators

The qualitative aspects of this domain pertain to family circumstances; risk is associated with a lack of supportive family members and unresolved conflicts with parents.



Source: Juvenile Intake & Assessment Center


18th Judicial District YLS/CMI Family Circumstances Percent by Risk Level



These charts include youth who have been administered the YLS/CMI in the 18th Judicial District. Indicators for the family circumstances domain are: inadequate

supervision, difficulty controlling behavior, inappropriate discipline, inconsistent parenting and poor parent-child relationships.

18th Judicial District YLS/CMI Family Circumstances Percent Scoring Domain Indicators



Source: Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services

RNR Risk Factor: School and/or Work

Low levels of performance and satisfaction at school and/or work indicate possible risk in this area. National research shows that truancy usually follows the onset of delinquency.

Programs with Highest Effect Sizes

Programs related to school-related risk factors are typically offered in the school setting and try to enhance attachment to school by means of expanded opportunities and recognition for success. Academic programs to provide expanded opportunities for success achieved an effect size of .29 (approximate 29% reduction in delinquency among those at risk in this group).


Comments Regarding Data Results

Of youth admitted to JIAC, there is a shift from low risk toward higher levels. This is a

domain where females generally are most evident at low risk levels. This data shows the school / work domain of risk is elevated for roughly half of youth referred to JIAC. Low achievement, truancy and classroom behaviors were dominant issues in the YLS/CMI domain indicators. The YLS/CMI for 2019 indicates that 77% were moderate or high risk of future delinquency due to school/work issues.


Indicators

The qualitative aspects of this domain pertain to school and/or work situation: risk resides in a hostile attitude toward the environment or a sense of alienation. Risk is indicated by poor attendance and poor performance at school or low motivation regarding employment.



Source: Juvenile Intake & Assessment Center


18th Judicial District YLS/CMI School / Work Percent by Risk Level



These charts include youth who have been administered the YLS/CMI in the 18th Judicial District. Indicators for the school/work domain are: disruptive classroom behavior, disruptive behavior on

school property, low achievement, problems with peers and teachers, truancy and unemployment. The employment category is only scored if the youth is not in school.

18th Judicial District YLS/CMI School / Work Percent Scoring Domain Indicators



Source: Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services

RNR Risk Factor: Leisure and/or Recreation

Elements of risk associated with this factor include low levels of involvement and satisfaction with pro-social leisure activities. In order to address needs in this area, enhanced involvement in pro-social activities must occur. This could be achieved through mentoring, role modeling, alternative community activities and increased interaction with pro-social others.

Programs with Highest Effect Sizes


The main form of evidence-based approach with good effect sizes for this area of risk is interpersonal skills training (-.44 effect size). Given the social nature of most leisure and recreational activities, it is easy to understand how enhanced interpersonal social skills would improve this area of risk.

Comments Regarding Data Results

In the JIAC population this is an area of declining risk. In the JFS population most have high risk associated with few interests and limited activities. Organized activities and interests are an opportunity for the development of pro-social values and skills.


Indicators

This risk factor is more prevalent in the male gender. The qualitative aspects of this domain pertain to leisure and recreational activity: risk comes from a lack of pro-social hobbies and activities; the first stage of risk comes from a lack of interest in pro-social activities. This risk factor plays a much greater role among those with substantial juvenile justice involvement.



Source: Juvenile Intake & Assessment Center


18th Judicial District YLS/CMI Leisure / Recreation Percent by Risk Level



These charts include youth who have been administered the YLS/CMI in the 18th Judicial District. Indicators for the leisure /

recreation domain are: limited organized activities, could make better use of time and no personal interests.

18th Judicial District YLS/CMI Leisure / Recreation Percent Scoring Domain Indicators



Source: Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services

RNR Risk Factor: Substance Abuse

This risk factor is defined by the abuse of alcohol and/or drugs. The dynamic needs associated with this risk include reducing substance abuse, reducing the personal and interpersonal supports for substance abuse behavior and enhancing alternatives to substance abuse. In females it can be trauma related, so treatment is gender-specific.

Programs with Highest Effect Sizes


The most effective methods involve treatment for the substance abuse problem with strong cognitive behavioral components (-.46 effectsize). The challenge is to treat the substance abuse and change the thinking that supports such behavior, with trauma emphasis for females.

Comments Regarding Data Results

Elevation of risk in this domain is increasing among the JIAC population. It is a very common problem. The same can be said when discussing the JFS population where currently at least two-thirds have elevated risk associated with substance abuse. The three-year trends are not particularly encouraging when it comes to program needs in this area. In 2019 the indicators in the JFS population show drug use, occasional or chronic, is driving elevations in this risk domain.


Indicators

The qualitative aspects of this domain pertain to substance abuse: since all youthful use is illegal; any use not supervised by a parent is considered risky; frequency and duration of use distinguishes moderate from high risk. Females scored in lower risk levels.



Source: Juvenile Intake & Assessment Center


18th Judicial District YLS/CMI Substance Abuse Percent by Risk Level



These charts include youth who have been administered the YLS/CMI in the 18th Judicial District. Indicators for the substance abuse domain are: occasional drug use, chronic drug use, chronic alcohol use,

substance abuse interferes with life, and substance abuse linked to offense. There is a stringent scoring requirement for chronic alcohol use.

18th Judicial District YLS/CMI Substance Abuse Percent Scoring Domain Indicators



Source: Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services

2

System Overview

Introduction

This section starts with a court process flow chart and information on those served by prevention, intervention, and graduated sanctions. The system activity chart provides a basis for comparing trends over time for arrests/intakes, case filings, youth involved in “deeper end” levels of supervision such as Juvenile Intensive Supervision Probation (JISP), Juvenile Case Management (JCM), and Juvenile Correctional Facility Commitments.


Following the system activity chart, there is information related to Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center (JIAC) intakes, including intakes related to Notice to Appear (NTA), and Agreement to Appear (ATA).

Current information on the District Attorney’s Juvenile Intervention Program (Diversion) shows roughly 64% of youth eligible make application for the program. About three-quarters of those that apply are accepted, and roughly two out of three youth diverted successfully complete the program.

The information on detention covers reasons for detention, alternatives to detention, and cost details.


While the numbers throughout the juvenile justice system have fallen in recent years, there have been changes qualitatively of the youth who do appear in juvenile justice. They have more serious levels of risk in the most damaging areas of risk for further delinquency. These domains include antisocial personality, antisocial cognitions, antisocial behavior (criminal record), and antisocial associates. Please keep these changes in mind as you look at the quantitative information.

JUVENILE JUSTICE & COURT PROCESS OF JUVENILE OFFENDER CASES
In the District Court, Eighteenth Judicial District, Sedgwick County, Kansas



Updated
1/5/21


**Juvenile Justice Continuum
Annual Counts of Clients Served for Sedgwick County**



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention with partially unduplicated numbers 	720 SFY20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juvenile Intake (JIAC) • Juvenile Detention • Residential Alternative • Home Based Supervision • Juvenile Diversion 	1,274 CY20 499 CY20 160 CY20 171 CY20 148 CY20
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juvenile Probation • Juvenile Intensive Supervision • KDOC-JS Case Management • Evening Reporting Center 	308 CY20 263 CY20 110 CY20 117 CY20

CY = Calendar Year SFY = State Fiscal Year

SEDGWICK COUNTY JUVENILE SYSTEM ACTIVITY CHART



■ Juvenile Filings
■ Juvenile Intensive Supervision Average Daily Population
■ KDOC-JS New Custody
■ Case Management Average Daily Population
■ Juvenile Correctional Facility Commitments
■ % JDF population in KDOC-JS Custody awaiting placement by CY no longer collected in 2016*

Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center (JIAC)

JIAC provides a 24-hour a day program serving youth in contact with law enforcement agencies in Sedgwick County. Youth are either brought in by law enforcement because they are juveniles suspected of illegal behaviors or an assessment is scheduled in response to a Notice to Appear (NTA) or an Agreement to Appear (ATA). JIAC's goal is to help youth avoid reoffending and getting more deeply entrenched in the juvenile justice system by providing effective intake booking, assessment and referral services. JIAC staff achieves this goal by performing intake and assessment activities and by making appropriate referrals for the youth and the youth's family. Youth referred to JIAC are


either booked or receive a complete intake and assessment which typically includes completion of the Intake Questionnaire, the Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument, Version 2 (MAYSI-2) to assist in identifying youth who might have special mental health needs, the Kansas Detention Assessment Instrument (KDAI) to determine the most appropriate placement disposition and the Sedgwick County Department of Corrections Risk for Reoffending screening tool that provides preliminary risk level information. Placement of youth to the Juvenile Detention Facility are generally for severity of the booking offense, warrants (with no new charges), commitment orders, sanctions or out-of-state runaways.

JIAC – Completed Intakes / Assessments


	SFY16	SFY17	SFY18	SFY19	SFY20
Juvenile Offenders (JO)	2,038	1,442	1,657	1,718	1,475
Males	1,321	969	1,160	1,214	1,022
Females	717	473	497	504	453
Non-Offender (NO)		2	4	0	1
Males		2	1	0	0
Females		0	3	0	1
Status Offenders (SO)	151	96	83	112	93
Males	96	52	36	57	51
Females	55	44	47	55	42
TOTAL	2,189	1,540	1,744	1,830	1,569

*Keep in mind, as of 7/1/17, Intakes to JDF are included with Complete I/As. This change was made due to the KDAI now being conducted on Pass-throughs and those intake records now being uploaded to KDOC-JS (JIAMS – the state database).

JIAC Brief Screen Overall Risk Level



JIAC Brief Screen Overall Risk Level by Gender



JIAC – Referrals Performance Measures

	2015-2019 Five Year Average	2017 Actual	2018 Actual	2019 Actual	2020 Actual
Number of intakes / %	10,794/10796 99.9%	1,832/1,832 100%	1,874/1,874 100%	1,765/1,765 100%	1,274/1,274 100%
% of youth receiving recommendations for service	1,505/1,577 95%	239/242 99%	263/265 99%	237/239 99%	145/148 98%
% of youth accepting referrals	1,041/1,577 66%	182/242 75%	201/265 76%	182/239 76%	86/148 58%
% overrides to Detention Screening Instruments*	225/6,972 3%	43/568 8%	87/1,242 7%	64/1,189 5%	66/867 8%

Source: Juvenile Intake & Assessment Center

Sedgwick County Juvenile Intake & Assessment Center ~ Notice To Appear (NTA) Intakes ~ Calendar Years: 2017 - 2020

Calendar Year	# Issued	Ineligible	Successful	Unsuccessful
2017 2-1-17 to 12-31-17	492	26	92.3% (454 out of 492)	7.7% (38 out of 492)
2018 1-1-18 to 12-31-18	458	15	91.9% (421 out of 458)	8.1% (37 out of 458)
2019 1-1-19 to 12-31-19	412	4	91.7% (378 out of 412)	8.3% (34 out of 412)
2020 1-1-20 to 12-31-20	341	12	93.9% (318 out of 341)	6.7% (23 out of 341)
2017 – 2020 2-1-17 to 12-31-20	1,703	57	92% (1,571 out of 1,703)	8% (132 out of 1,703)

While the NTA data reported on a monthly basis to KDOC-JS and SCDOC is the actual number of NTA intakes conducted, this report reflects the outcomes for all NTAs issued during the year regardless of the year the intake was conducted.

In 2017, there were 435 NTA intakes while 454 were successful because there were 16 NTAs issued in 2017 with the intake being conducted in 2018. Also, there were 3 with multiple NTAs that were combined into a single intake.

In 2018, 2019 and 2020 there were 409, 359 and 308 NTA intakes respectively with the numbers differing from the number successful for the same reasons noted for 2017.

“Ineligible” is determined for a variety of reasons including: Municipal code violations; DCF custody – placed out of county; inpatient mental health treatment; active warrants; and, resides out of state.

Sedgwick County Juvenile Intake & Assessment Center ~ Agreement To Appear (ATA) Intakes
State Fiscal Years: SFY13 - SFY19

Fiscal Year	# Issued	Ineligible	Successful	Unsuccessful
SFY14 7-1-13 to 6-30-14	223	3	94% 207 out of 220 (193 intakes; 14 referred to supervision officer in lieu of intake)	6% 13 out of 220
SFY15 7-1-14 to 6-30-15	261	3	93% 239 out of 258 (214 intakes; 25 referred to supervision officer in lieu of intake)	7% 19 out of 258
SFY16 7-1-15 to 6-30-16	201	2	92% 184 out of 199 (174 intakes; 10 referred to supervision officer in lieu of intake)	8% 15 out of 199
SFY17 7-1-16 to 6-30-17	191	3	94% 176 out of 188 (155 intakes; 21 referred to supervision officer in lieu of intake)	6% 12 out of 188
SFY18 7-1-17 to 6-30-18	204	4	93% 185 out of 200 (172 intakes; 13 referred to supervision officer in lieu of intake)	7% 15 out of 200
SFY19 7-1-18 to 6-30-19	221	2	99% 217 out of 219 (208 intakes; 9 referred to supervision officer in lieu of intake)	6% 2 out of 219
SFY20 7-1-19 to 6-30-20	170	0	95% 161 out of 170 (208 intakes; 9 referred to supervision officer in lieu of intake)	5% 9 out of 170
SFY12 – SFY20 7-1-11 to 6-30-20	1,903	21	95% 1,781 out of 1,882 (1,650 intakes; 131 referred to supervision officer in lieu of intake)	5% 101 out of 1,882

“Successful” indicates that the youth completed an intake and assessment appointment OR was referred to their supervision officer.
 “Ineligible” is determined for a variety of reasons including: the youth’s age; having an open CINC case; being placed in foster care; having a subsequent arrest; being admitted for inpatient treatment; moving out of the country; AWOL from placement; and being sentenced.

District Attorney's Juvenile Intervention Program (Diversion)-

The District Attorney's Juvenile Intervention Program (juvenile offender diversion) is an important option for the juvenile justice system. It allows consequences for first offenses without deep involvement in the juvenile justice system. Certain second time offenders may be offered an opportunity to complete Diversion, if deemed appropriate. Early intervention is a key component of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's comprehensive strategy for communities to address juvenile delinquency through a continuum of local programs, sanctions and services.

The Juvenile Intervention Program utilizes the Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center (JIAC) Brief Screen as well as a structured interview along with a thorough background investigation to assess clients for a wide range

of risk factors. Program staff members administer the assessment and review results of any previous screening. The JIAC screening instrument assesses criminogenic risk factors in an actuarial, objective way while the interview assesses risk factors in a non-actuarial, subjective way. Diversion coordinators develop recommendations regarding the appropriateness of the client for diversion and the appropriate services, level of service and monitoring that would be beneficial for the client. This "service plan" is incorporated into the client's diversion agreement, and each client is required to comply with all conditions of the agreement. While there are standard conditions that all clients will have to comply with, each diversion agreement is individually developed to match the needs of the client with the level of service that is provided.

District Attorney's Juvenile Intervention Program* – CY20	
Number of Youth Eligible to Apply	321
Number of Diversion Applications Received	204
Number of New Clients Accepted into the Program	156
Number of Clients Denied or Ineligible for the Program	56
Number of Clients Revoked from the Program / Motion Filed	93
Number of Clients Successfully Completed	149
Restitution Collected for Victims	\$436.25

*This program is a Judicial District 18 program but is not equivalent to the state SB367 Immediate Intervention Program (IIP).

Juvenile Detention Alternatives

Detention Advocacy Service (DAS) was provided by Kansas Legal Services through the end of fiscal year 2019. Beginning in July 2019 Sedgwick County DOC began has been providing the case management portion of this funding. KLS continues to provide legal services. The program is part of the continuum of detention alternatives to secure custody at the Juvenile Detention Facility. The program has two primary goals: reducing racial and ethnic disparities and reducing length of stay for all youth in the Juvenile Detention Facility.

In 2019, the combined average daily demand for detention and alternatives was up by 10 (92 in 2018 and 102 in 2019). The 2019 average daily demand is up by 5 from the five year average 2015-2019.

The Sedgwick County Department of Corrections has maintained a Juvenile Residential Facility (JRF) since June of 1994. This is a 24 bed detention alternative. The program serves male and female juveniles between the ages of 10 and 18 who require detention services but do not require secure confinement. In 2019, JRF served 263 youth with an average daily population of 15.

Future planning includes contracting with for use of beds for youth in their custody.

The Sedgwick County Department of Corrections has established and maintained Home-Based Services (HBS) as an alternative to secure detention for selected youth who are deemed to be releasable to their parents'/guardians' home under supervision of program staff. This is to allow the youth to remain in their home environment while awaiting a court hearing. The purpose of HBS is to maintain the safety of the youth, family, community, and to maintain supervision of the youth in the least restrictive environment possible. HBS is a level of supervision that places youth on a strict contract that severely limits their freedom to only approved activities. HBS clients may be male or female and range in age from 10 to 17 years. However, they can be 18 or older if they have an open juvenile case. Spanish speaking staff members are available. In addition, electronic monitoring can be used. The client is monitored by a transmitter strapped to the ankle. Electronic monitoring with GPS tracking increases supervision and accountability. In 2019, the program served 212 youth.

Juvenile Detention Facility (JDF)

The Sedgwick County Juvenile Detention Facility (JDF) is a 108 bed facility for secure detention for male and female offenders' ages 10 – 17 years of age. The facility is licensed by Department for Children and Families (DCF) and has annual licensing inspections. JDF saw a decrease in admissions at the onset of implementation of SB367. Admissions in 2017 were 634, 2018 they were 656 and in 2019 they were 620. In 2020 admissions decreased to 400 (not sure what other words to put here).

There were 400 admissions to detention in 2020 with an average length of stay of 44


days. The average daily population in 2020 was 44.

In consideration of the underutilization of secure beds, the Department of Corrections leased space in the facility for secure care beds for the child in need of care (CINC) system due to an identified need for this level of secure placement for non-offender youth. The lease was effective August 1, 2018 with Saint Frances Ministries and will end April 1, 2020. Per SB367, the use of detention as secure care ended June 30 2019.

Details of Juvenile Detention

	2017 – 2019 Average	2020
Admits	637 (1,910/3)	400
Average Daily Population		
Juvenile Detention Facility	53 (19,432/365)	44
Juvenile Residential Facility	15 (5,331/365)	15
Demand for Detention Services (Days)		
Juvenile Detention Facility	*19,432 (58,297/3)	15,927
Juvenile Residential Facility	5,331 (15,995/3)	5,540
Home Based Supervision	9,667 (29,000/3)	13,415
Average daily demand	94 (103,292/365/3)	95
Secure Bed Monthly Fluctuations		
Monthly Average	53 (160/3)	44
Monthly Low	45 (136/3)	32
Monthly High	61 (183/3)	55

*Numbers used in previous years were ALOS instead of ADP.



3

Department of Corrections Juvenile Services Outcomes

Introduction

This section contains the five target outcomes for Sedgwick County identified by the Juvenile Corrections Advisory Board – Team Justice.

- A. Outcome 1: Reduced arrests
- B. Outcome 2: Reduced recidivism
- C. Outcome 3: Reduced detention admissions
- D. Outcome 4: Successful completion rates by gender
- E. Outcome 5: Successful completion rates by race

Information from the Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center (JIAC) indicates all admissions have increased slightly from SFY18 through SFY19. Those with prior admissions have increased slightly. Total admissions to detention during 2018 were 21.9% below the prior three year average. In addition to the provision of alternatives to secure detention, the utilization of a validated juvenile detention risk assessment is a part of the plan to reduce the number of youth who are placed in secure detention. Program success rates show gender and race have little impact on program success. The Kansas Department of Corrections mission and vision guide correctional services in the state. The KDOC mission and vision can be found at <http://www.doc.ks.gov/>.


VISION

A safer Kansas through effective correctional services.

MISSION

The Department of Corrections, as part of the criminal justice system, contributes to the public safety and supports victims of crime by exercising safe and effective containment and supervision of inmates, by managing offenders in the community, and by actively encouraging and assisting offenders to become law-abiding citizens.

A. Outcome 1: Reduced Arrests



B. Outcome 2: Reduced Recidivism

Number of Times Referred to JIAC in SFY	SFY14	SFY15	SFY16	SFY17	SFY 18	SFY 19	SFY20
≥ 9	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
8	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
7	0	0	1	2	2	6	2
6	1	0	1	1	4	13	0
5	0	10	2	3	9	26	10
4	15	17	16	8	19	27	18
3	44	55	55	31	71	72	39
2	219	218	193	150	197	156	165
1	1,444	1,345	1,456	1,080	970	936	942
Total Intakes*	2,080	2,064	2,103	1,540	1,744	1,830	1,566
Total Youth	1,723	1,645	1,725	1,275	1,273	1,237	1,180
Total Youth with >1 Intake	279	300	269	195	303	301	238
Recidivism Rate	16.19%	18.24%	15.59%	15.29%	**	**	**

*The total number of intakes occasionally varies slightly from annual figures reported elsewhere due to the timing of when reports are run, report parameters and the timing of data corrections. Historical data reviewed and updated with this printing

**Recidivism is based on reconviction in Sedgwick County, as of 7/1/17, therefore cannot be calculated on the basis of JIAC admissions since some do not result in reconviction.

C. Outcome 3: Reduced Detention Admissions

**JUVENILE DETENTION
Details of Juvenile Detention**

	2017 – 2019 Average	2020
Admits	637 (1,910/3)	400
Average Daily Population		
Juvenile Detention Facility	53 (19,432/365)	44
Juvenile Residential Facility	15 (5,331/365)	15
Demand for Detention Services (Days)		
Juvenile Detention Facility	*19,432 (58,297/3)	15,927
Juvenile Residential Facility	5,331 (15,995/3)	5,540
Home Based Supervision	9,667 (29,000/3)	13,415
Average daily demand	94 (103,292/365/3)	95
Secure Bed Monthly Fluctuations		
Monthly Average	53 (160/3)	44
Monthly Low	45 (136/3)	32
Monthly High	61 (183/3)	55

*Numbers used in previous years were ALOS instead of ADP.

D. Outcome 4: Successful Completion Rates by Gender

Differential Success Rates by Gender
Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services &
County Crime Prevention Funded Programs

SFY20		<u>Successful</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Unsuccessful</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	Male Clients	207	72%	58	28%
Female Clients	68	70%	29	30%	
Total = 1,515	218	72%	87	28%	

SFY19		<u>Successful</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Unsuccessful</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	Males = 614	503	81.6%	111	18.4%
Females = 398	319	80.2%	79	19.8%	
Unknown=47	46	98%	1	2%	
Total = 1,059	868	82%	191	18%	

SFY18		<u>Successful</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Unsuccessful</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	Males = 575	528	92%	47	8%
Females = 399	366	92%	33	8%	
Unknown=118	112	95%	6	5%	
Total = 1,092	1,006	92%	86	8%	

SFY17		<u>Successful</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Unsuccessful</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	Male Clients	711	87.9%	98	12.1%
Female Clients	575	95.0%	30	5.0%	
Unknown	25	100.0%	0	0.0%	
Total = 1,439	1,311	91.1%	128	8.9%	

SFY16		<u>Successful</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Unsuccessful</u>	<u>Percent</u>
	Male Clients	586	80.3%	144	19.7%
Female Clients	403	83.4%	80	16.6%	
Total = 1,213	989	81.5%	224	18.5%	

E. Outcome 5: Successful Completion Rates by Race

Differential Success Rates by Race
 Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services &
 County Crime Prevention Funded Programs

		Successful	Percent	Unsuccessful	Percent
SFY20	Caucasian Youth	86	84%	16	16%
	Minority Youth	131	65%	70	35%
	African American Youth	45	52%	42	48%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	4	67%	2	33%
	Asian Youth	1	100%	0	0%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	1	100%	0	0%
	Multi-Race Youth	9	50%	9	50%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	71	81%	17	19%
	Other/Unknown	1	50%	1	50%
	TOTAL CLOSURES (305)	218	71%	87	29%
SFY19	Caucasian Youth	225	87%	42	13%
	Minority Youth	465	83%	97	17%
	African American Youth	246	82%	53	18%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	4	100%	0	0%
	Asian Youth	28	97%	3	3%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	1	100%	0	0%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	162	88%	33	22%
	Multi-Race Youth	24	75%	8	25%
	Other/Unknown	175	78%	52	22%
	TOTAL CLOSURES (1,056)	868	83%	191	17%
SFY18	Caucasian Youth	210	90%	24	10%
	Minority Youth	475	92%	42	8%
	African American Youth	224	93%	18	7%
	American Indian/Alaska Native Youth	8	80%	2	20%
	Asian Youth	24	96%	1	4%
	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth	1	100%	0	0%
	Hispanic/Latino Youth	218	91%	21	9%
	Other/Unknown	315	92%	26	8%
	TOTAL CLOSURES (1,092)	1,000	92%	92	8%
	SFY17	Caucasian Youth	349	91.8%	31
Minority Youth		704	89.6%	82	10.4%
African American Youth		295	84.8%	53	15.2%
American Indian/Alaska Native Youth		9	100.0%	0	0.0%
Asian Youth		34	89.5%	4	10.5%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Youth		1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Hispanic/Latino Youth		365	93.6%	25	6.4%
Other/Unknown		258	94.5%	15	5.5%
TOTAL CLOSURES (1,439)		1,311	91.1%	128	8.9%

4

Prevention and Graduated Sanctions Programs

Introduction

Two sources of funding: the Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services and the Sedgwick County Crime Prevention Fund, support secondary and tertiary programs with a goal of preventing juvenile delinquency. The combined funds served 720 members of the community during SFY2020. All of the programs perform some sort of risk assessment, and most are utilizing assessment of future criminal behavior risk among the juveniles served in their programs to focus resources where the impact is greatest. A review of the distribution of risk levels through the programs shows the only program with substantial numbers of low risk youth is PATHS for Kids. As a secondary prevention program, such service of lower risk youth in a potentially at-risk location is accepted practice. All of the programs with an individual focus in delivery are mainly serving moderate risk youth and some higher risk youth. Duration and dosages of intervention must be guided by client risk levels and specific risk domains. Programs are taking measures to avoid the risk of contagion when serving high-risk clients with a population that includes moderate-risk youth.

For detailed information on Prevention Program outcomes please see Program Evaluation for State Fiscal Year 2020 (www.sedgwickcounty.org/corrections/reports-plans-and-initiatives) and Division of Corrections Strategic Plan (www.sedgwickcounty.org/corrections/).

The graduated sanctions include juvenile court services, juvenile intensive supervision, juvenile case management, conditional release, and juvenile correctional facilities. Effective January 1, 2018, the Secretary of Corrections only contracted for up to 50, non-foster beds in youth residential facilities for placement of juvenile offenders with a specified criteria. A substantial part of the impact of SB367 has

Risk-Need-Responsivity Factors Addressed by Each Program

	History of antisocial behavior	Antisocial personality	Antisocial cognition	Antisocial associates	Family	School and/or work	Leisure and/or recreation	Substance abuse
Secondary Prevention Programs								
Pando Initiative						●	●	
PATHS for Kids - MHA			●		●			
Tertiary Prevention Programs								
Detention Advocacy Services (DAS)				●		●		
Functional Family Therapy (EmberHope)			●		●			
Learning the Ropes (Higher Ground)			●		●			●
CBAR / McAdams Academy			●		●	●		
Big Brothers Big Sisters								

*Also provided secondary prevention

Composition of Risk of Youth Served in SFY20 by Prevention Programs in Sedgwick County

Program	Low Risk	Moderate -risk	High-risk	Very High Risk	No Risk Level*	Program utilizes JIAC Brief Screen / YLSCMI	Program utilizes their own assessment
Pando Initiative	0%	80%	10%	0%	10%	✓	✓
Big Brothers Big Sisters	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	✓	
Detention Advocacy Service (KDOC grant)	25%	54%	20%	1%	0%	✓	
Functional Family Therapy	0%	90%	10%	0%	0%	✓	
Learning the Ropes (Higher Ground)	0%	73%	27%	0%	0%	✓	✓
Center for Academic & Behavioral Research (CBAR)/McAdams Academy	0%	97%	3%	0%	0%	✓	
PATHS for Kids – MHA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	✓	

**Exit Information for SFY20 for
Prevention Programs in Sedgwick County**

Program	# Served	# Carried-over to SFY21	# Excluded * NEITHER Successful or Unsuccessful	# Exited BOTH Successful and Unsuccessful	# Successful	# Unsuccessful	% Successful
Pando Initiative	122	0	4	118	71	47	60%
Big Brothers Big Sisters	1	0	1	0	0	0	0%
Detention Advocacy Service (KDOC Grant)	69	5	0	64	53	11	83%
Functional Family Therapy	21	2	0	19	11	8	58%
Learning the Ropes (youth only)	81	8	0	73	55	18	75%
CBAR / McAdams Academy	30	0	0	30	28	2	93%
PATHS for Kids – MHA	403	0	403	1	0	1	0%

Success is determined according to the planned services. Each program has specific criteria to define success.

Juvenile Court Disposition Information

Judicial Handling (Based on number of youth)

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Court Services:					
Juvenile Court Filings*	1,236	1,090	936	1,078	777
Probation Admissions	345	292	212	230	129
Probation Case Load	600	462	378	410	308
JISP:					
Admissions	126	127	169	177	133
Average Daily Population	148	115	127	130	107
JCM:					
Admissions	83	62	23	46	35
Average Daily Population (Total All CM)	227	167	105	75	67
State Juvenile Correctional Facilities:					
Admissions	102	79	36	39	24
Transfers to Adult System:					
Motions	6	17	20	26	11

*Juvenile court filings are based on state fiscal year. All other data is based on calendar year.

Non-Judicial Handling (Based on number of youth)

Non-Judicial Handling	SFY15	SFY16	SFY17	SFY18	**CY19	CY20
# placed on contract	294	291	236	220	185	156
# successful completions	194	214	192	196	168	149
% revocation rate (revocation/placed on Contract)	27%	27%	21%	31%	24%	60%
% with new charges 12 months post completion	3%	*	*	*	*	*

*The DA Diversion program no longer tracks recidivism data.

**The DA Diversion program provided CY data.

Juvenile Court Services

Probation

Juvenile offenders convicted of offenses that do not merit referral to a juvenile correctional facility are typically placed under court jurisdiction. Court Services monitors compliance with court orders for youth placed on standard probation. Juvenile Field Services provides supervision for youth placed on juvenile intensive supervision, juvenile case management and conditional release. The number of contacts varies based upon risk and client needs. Court Services provides Pre-Sentence Investigation reports to the court. An assessment tool, the Youthful Level of Service / Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) is conducted and scored on juveniles who meet certain criteria. Court Services provides YLS/CMI scores at the time of sentencing to aid the judge in selecting sentencing options. The desired outcome of implementing the risk and needs assessment instrument is enhanced community safety achieved by providing appropriate intensive supervision and programming to juveniles who score at

moderate risk or above, and less supervision and programming to low risk youth. Random drug testing is performed. Sedgwick County Department of Corrections makes electronic monitoring available to Court Services to address supervision issues for juveniles residing in the home.

In the table below, the number of new cases assigned is the total number of cases assigned to a Court Services Officer in juvenile probation for the entire year. The other three categories are a snapshot of juveniles as of the last day of the year. The total number represents the number of juveniles with Court Services involvement; the number of cases would be higher as some juveniles have multiple cases, but each juvenile is only counted once. The Administrative Total includes the following: JISP cases, KDOC-JS cases, Intra State Transfers and Inter State Transfers. During the five year period in the table, there has been a nearly 50% decrease in juveniles with Court Service involvement.

Performance Report Activities

Juvenile Court Services Probation	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
# of New Cases Assigned	345	292	212	230	129
Pending Sentencing	99	75	89	94	57
Active Standard Probation Cases	188	132	92	120	79
Administrative Total	313	255	197	196	172
TOTAL	600	462	378	410	308

Juvenile Field Services

Juvenile Field Services consists of three programs: Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program (JISP), Juvenile Case Management (CM) and Conditional Release (CR). The department was formed in March 1998, and operates with state funding under the State of Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services (KDOC-JS).

Juvenile Field Services places emphasis on public safety, preventing future offenses through the use of evidence-based correctional practices and services, education, employment and enhancing positive family impact on the offender’s behavior. Offenders are supervised on level systems based on their risk to reoffend as determined by evidence-based correctional risk assessments. Juvenile offenders are monitored utilizing a graduated response approach to technical supervision violations. Graduated responses may consist of regularly scheduled community service work projects, reduction in curfew or attend an Accountability Panel. Accountability Panels consist of community volunteers

who meet with the offender to address issues relating to community supervision to arrive at creative solutions.

Offenders submit to urinalysis and breath analysis tests to detect drug use. Contacts with employers, educators, treatment providers, caregivers and the offender are characteristic of the program. In some cases, electronic monitoring is used to restrict freedom and provide sanctions for minor violations of the conditions of supervision. This restricts the offender’s mobility to the home or other approved locations. If the offender violates the rules, staff members are quickly notified and can take action.

The three tables provided show long-term trends (decreases) for average daily population, admissions, and re-offense rates. The exceptions to the downward trend are in the re-offense rates for conditional release and intensive supervision at 12 months after the case was closed. The average number of new adjudications per month for KDOC-JS custody clients is lower in 2017, but has been relatively stable.

State Fiscal Year	SFY15	SFY16	SFY17	SFY18	SFY19	SFY20
Case Management						
Average Daily Population (Non-JCF* and Non-CR)	142	131	86	85	48	42
Average Daily Population (JCF and CR)	123	111	53	53	35	29
Average Daily Population - Total	266	242	139	138	83	71
% JCF and CR of Total Case Management	46%	46%	38%	38%	42%	41%
JISP						
Average Daily Population	152	153	114	115	133	116

*JCF-Juvenile Correctional Facility

JFS New Admits by Month

NEW ADMITS	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Case Management						
January	9	6	3	1	5	4
February	9	2	11	2	2	1
March	6	13	5	1	4	2
April	18	5	5	1	5	0
May	17	12	5	1	3	2
June	8	8	5	4	2	5
July	5	9	5	0	4	4
August	9	6	6	1	3	4
September	14	8	6	3	3	4
October	11	6	5	3	8	2
November	5	7	6	4	2	2
December	5	1	0	2	5	5
TOTAL	116	83	62	23	46	35

JISP						
January	20	13	13	14	21	13
February	15	7	13	16	13	12
March	13	10	13	16	8	7
April	22	13	5	16	20	2
May	15	14	8	17	18	4
June	12	13	14	6	10	27
July	18	10	12	13	15	6
August	21	8	6	10	14	11
September	22	11	8	10	11	19
October	17	8	10	18	18	17
November	9	10	19	24	11	9
December	6	9	6	9	18	6
TOTAL	190	126	127	169	177	133

JFS Recidivism Rates

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Case Management Percentage Re-offenses 12 Months After Case Closure	18%	14%	6%	10%	13%
Conditional Release Percentage Re-offenses 12 Months After Case Closure	16%	17%	19%	12%	6%
Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program Percentage Re-offenses 12 Months After Case Closure	11%	15%	18%	17%	1%
Average # of New Adjudications Per Month – KDOC-JS Custody Clients	4	4	1	3	3

Source: Juvenile Field Services

Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program (JISP)

Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program is an intensive community based program providing services to offenders at risk of entering state's custody offenders are supervised according to a level system. Frequent contacts with employers, educators, treatment providers and the offender are components of intensive supervision, as are additional services including electronic monitoring, urinalysis testing, DNA testing and registration, surveillance and job readiness training. Emphasis is placed on

public safety, preventing future offenses, education and enhancing positive family impact on the offender's behavior. The primary goals of this program are: to enhance community safety, reparation and behavior change in juvenile offenders through effective case management by holding them accountable for their criminal behavior; and providing effective correctional intervention, supervision and services to offenders assigned to JISP.

JISP - Performance Measures

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Number JISP clients served	345	272	275	284	304	263
ADP for JISP	146	148	115	127	130	107
Unit Cost per day for JISP	\$12.04	\$10.52	\$11.14	\$14.27	\$13.12	N/A
Average Caseload Size*	24	29	19	13	14	15

Source: Juvenile Field Services

*Mixed caseload of JISP & CM clients.

JISP – Recidivism

	Average (2014 – 2019)	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Juvenile Intensive Supervision Program Percentage Re-offenses 12 Months After Case Closure	14%	6%	11%	15%	18%	17%	1%

Source: Juvenile Field Services

JISP - Annual Successful Completions Rate

% Successful Completions	2016	2017	2018*	2019	2020
Successful Closures	90	104	88	81	80
TOTAL	90/144 63%	60/144 58%	73/88 83%	81/108 75%	80/96 83%
Low Risk (Prior to 2018 Included in General Caseloads)	100%	100%	1/2 50%	4/4 100%	1/2 50%
General Caseloads	62%	49%	47/54 87%	43/50 82%	44/49 90%
High Risk Unit	13/24 54%	21/33 64%	25/32 78%	34/54 63%	35/45 78%

Source: Juvenile Field Services

*Case Length Limit Closures started occurring in 2018.

JISP - Summary of Recent Case Failure Outcomes (General Caseloads)

Closures	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Outcome of Unsuccessful Closures	51/141 36%	44/148 30%	15/103 15%	27/108 25%	16/96 17%
Juvenile Correctional Facility	4/51 8%	10/44 23%	6/15 40%	15/27 56%	8/16 50%
KDOC-JS Custody / Out-of-Home	26/51 51%	17/44 39%	2/15 13%	1/27 4%	N/A
Sanctioned / Closed	19/51 37%	12/44 27%	7/15 47%	1/27 4%	5/16 31%
Adult Charge / Closed	2/51 4%	3/44 7%	0/15 0%	2/27 7%	1/16 6%
Client Turned 21 / Other	0/51 0%	2/44 5%	0/15 0%	8/27 30%	2/16 13%
Successful Closures	90	104	88	81	80
Total Closures	141	148	103	108	96

Source: Juvenile Field Services

Juvenile Case Management (JCM)

Juvenile Case Management provides supervision, case management and placement to offenders. Offenders served include those in state’s custody, and those directly committed to state Juvenile Correctional Facilities (JCFs). The offenders may be placed in the community, in residential treatment facilities and in JCFs. Offenders are supervised according to a level system. Contacts with employers, educators, treatment providers and the offender are components of supervision, as are additional services including electronic monitoring, urinalysis testing, DNA testing and

registration, job readiness training, surveillance and independent living services. Emphasis is placed on public safety, preventing future offenses, education and enhancing positive family impact on the offender’s behavior. The primary goals of this program are: to enhance community safety, reparation and behavior change in juvenile offenders through effective case management by holding youth accountable for their criminal behavior; and providing effective correctional intervention, supervision and services to offenders assigned to JCM at Juvenile Field Services.

JCM - Performance Measures

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Number CM clients served	411	354	232	151	110
ADP for CM	227	167	105	75	67
Unit Cost per day for CM	\$15.55	\$17.98	\$27.57	\$49.06	N/A
Average Caseload Size*	29	19	13	14	15

Source: Juvenile Field Services

*Mixed caseload of JISP & CM clients.

JCM – Recidivism

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Case Management Percentage Re-offenses 12 Months After Case Closure	18%	14%	20%	2/31 6%	13%

Source: Juvenile Field Services

JCM - Annual Successful Completions Rate

% Successful Completions	2016	2017	2018*	2019	2020
TOTAL	76%	82%	100%	83%	86%
Low Risk (Included in General Caseloads)	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
General Caseloads	77%	83%	100%	71%	71%
High Risk Unit	74%	80%	100%	100%	93%

Source: Juvenile Field Services

*Case Length Limit Closures started occurring in 2018.

In 2017, the overall percentage of successful completions increased by 6% compared to 2016. Success rates for all categories are above target rates (overall successful completion rate target is 60%). The high risk team experienced an increase in successful completions, with the highest successful completions rate at 80%.

Conditional Release (CR)

Conditional Release provides supervision and case management for youth returning to the community from juvenile correctional facilities on conditional release. Juveniles served by this unit are placed in their family homes, detention, resource homes, residential treatment facilities and independent living programs. The Conditional Release population continues to be a very difficult

population to work with, and finding the means to help these clients be successful continues to be a struggle. Compared with the general caseloads, the high risk unit experienced success with this population. Success rates for the high risk unit returned to a point near the 60% goal, and rates are 100% for the low risk caseload.

CR – Recidivism Rates

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
12 Months After Case Closure	16%	17%	3/16 19%	2/17 12%	1/18 6%

Source: Juvenile Field Services

CR - Annual Successful Completions Rate

% Successful Completions	2016	2017	2018*	2019	2020
TOTAL	47%	68%	56%	73%	60%
Low Risk (Prior to 2018 Included in General Caseloads)	100%	100%	33%	100%	N/A
General Caseloads	55%	100%	62%	81%	50%
High Risk Unit	30%	59%	50%	56%	67%

Source: Juvenile Field Services

*Case Length Limit Closures started occurring in 2018.

**KDOC - JS Custody Youth Placements
Average End of Month Placements**

Conditional Release	SFY15	SFY16	SFY17	SFY18	SFY19	SFY20
Comm. Integration Program	.67	.92	0	0	0	0
Detention	12.8	12.2	12.08	10.2	10.5	7
Emergency Shelter	.17	.08	.08	.08	0	0
Family Resource Home	0	0	0	0	0	0
Home/Relative	16.6	17.5	27.9	25.4	15.58	16
Hospital	0	0	.08	0	0	0
Independent Living	4.3	3.1	2.08	3.1	4	3
Juvenile Correctional Facility	0	.92	.08	.17	0	0
Juvenile Justice Foster Care	.42	.58	.17	.25	0	0
PRTF	0	0	0	.08	0	0
Residential D/A Treatment	.17	.17	.08	.17	0	0
Specialized Family Res. Home	0	0	0	0	0	0
Therapeutic Family Res. Home	0	0	0	.17	0	0
Transitional Living Program	4.1	2.1	5.4	4.17	1.75	2
YRC I	0	0	0	0	0	0
YRC II	13.6	6.9	1.25	.25	0	0
Average Total Placements	53	44	49	44	32	28

Source: Juvenile Field Services / AWOLs are not included in this table.

Juvenile Correctional Facilities

Kansas operates one Juvenile Correctional Facility (JCF) in Topeka, Kansas. Youth placed in a JCF are committed by court order. All males entering the Juvenile Correctional Facility are admitted through the Reception and Diagnostic Unit (RDU) at the Kansas Juvenile Correctional Complex – East (KJCC-E). Upon completion of a classification assessment at the RDU, males serve out their sentence at the KJCC-E location. Kansas Juvenile Correctional Complex - West (KJCC-W) is the only facility that receives female admissions and is the RDU for females.

SFY18 admissions dropped by 48.1%, while the total admissions for SFY19 went up by 9/75%. The increase in total admissions for SFY19 may be an indication the full impact of SB367 on juvenile correctional facility admissions is realized.

Admissions to Juvenile Correctional Facilities - 18th Judicial District

Facility	SFY15	SFY16	SFY17	SFY18	SFY19	SFY20
KJCC – East Males	66	99	70	37	40	30
KJCC – West Females	7	3	9	4	5	2
TOTAL	73	102	79	41	45	32
% Change from prior year	11%	40%	-22%	-48.1%	9.75%	-28.88%

Source: Kansas Department of Corrections & Sedgwick County Department of Corrections, Juvenile Field Services

Evening Reporting Center

The Evening Reporting Center (ERC) serves youth aged 10 to 22.5 from Sedgwick County or from the surrounding counties (Butler, Harvey, Elk, Greenwood, Sumner, McPherson, and Cowley). Youth targeted are identified as moderate to high-risk on the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS-CMI). The population served includes post-adjudicated youth, as well as youth in Court Services, case management, and Intensive Supervision Probation with community corrections. Youth may also become involved following a sanction by community corrections programs.

- **Evidence-based group services:** these include Aggression Replacement Training (ART), Thinking for a Change (T4C), Moral Recognition Therapy (MRT), Courage to Change (C2C), and Cognitive Behavioral Intervention (CBI).
- **Drug and Alcohol Treatment:** if necessary, youth are eligible for drug and alcohol services provided by a local community provider on-site at ERC.
- **Seeking Safety:** present-focused counseling to help attain safety from trauma and/or substance abuse.
- **Girls Circle:** a structured support group for girls that foster strengths and promote resiliency while developing a connection with peers and adults.
- **Independent Living Skill Groups:** youth may receive support with employment, cooking, budgeting, college preparation, community resources, housing, health, and other related skills.
- **Community Resource Team (CRT):** Provides support to youth within the Juvenile Justice System with a spectrum that focuses on community service work, education, employment, housing, medical, clothing, mental health, mentoring, food resources, and obtaining important documents.
- **Youth Council:** Youth are able to provide mentorship to their peers. They also ensure there is positive interaction with youth by providing constructive criticism and reassuring positive behavior while encouraging active engagement within their probation requirements.
- **Family Council:** Families meet quarterly to review and provide feedback around programming, changes to policies and services delivered by ISO, ERC and JFS staff. This ensures that families have positive outcomes with their experience and increase the likelihood of expedient case closure and a successful program completion.
- **Education Services:** Site based tutoring, GED preparation and educational enrichment provided by a contracted certified teacher. Educational services provide supports for youth needing credit recovery, reconnecting to school and preparing for post-secondary education.

There were one hundred seventeen (117) individual youth served through the ERC in 2020 (January 1, 2020-December 31, 2020). These include 70 youth and families served by CRT. Of those 117 youth, 23 youth completed programming with 20 youth successful. As of December 31, 2020, 94 youth were still listed as actively attending programming, detained, AWOL, inpatient treatment, or non-compliant.

Risk level is determined by youth's YLS/CMI score. Youth scoring low risk were diverted to other programming, in order to avoid the criminogenic contagion that can occur by mixing them with moderate and high-risk youth. Moderate and high-risk youth are offered the same programming; however which group youth are placed in is done on a case-by-case basis, with the referral team assigning a schedule based on court-orders, YLS/CMI sub-scores, and individual needs.



The program has the ability to address issues such as gender and race. For gender sensitive groups (such as *Seeking Safety and Girls Circle*), gender-matching facilitators are used exclusively for the girls' group and at client discretion for the boys' groups. In addition, the program offers coed groups. We have a diverse group of youth in terms of race and ethnicity. We have not had issues placing youth in programming based on racial/ethnic demographics.

As needed for non-English speaking persons, ERC staff utilize our on-call translation service to complete parent update phone calls, notification calls, and even CRT sessions. We also have some curriculum materials available in Spanish; however we have not yet had a need to utilize these.


Any pre-adjudicated youth were separated from ERC programming, so as not to mix them with post-adjudicated/higher risk youth.

The program specifically asks about gang involvement and safety concerns on our referral form so that we can assign youth to appropriate programming, without putting them at risk for interaction with opposing gang members or court-ordered no-contacts (be they victims, perpetrators, or co-respondents).


ERC youth with especially traumatic histories, increased mental health needs, and cognitive functioning issues are given special consideration (such as 1:1 sessions, referrals to other community services, and specialized group scheduling).



2020 Completions







CSW Hours By Quarter 2020





N=102.5

Youth Served by Risk Level 2020







5

Racial and Ethnic Disparity & Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative

The section on racial and ethnic disparity contains limited information, extracted from some of the juvenile justice agencies. A full discussion of this topic is contained in the Program Evaluation Report, available on the Sedgwick County website. Program success rates decreased, as did most program rates for the identified races and ethnic groups, as well as for gender. The information for SFY2020 is so atypical due to the COVID-19 pandemic it cannot be regarded as indicative of regular conditions.

As part of an ongoing commitment to reduce the number of youth placed in secure bed detention, Team Justice and the Detention Utilization Committee agreed to participate with the Kansas Department of Corrections – Juvenile Services in the Annie E. Casey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) by working collaboratively with community and justice system stakeholders to collect and analyze data and make agreed upon improvement. Phase I involved collaborating with consultants from the Annie E. Casey Foundation and representatives from four other Kansas sites (Shawnee, Johnson, Douglas and Wyandotte counties). The JDAI work is voluntary and lasted five years (until 2016). Department of Corrections contracted with the W. Haywood Burns Institute with Title II grant funding towards a goal of developing a community strategic plan for Sedgwick County. The Title II grant ended June 30, 2018. However, community and justice stakeholders are committed to continue working in this area and making changes to reduce ethnic disparity. Community member participation gradually diminished. The focus on racial and ethnic disparity shifted to orchestration of a series of community listening sessions, a community survey of assets and needs to assist minority youth in positive development. The process culminated in a virtual community summit that informed Team Justice of community priorities for reducing racial and ethnic disparity among youth entering the juvenile justice system. Team Justice is adding an outcome related to offering secondary prevention programs with cultural relevance to reduce racial and ethnic disparity. Additionally, Team Justice is accepting applications to use evidence-based funding to improve racial and ethnic disparity.

For more information on Sedgwick County, Department of Corrections efforts please see the Strategic Plan (www.sedgwickcounty.org/corrections/) and the Program Evaluation for State Fiscal Year 2020. (www.sedgwickcounty.org/corrections/reports-plans-and-initiatives).

The data following is an attempt to understand the experiences of racial and ethnic minority youth in the juvenile justice system. The first table shows total admissions to the intake and detention continuum for two years. It shows activity throughout the continuum is down for 2020 when compared with 2019.

Juvenile Intake & Detention Continuum

Activity Report

2019 - 2020 YTD

2020	JIAC Intakes	JDF Admits	JDF ADP	JRF ADP	HBS ADP	*DAS - ATD ADP	**CACS Attended
JAN	156.00	53.00	54.71	19.87	35.52	15.03	6.00
FEB	137.00	43.00	51.90	20.97	26.62	11.52	20.00
MAR	128.00	35.00	53.58	14.00	28.68	6.29	0.00
APR	76.00	28.00	49.37	17.20	34.87	4.87	0.00
MAY	94.00	28.00	56.77	18.39	38.13	5.84	0.00
JUN	97.00	27.00	50.70	15.40	38.23	6.03	0.00
JUL	88.00	31.00	36.19	15.52	41.03	3.61	0.00
AUG	121.00	47.00	34.48	14.84	36.74	1.23	0.00
SEP	105.00	31.00	32.87	16.20	29.20	2.47	0.00
OCT	80.00	19.00	34.26	12.97	24.74	0.68	0.00
NOV	94.00	29.00	32.27	8.63	21.03	2.80	0.00
DEC	98.00	34.00	35.35	7.94	19.03	5.52	0.00
YTD	1,274.00	405.00	43.52	15.14	31.19	5.47	26.00

**Program on hold due to COVID-19.

2019	JIAC Intakes	JDF Admits	JDF ADP	JRF ADP	HBS ADP	*DAS - ATD ADP	CACS Attended	Comm Svc Hours
JAN	144.00	53.00	51.16	15.39	31.97	29.16	5.00	4.00
FEB	137.00	48.00	45.32	13.50	27.71	25.46	3.00	7.00
MAR	161.00	55.00	55.03	11.87	27.61	30.71	8.00	5.00
APR	165.00	60.00	63.07	13.10	24.07	31.63	6.00	3.00
MAY	165.00	51.00	51.23	14.61	21.87	30.00	2.00	0.00
JUN	112.00	53.00	53.73	15.67	29.30	15.43	14.00	12.00
JUL	134.00	47.00	51.58	16.23	29.23	8.10	9.00	4.00
AUG	138.00	57.00	49.42	16.52	26.84	11.42	0.00	
SEP	127.00	49.00	56.03	16.17	22.67	12.57	20.00	
OCT	166.00	57.00	59.87	12.81	24.81	8.45	17.00	
NOV	157.00	45.00	61.40	13.33	28.73	10.70	0.00	
DEC	159.00	45.00	58.32	14.81	32.94	12.68	0.00	
YTD	1,765.00	620.00	54.72	14.51	26.76	22.60	84.00	35.00

*Detention Alternative Services were provided by Kansas Legal Service until the end of their grant on 06/30/19. SCDOC began case management for these youth on 07/01/19.

The information in this table shows greater detail on the experiences of all youth in detention, including how many youths were admitted to juvenile detention (admit), average daily population (ADP) by group, and average length of stay (ALOS). The greatest disparity in admissions is for African Americans who make up 9.3% of the Sedgwick County population age 10-18 years but make up 54% of detention admissions. Hispanic youth make up 18.5% of detention admissions but are 15% of the youth population in Sedgwick County. For average daily population (ADP) in detention the disparity for both African American and Hispanic youth is even greater than at admission. Average length of stay information shows Hispanic youth contribute a great deal to the rise in average daily population by extremely long stays in detention. The gender information shows local detention practice obtains admissions, ADP, and ALOS like national figures. Explanations for these differences are multidimensional and complex, nonetheless require some form of response.

2020 Calendar Year details of detention

Racial/Ethnic/Gender	Admit (total=400)*	ADP* (43.52 youth)	ALOS* (43.55 days)
Race and Ethnicity			
African American	216 (54%)	24.58(56.5%)	41.65
Hispanic	74(18.5%)	11.20(25.7%)	72.49
Caucasian	107(26.75%)	7.72(17.7%)	26.72
Gender			
Male	306(76.5%)	36.10(83%)	48.41
Female	94(23.5%)	7.42(17%)	26.41

*Admit figures for race/ethnicity do not sum to 100% due to 3 youth with no information. The absence of detail on those 3 youth also impacts ADP and ALOS.

The data following is more specific to the experiences of youth as it relates to repeat admission to the Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center. The tables show racial and ethnic disparity not only for the total admissions to JIAC, but greater disparity when information covered chronic levels of admissions (4 or more) within SFY2020.

Intake Frequency – SFY20

# of Times at JIAC	SFY20
≥ 9	3
8	1
7	2
6	0
5	10
4	18
3	40
2	164
1	942
Total Intakes	1,566
Total Youth	1,180

This data varies slightly from a previous report due to pulling intake records from a different system at a different time. The prior report showed 165 with 2 intakes and 39 with 3 intakes.

# of Times at JIAC	Ethnicity % Hispanic	Race % Black	Race % White
≥ 9	0.0% (0/3)	33.3% (1/3)	66.7% (2/3)
8	0.0% (0/1)	100.0% (1/1)	0.0% (0/1)
7	0.0% (0/2)	50.0% (1/2)	50.0% (1/2)
5	30.0% (3/10)	40% (4/10)	30% (3/10)
4	22.2% (4/18)	33.3% (6/18)	44.4% (8/18)
3	15.0% (6/40)	45.0% (18/40)	40.0% (16/40)
2	29.3% (42/164)	36.0% (59/164)	32.9% (54/164)

*Ethnicity includes all racial categories. Racial data includes only two categories (Black/African-American and White/Caucasian) and excludes categories with small percentages.

# of Times at JIAC	Total
≥ 4 Intake (4 – 14 intakes)	34 (3%)
>1 Intake (2 – 14 intakes)	238 (20%)
1 Intake (1 intake during the year)	942 (80%)

In SFY20 (7/1/19 to 6/30/20), 80% of youth with an intake at JIAC did not return during the fiscal year. While 20% did have a subsequent intake, they did not necessarily have new charges. Youth with a chronic level of intakes (4 or more) amounted to 3% (34 youth).

# of Times at JIAC	Ethnicity % Hispanic	Race % Black	Race % White
≥ 4	23% (55/238)	38% (90/238)	35% (84/238)
≥ 2	21% (7/34)	38% (13/34)	41% (14/34)

Youth with subsequent contact at JIAC (two or more intakes) were similar in number and percentage for white and black youth while the percentage of white youth declined for those with a chronic level of intakes (four or more intakes). This data can be compared to the percentage of youth in Sedgwick County ages 10 – 17 by race.

	Violent	Serious	Serious Drug	Mid-Level	Minor	Minor Drug	Unclassified	Status
Youth With 2 Intakes								
1 st intake	18.9% (31)	2.4% (4)	2.4% (4)	12.2% (20)	22.0% (36)	17.1% (28)	23.2% (38)	1.8% (3)
2 nd intake	16.5% (27)	6.7% (11)	2.4% (4)	9.1% (15)	19.5% (32)	11.6% (19)	30.5% (50)	3.7% (6)
Youth With 3 Intakes								
1 st intake	5% (2)	7.5% (3)	2.5% (1)	12.5% (5)	30% (12)	7.5% (3)	25% (10)	10% (4)
2 nd intake	15% (6)	10% (4)	2.5% (1)	5% (2)	20% (8)	5% (2)	35% (14)	7.5% (3)
3 rd intake	20% (8)	7.5% (3)	5% (2)	10% (4)	17.5% (7)	5% (2)	30% (12)	5% (2)
Youth With 4 And More Intakes								
1 st intake	15% (5)	12% (4)		21% (7)	29% (10)	3% (1)	18% (6)	3% (1)
2 nd intake	18% (6)	18% (6)	3% (1)	6% (2)	18% (6)	6% (2)	21% (7)	12% (4)
3 rd intake	6% (2)	12% (4)	3% (1)	21% (7)	15% (5)	3% (1)	24% (8)	18% (6)
4 th intake	6% (2)	18% (6)	9% (3)	3% (1)	12% (4)	12% (4)	29% (10)	12% (4)
5 th intake	6% (1)	13% (2)		13% (2)	19% (3)	6% (1)	19% (3)	25% (4)
6 th intake	17% (1)				17% (1)		17% (1)	50% (3)
7 th intake	17% (1)				50% (3)		17% (1)	17% (1)
8 th intake				25% (1)			25% (1)	50% (2)
9 th intake					33% (1)		33% (1)	33% (1)
10 th intake							50% (1)	50% (1)
11 th intake						100% (1)		
12 th intake				100% (1)				
13 th intake								100% (1)
14 th intake								100% (1)

This chart shows the most serious offense category at intake as youth continued throughout the fiscal year. . The percentages in red indicate the most frequent reason and reveals that Unclassified (warrants) and Status offenses are a primary driver of contact with JIAC (not new offenses). This is a snapshot of intake frequency, though, and does not capture those with intakes before or after the given period. This chart shows the frequency of intakes for mandatory reasons (the Unclassified category), status offenses and minor offenses. Another way to look at the data would be to focus on the first 6 categories (Violent – Minor Drug) which involved new alleged offenses at intake.

Explanation of Offense Categories

Violent P/F	Serious NP/F	Drug / Serious D/F	Mid-level P/M	Minor NP/M	Drug / Minor D/M
----------------	-----------------	-----------------------	------------------	---------------	---------------------

P = Person; NP = Non-Person; F = Felony; M = Misdemeanor; D = Drug

Violent offenses are person felonies including: murder; rape; robbery; aggravated assault; aggravated burglary; aggravated robbery; aggravated battery; burglary – dwelling; criminal threat.

Serious offenses are non-person felonies including: criminal damage to property; burglary (motor vehicle and not a dwelling).

Serious Drug offenses are felony drug including: sale of marijuana; possession of depressants/stimulants/hallucinogens; possession of opiate/opium/narcotics.

Mid-level offenses are person misdemeanors including: battery; assault.

Minor offenses are non-person misdemeanors including: criminal damage to property < \$500; criminal trespass; disorderly conduct; theft < \$1000.

Minor Drug offenses are misdemeanor drug offenses including: possession of marijuana; possession of drug paraphernalia; minor in possession of alcohol; tobacco warrant.

Unclassified refers to warrants, commitment orders, sanctions, most traffic/traffic warrants. This category is used when there are no new charges.

Status offenses include curfew, runaway and truancy.

In summary, the various information contained in this section demonstrated racial and ethnic disparity at the point of JIAC where repeat appearances are especially disparate for African Americans, and disparity using detention. All the information in this section demonstrated the continuing urgency of addressing racial and ethnic disparity in Sedgwick County juvenile justice.

6

Special Initiatives

Introduction

As issues and concerns arise in Sedgwick County, the Department of Corrections and other community entities develop initiatives aimed at addressing those issues. Currently, there are initiatives regarding Human Trafficking and Cross-systems Youth. In addition, the Sedgwick County Department of Corrections, Juvenile Field Services, has included Accountability Panels into the system. The previously mentioned process of listening sessions and a virtual community summit provided much information about assets and needs and programs that would engage the community in the effort to reduce racial and ethnic disparity.

Efforts to Reduce Human Trafficking

In 2016, the Legislature enacted several changes to strengthen access to victim services by adding a definition of runaway, creating a duty for law enforcement to take runaways into custody, and to allow safety holds of out of state runaways with Department for Children and Families (DCF) custody when return to the home is unsafe. The 2017 Legislature considered more changes and refinements contained in SB 40/179.

Sedgwick County Department of Corrections Efforts

Beginning in 2012, the Sedgwick County Department of Corrections, Juvenile Detention Facility (JDF) took steps to prepare and coordinate implementation of the provisions and changes contained in SB 61. The Sedgwick County Department of Corrections continues to support community efforts. JDF Mental Health continues to support the population in the following areas:

- Collect data, provide case management/advocacy and coordinate services for youth detained.
- HT victims who are required to testify have access to regular clothing rather than attending in the standard detention jumpsuits.
- The community group, ASERCA, which mental health staff previously attended, has dissolved.
- While detained, therapy services are provided for youth by the Child Advocacy Center (CAC). If a youth is in St. Francis Community Services Custody (SFCS), a SFCS therapist provides the therapy services to this population. Some SFCS youth also qualify for drug/alcohol treatment services.

The Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center (JIAC) remains involved in community coordination in the following areas:

- JIAC has reported intakes involving suspected HT involvement to EMCU and KDOC-JS since March 2014.
- In June 2016, the Sedgwick County Department of Corrections, Juvenile Intake and Assessment Center in the 18th JD agreed to participate, along with five other judicial districts, in the KDOC-JS piloting effort for the creation, implementation, and evaluation of a human trafficking screening instrument for juvenile intake. The screening instrument is to work in a complimentary manner with the HT investigation systems within the state. Piloting of a human trafficking screening instrument has yet to be implemented.
- All JIAC staff receive training during orientation on the identification of human trafficking victims.
- The current local protocol provides two different responses depending upon the circumstances:
 - Intakes involving youth with suspected human trafficking are reported immediately to EMCU, Kansas Protection Report Center and (if detained) the Mental Health team at the Juvenile Detention Facility.
 - Intakes involving non-urgent indirect indicators are reported via email to EMCU (and to the Kansas Protection Report Center).
- In calendar year 2020 there were three youth identified by JDF as being involved with human trafficking.

Cross-System Youth Coordination

Often, youth in the juvenile justice system find themselves involved in more than one system. For example, a juvenile offender may also be involved in the child welfare system due to conditions in the home. These youth are particularly vulnerable and can often fall through the cracks of multiple systems.

The prevalence of crossover youth remains challenging to ascertain due to a lack of integration across the nation between child welfare and juvenile justice systems. While various studies indicate that anywhere from 9% to 29% of youth involved in the child welfare system will also engage in delinquent behavior, there is clear indication that percentages of dually involved youth increase sharply as one examines deeper levels of the juvenile justice system. One study indicated that while only 1% of youth in the diversion program came from this population, 42% percent of the youth on probation placement were crossover youth (Herz, D. C., Ryan, J. P., & Bilchik, S., 2010).

Most studies indicate that minority youth are overrepresented in crossover youth populations. The average age of entry into the juvenile justice system by crossover youth was 15.73 years. On average, these youth entered the child welfare system more than 7 years before entering the justice system (Herz, et al, 2010).

The CYPM identified youth involved with Family Preservation Services with St. Francis are at an elevated risk of out of home placement in the juvenile justice system. The collaborative group now identifies family preservation youth who had experienced an arrest within 6 months of the family preservation referral or have an arrest while participating in family preservation.

The collaborative group comes together with the youth and family to provide wrap around services to help youth avoid further involvement in the juvenile justice system. CYPM staffings were initiated in August of 2017. Between August 1, 2017 and December 31, 2017, 20 staffings

occurred. Of the 20 youth involved in staffings, there were 14 males (11 White, 3 Black) and 6 females (5 White, 1 Native American). Between January 1, 2018 and December 31, 2018, 33 staffings for 25 youth occurred. Of the 25 youth involved in the staffings there were 12 males (10 White, 2 Black) and 13 females (12 White, 1 Native American).

Due to staffing changes in 2019, individual case staff meetings did not continue. However; the Crossover Youth oversight committee consisting of representatives from DCF, St. Francis Ministries, COMCARE and the SCDOC continued to meet regularly to discuss issues related to crossover youth. This committee also presented information on the Crossover Youth Practice Model to the state oversight committee and Team Justice. Opportunities exist to expand these efforts in 2020 with the eventual goal to resume collaborative work on the individual youth and family level

In 2020 DCF took the opportunity to apply for Evidence Based funding to staff a position through KDOC-JS. This application was approved by Team Justice in March of 2020 and final approval was then provided by KDOC-JS in June. DCF was successful in filling a position in November of 2020.

Herz, D. C., Ryan, J. P., & Bilchik, S. (2010). Challenges Facing Crossover Youth: An Examination of Juvenile-Justice Decision Making and Recidivism. *Family Court Review*, 48(2), 305-321. doi:10.1111/j.1744-1617.2010.01312.x

Success Panels (formerly Accountability Panels)

Success Panels ~~that~~ meet with youth and their families who are on Juvenile Intensive Supervision Probation or on conditional release. Volunteers are required to attend a one-time two-hour orientation session and be willing to volunteer a minimum of two hours three times per year.

In 2019 - 11 Panels were conducted and served 13 youth. Of the 15 Panel Members that volunteered for Panels in 2019, 8 were from the community, and 7 are from the Division of Corrections/Juvenile Field Services. 10 of these volunteers served on 2 or more Panels.

In 2020 - 2 Panels were conducted and served 2 youth. Of the 4 Panel Members that volunteered for Panels in 2020, 2 were from the community, and 2 were from the Department of Corrections/Juvenile Field Services. Due to COVID 19 safety protocols, no Panels have been held since February 2020.

Juvenile Field Services Success Plan Mission Statement:

The purpose of the Success Panel is to connect youth served by Juvenile Field Services to members of the community, who will help youth set goals, recognize their strengths, overcome barriers, and develop a Success Plan, to aid them in completing court ordered supervision successfully.