

# Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

## **Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Programs: Selected References, 1998-Present**

**February 3, 2003**

Tangela G. Roe  
Information Resource Specialist  
Office of Information Resources Management

# Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Programs: Selected References, 1998-Present

## Summary

CRS is often asked for references to literature, published from 1998 to present, that discuss juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs. This bibliography's focus is on programs relating to delinquency prevention, treatment, rehabilitation, and juvenile justice, rather than discussions relating to the causes of delinquency, types of delinquent acts, and statistics on juvenile delinquency, in general. Many resources discuss selected programs that have been evaluated and shown to produce favorable results. In addition, the bibliography includes multiple Web sites of selected evaluated programs. A final section includes citations to resources discussing how to evaluate programs. This bibliography will be updated periodically.

The bibliography includes citations to CRS reports, books, journal articles, studies, reports, and Web sites. The materials were selected from searches of products on the CRS Web site [<http://www.crs.gov>], the Library of Congress Voyager Online Catalog [<http://catalog.loc.gov>], bibliographic databases available to the Congressional Research Service, and the Internet.

The CRS products are provided with report numbers and are available to congressional offices full-text from the CRS Web site [<http://www.crs.gov>]. Products can also be ordered by calling the Products Line at 7-7132. Citations to books on the Library of Congress Voyager Online Catalog [<http://catalog.loc.gov>] are provided with the Library's classification number (for assistance, call the Congressional Loan section, 7-5445). CRS readers can obtain the full text of other items by calling 7-5700. A significant number of resources are available on the Internet.

# Contents

I. General .....	1
II. Aftercare .....	11
III. Boot Camps .....	12
IV. Corrections .....	14
V. Courts .....	14
A. General .....	14
B. Diversion .....	15
1. General .....	15
2. Restorative Justice .....	16
C. Drug Courts .....	18
D. Indigent Defense .....	19
E. Teen Courts .....	20
F. Transfers to Criminal Court .....	21
VI. Curfews .....	21
VII. Drugs .....	22

# Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Programs: Selected References, 1998-Present

## I. General

America's after-school choice: the prime time for juvenile crime, or youth enrichment and achievement; a report from Fight Crime: Invest in Kids. Washington, Fight Crime: Invest in Kids, 2000. 32 p.

[<http://www.fightcrime.org>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003; click on the words "Read More" under the category titled Youth Violence Prevention Plan, then click on "PDF version" under title of this work).

Partial contents.—Prime time for juvenile crime, kids becoming victims, and other dangers.—After-school programs prevent crime, teach skills and values.—Investing in after-school programs saves money and lives.

Best practices of youth violence prevention: a sourcebook for community action. Atlanta, GA, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2000. 207 p.

[<http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/dvp/bestpractices.htm>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

The book "is the first of its kind to look at the effectiveness of specific practices in four key areas: parents and families, home visiting, social and conflict resolution skills, and mentoring .... Offers insight into the practices that make prevention programs work. These programs are drawn from real-world experiences of professionals who have successfully worked to prevent violence among children and adolescents. 'Best Practices' also documents the science behind each best practice and offers a comprehensive directory of resources for more information about organizations that have used these methods."

Blueprints for violence prevention [Web site]. University of Colorado at Boulder, Institute of Behavioral Science, Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence (CSPV).

[<http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

"Blueprints for Violence Prevention, has identified 11 prevention and intervention programs that meet a strict scientific standard of program effectiveness. Program effectiveness is based upon an initial review by CSPV and a final review and recommendation from a distinguished Advisory Board, comprised of seven experts in the field of violence prevention. The 11 model programs [click on Model Programs on the left side of the page], called Blueprints, have been effective in reducing adolescent violent crime, aggression, delinquency, and substance abuse. Another 21 programs [click on Promising Programs on the left side of the page] have been identified as promising programs. To date, more than 600 programs have been reviewed, and the Center continues to look for programs which meet the selection criteria."

A discussion of the Blueprints for Violence Prevention program appears in the Juvenile justice bulletin, July 2001 and is available on the Internet at [<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/187079.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Burton, David. Smith-Darden, Joanne P.

1996 nationwide survey: a survey of treatment programs & models serving children with sexual behavior problems, adolescent sex offenders, and adult sex offenders: a summary of the past ten years of specialized treatment with projections for the coming decade. Brandon, VT, Safer Society Foundation, 2000. 32 p. RC560.S47B87 2000

“The design of the survey was intended to specifically identify specialized sex offender treatment services by state and setting, profile the distribution of therapeutic resources by geographical regions, and aid in monitoring trends in treatment. The survey was also designed to identify the number of services using specific treatment methods and populations, as well as to compare how treatment was conducted with different age and gender categories.”

Butts, Jeffrey A. Mears, Daniel P.

Reviving juvenile justice in a get-tough era. *Youth & society*, v. 33, Dec. 2001: 169-198.

[<http://jbutts.com/pdfs/youth&society.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“State and local jurisdictions throughout the United States enacted a wide array of new juvenile justice policies in recent years. Many of these policies were intended to make the juvenile justice system tougher, but others improved prevention, increased rehabilitation, and enhanced the restorative features of the juvenile justice system. This article describes the most prominent new ideas in juvenile justice and addresses a question usually asked by policy makers: What works?”

Catalano, Richard F. Loeber, Rolf. McKinney, Kay C.

School and community interventions to prevent serious and violent offending. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1999. 11 p.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/177624.pdf> (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“According to the Study Group on Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders—a group of 22 researchers convened by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to study the population of SVJ [serious violent juvenile] offenders—implementing family, school, and community interventions is the best way to prevent children from developing into SVJ offenders.”

Coolbaugh, Kathleen. Hansel, Cynthia J.

The Comprehensive Strategy: lessons learned from the pilot sites. Washington, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2000. 11 p.

<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/178258.pdf> (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“In 1996 three communities – Lee and Duval Counties, Fla.; and San Diego County, Calif. – collaborated with the Federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to apply the processes and principles set forth in the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders. This Bulletin describes the experiences of and lessons learned by

these Comprehensive Strategy pilot sites .... Each of the three pilot sites has benefitted significantly from the Comprehensive Strategy planning process. Although it is still too soon to assess the long-term impact on juvenile crime and delinquency, there are numerous short-term indicators of success, including promising plans for each community's future.”

Doyle, Charles.

Juvenile delinquents & federal criminal law: the federal Juvenile Delinquency Act & related matters. 27 p. CRS Report RL30822.

This report provides an overview of the history of federal juvenile delinquency law, current federal law, and the stages of juvenile adjudications. A survey noting the jurisdictional age for state juvenile courts and their provisions for waivers or transfers of jurisdiction as well as a selected legal bibliography are appended.

Fagan, Patrick F.

Congress's role in improving juvenile delinquency data. Washington, Heritage Foundation, 2000. 7 p.

[<http://www.heritage.org/Research/Crime/BG1351.cfm>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Startling data available from Wisconsin—the one state that has identified some of the family background of its delinquents—indicate that the probability of incarceration for juveniles in families headed by never-married single mothers might be at least as much as 22 times higher than for juveniles in the two-parent family. Yet despite such evidence, the juvenile justice system and the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) seem intent on ignoring the best prevention strategy in society today: a family environment in which the child's mother and father remain married. Because tracking family background never enters the juvenile justice policy debate or underlying research, promoting strong families is never part of juvenile delinquency prevention programs.”

Harrell, Adele V. Cavanagh, Shannon. Sridhahan Sanjeev.

Impact of the Children at Risk program: comprehensive final report II. Washington, Urban Institute, 1998. 171 p.

Examines “the impact of the Children At Risk program, a drug and delinquency prevention program for high-risk adolescents aged 11-13 years old who live in narrowly defined, severely distressed neighborhoods.”

Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants Program [Web site]. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

[<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/jaibg/oview.html>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Through the JAIBG program, funds are provided as block grants to States that have implemented, or are considering implementation of legislation and/or programs promoting greater accountability in the juvenile justice system. Accountability in juvenile justice means assuring that as a result of their wrongdoing, juvenile offenders face individualized consequences that make them aware of and answerable for the loss, damage, or injury perpetrated upon the victim. This is best achieved through a system of graduated sanctions which are imposed surely and swiftly. Graduated sanctions are defined in relation to

the nature and seriousness of the offense, moving from limited interventions to more restrictive actions if the juvenile offender continues delinquent activities.”

Juvenile Mentoring Program [Web site]. Washington, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

[<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/jump>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Links include legislation, grants & funding, evaluation, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention publications, and others.

Juvenile Mentoring Program: a progress review. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2000. 7 p.

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/182209.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Lists the parameters under which the current 164 JUMP projects operate and describes the scope and methodology of JUMP’s ongoing national evaluation. . . . Both youth and mentors were quite positive when rating their mentoring experiences, which were assessed in such terms as school achievement, abstention from drugs and alcohol, and avoidance of violence. “

Lipsey, Mark. Wilson, David. Cothorn, Lynn.

Effective intervention for serious juvenile offenders. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2000. 7 p.

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/181201.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“This bulletin describes a meta-analysis that addresses the following questions: Can intervention programs reduce recidivism rates among serious juvenile delinquents? If so, what types of programs are most effective? It also describes the intervention programs that showed the strongest, most consistent impact on recidivism for serious juvenile offenders.”

Matthews, Stephen A. Larkin, Gayle.

Guide to community-based alternatives for low-risk juvenile offenders. Topeka, KS, KCI (formerly the Koch Crime Institute), 1999. 126 p.

[<http://www.kci.org/publication/sji/index.htm>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“This guide spotlights 20 community-based programs that have been proven to be effective in dealing with low-risk juvenile offenders and achieving significant declines in juvenile delinquency.”

McCord, Joan. Widom, Cathy Spatz. Crowell, Nancy A.

Juvenile crime, juvenile justice. Washington, National Academy Press, 2001. 404 p. HV9104.J832 2001

[<http://www.nap.edu/books/0309068428/html>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Examines a range of solutions: prevention and intervention efforts directed to individuals, peer groups, and families, as well as day care-, school- and community-based initiatives; intervention within the juvenile justice system; role of the police; processing and detention of youth offenders; transferring youths to the adult judicial system; and residential placement of juveniles.”

Mendel, Richard.

LESS COST, MORE SAFETY: guiding lights for reform in juvenile justice. Washington, American Youth Policy Forum, 2001. 66 p.

(click on the words “Full Document” in left frame):

[<http://www.aypf.org/lesscost>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Serving youth in California, Florida, Mississippi, Missouri, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin, the initiatives profiled in LESS COST, MORE SAFETY show that quality intervention programs – not transfer to adult courts and correctional systems, or misdirected juvenile programs – reduce delinquency, ease overcrowding in juvenile detention and corrections facilities, divert delinquent youth from criminal careers, and reduce reliance on expensive “residential treatment” programs for disturbed and delinquent teens. Most importantly, these programs are making communities safer and saving taxpayers millions of dollars.”

- LESS HYPE, MORE HELP: reducing juvenile crime, what works — and what doesn't. Washington, American Youth Policy Forum, 2000. 93 p.

[<http://www.aypf.org/mendel/index.html>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003; click on title in left frame).

“Focused largely on the real-life success of early intervention and family counseling programs, and backed by solid research and analysis, the approaches that do work have proven enormously effective in areas such as Orange County and San Francisco, CA; Boston, MA; Charleston, SC; Milwaukee, WI; Eugene, OR; Salt Lake City, UT; Philadelphia, PA; Everglades and Fort Lauderdale, FL; Giddings, TX; and Seattle, WA.”

More things that do make a difference for youth: a compendium of evaluations of youth programs and practices. Edited by Donna Walker James. Washington, American Youth Policy Forum, 1999. 176 p.

[<http://www.aypf.org/compendium/index.html>] (click on title in left frame):

(as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Summarizes 64 evaluations of career academies, school-to-work, Tech Prep, school reform, juvenile justice and related areas of youth policy.”

National youth violence prevention resource center [Web site]. Sponsored by Atlanta, GA, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Federal Working Group on Youth Violence.

[<http://www.safeyouth.org/home.htm>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Established as a central source of information on prevention and intervention programs, publications, research, and statistics on violence committed by and against children and teens.”

O'Bryant, JoAnne. Cavanagh, David.

Juvenile justice: reauthorization of justice assistance programs. 6 p.

CRS Report RS21395

Under Title II of the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act (H.R. 2215), Congress reauthorized several major juvenile justice programs. The President signed the bill into law on November 2, 2002 (PL 107-273). The Act, as it pertains to juvenile justice assistance: (1) alters state block-grant programs authorized under Title II of the JJDP Act; (2) reauthorizes Title V of this Act, which provides Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention; (3) alters juvenile sentencing and probation in the



federal system; (4) authorizes the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants (JABG) which replace the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants (JAIBG); (5) provides grants to Indian tribes under the JABG Program; (6) mandates a role for state and local courts in preparing JABG grant applications; (7) encourages the states to improve their juvenile justice systems through a multi-track approach; (8) grants much greater authority to find and disseminate successful, model juvenile justice programs; (9) modifies the current federal mandates in the JJDP Act of 1974 regarding the incarceration of juveniles; and (10) changes the incentives for states to follow the core federal mandates of the JJDP Act of 1974.

O'Bryant, JoAnne. Cooper, Edith Fairman. Teasley, David.

Juvenile justice: legislative activity and funding trends for selected programs. 6 p. CRS Report RS20576

OJJDP's (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention) juvenile justice grant programs appear in Titles II and V of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP Act), as amended. For FY2002, OJJDP Act grant programs received a total appropriation of \$291.6 million, over \$10 million higher than the FY2001 total (\$279.8 million) .... In addition, Congress approved \$249.5 million for the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants (JAIBG), administered by OJJDP.

O'Bryant, JoAnne. Teasley, David L. Cooper, Edith Fairman.

Juvenile justice legislation: overview and the legislative debate. 17 p. CRS Report RL30741

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (JJDP Act), as amended, expired on September 30, 1996. The 107<sup>th</sup> Congress considered at least two major juvenile justice measures. The first bill (H.R. 863) focused on punishment, and it appeared to place somewhat less emphasis on "get tough" remedies than earlier bills considered since 1996. The second measure (H.R. 1900) addressed crime prevention initiatives, largely pertaining to the reauthorization of the JJDP Act. These were subsequently incorporated into H.R. 2215, 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act (P.L. 107-273), which was enacted on November 2, 2002.

OJJDP (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention) research 2000: report. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2001. 63 p.

[[http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/report\\_research\\_2000](http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/report_research_2000)] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Partial contents.—New findings: research on very young offenders; program of research on the causes and correlates of delinquency; juvenile transfers to criminal court; juveniles in corrections; youth gang research; diversion from juvenile court: teen/youth courts and restorative justice programs; national statistics on juvenile offenders and victims.—New and emerging research efforts: girls program evaluations and girls study group; research on American Indian and Alaska Native juveniles.—Highlights: evaluations of school-related projects; evaluations of substance abuse programs; pathways to resistance: a prospective study of serious adolescent offenders; working with states and communities to

improve evaluation and information collection efforts. –Conclusion.  
–Appendixes.

Patrick, Diane

Programs that work and promising programs for persons at risk of entering or in the criminal justice system; a report to the Task Force on Mental Illness and Offenders, Subcommittee on Prevention and Intervention. Denver, CO, State of Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, Office of Research and Statistics, 1999. 35 p.

[<http://dcj.state.co.us/ors/pdf/docs/work.pdf>] (as of Jan. 23, 2003.)

“Reviews programs that have promise or positive outcomes for children and adults with mental illness who may be at risk or who are involved with the criminal justice system; the report also presents information on outcomes, costs, and cost-benefit analyses where these were available.”

Pope, Carl E. Lovell, Rick. Hsia, Heidi M.

Disproportionate minority confinement: a review of the research literature from 1989-2001. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2002. 24 p.

[[http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/dmc/pdf/dmc89\\_01.pdf](http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/dmc/pdf/dmc89_01.pdf)] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Concerns about the overrepresentation of minority youth in secure confinement have long been noted, and much research has been devoted to this issue .... The purpose of this Bulletin is to extend the earlier analysis by examining research found in professional academic journals and edited books during the subsequent 12-year period .... The question is simple: What does the existing periodical research now tell us about the processing of minority youth through the juvenile justice system?”

Preventing crime: what works, what doesn't, what's promising: a report to the United States Congress. Prepared for the National Institute of Justice by Lawrence W. Sherman ... [et al.] in collaboration with members of the graduate program, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, University of Maryland. Washington, U.S. Office of Justice Programs, [1997]. 1 v. (various pagings). HV7431.P724 1997

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/works>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Partial contents.–Introduction: the congressional mandate to evaluate, by Lawrence W. Sherman.–Communities and crime prevention, by Lawrence W. Sherman.–Family-based crime prevention, by Lawrence W. Sherman.–School-based crime prevention, by Denise C. Gottfredson.–Labor markets and crime risk factors, by Shawn Bushway and Peter Reuter.–Policing for crime prevention, by Lawrence W. Sherman.–Criminal justice and crime prevention, by Doris Layton MacKenzie.–Conclusions: the effectiveness of local crime prevention funding, by Lawrence W. Sherman.

For a summary of the report under the same title, see

[<http://www.preventingcrime.org/171676.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Promising and innovative programs [Web site]. Washington, U.S. Office of Justice Programs.

[[http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/commprograms/promising\\_programs.htm](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/commprograms/promising_programs.htm)] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Promising and innovative community-based programs for juveniles and adults.

Safe and smart: making after school hours work for kids. Washington, U.S. Dept. of Education and Dept. of Justice, 1998. 93 p.

[<http://www.ed.gov/pubs/SafeandSmart>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The purpose of this report is to present positive research and examples illustrating the potential of quality after-school activities to keep children safe, out of trouble, and learning. Specifically, it presents evidence of success—both empirical and anecdotal—for after-school activities; it identifies key components of high-quality programs and effective program practices; and it showcases exemplary after-school and extended learning models from across the country with promising results in our nation’s efforts to keep children in school and on track.”

SafeFutures: a partnership to reduce youth violence and delinquency [Web site]. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

[<http://www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/safefutures>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) has awarded demonstration grants of approximately \$1.4 million a year for 5 years to each of six communities (four urban, one rural, and one tribal government) to assist with existing efforts to reduce youth violence and delinquency. Boston, MA; Seattle, WA; St. Louis, MO; Contra Costa County, CA; Imperial County, CA; and Fort Belknap, MT, were selected competitively on the basis of substantial progress toward community assessment and strategic planning to address delinquency.”

An 89-page, Nov. 2000 report by the Urban Institute, Comprehensive responses to youth at risk: interim findings from the SafeFutures initiative: summary, is [<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/183841.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“This report describes the lessons learned over the first 3 years of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention’s (OJJDP) SafeFutures initiative, which focuses on preventing and controlling juvenile delinquency and violence based on research on risk and protective factors and experience with promising strategies.”

Santoro, Joseph A.

Monrovia’s anti-truancy ordinance: one giant step toward keeping kids in school and out of trouble. *Police chief*, v. 68, Mar. 2001: 34-39.

“The ordinance allows police officers to issue non-criminal citations to children under 18 found off school grounds between 8:30 a.m. and 1:30 p.m. on school days unless accompanied by an adult. Special exceptions are made for minors traveling to or from work or a medical appointment and for those with written authorization from school. If a truant is found guilty, they are required to pay a fine of \$135 or perform 27 hours of community service work for the school district. If the court determines that the parent or legal guardian is not

exercising proper control and supervision, the court may suggest the parent attend a free 12-hour parenting workshop. Results since the implementation of the ordinance include: reduction in daytime crime; reduction in property crime; increased school attendance; and students held accountable for their actions. Since its implementation, truancy in Monrovia dropped 39 percent and daytime crime dropped 40 percent.”

Schumacher, Michael Allen. Kurz, Gwen A.

The 8% solution: preventing serious, repeat juvenile crime. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications, 2000. 138 p. HV9105.C2S38 2000

Partial contents.—The 8% problem.—Crime at an early age.—Disrupted families.—School failure.—Drug and alcohol abuse.—A case study.—The 8% solution.—Orange County style.—Overcoming barriers.—The future of the 8% solution.

Securing our children’s future: new approaches to juvenile justice and youth violence. Edited by Gary S. Katzmann. Washington, Brookings Institution Press, 2002. 432 p.

Partial contents.—New trends in prosecutors’ approaches to youthful offenders, by Catherine M. Coles and George L. Kelling.—The defense attorney’s perspective on youth violence, by Barbara Fedders, Randy Hertz, and Stephen Weymouth.—Youth violence: response of the judiciary, by David B. Mitchell and Sara E. Kropf.—Reinventing probation and reducing youth violence, by Ronald P. Corbett.—An umbrella of legitimacy: Boston Police Department-ten-point coalition collaboration, by Jenny Berrien and Christopher Winship.—A tale of one city: reflections on the Boston gun project, by David M. Kennedy.—Media violence: effects and potential remedies, by Ronald G. Slaby.—Conclusion: a new framework and agenda, by Gary S. Katzmann.

Sourcebook of treatment programs for sexual offenders. Edited by William Lamont Marshall. New York, Plenum Press, 1998. 483 p. RC560.S47S68 1998

Partial contents.—Children who molest, by Toni Cavanagh Johnson.—Adolescent sexual offender treatment at the SAFE-T Program, by James R. Worling.—Community-based sexual offender treatment for inner-city African-American and Latino youth, by Rotin L. Jones, and others.

Strengthening America’s families: effective family programs for prevention of delinquency [Web site]. Funded by Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

[<http://www.strengtheningfamilies.org>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) in collaboration with the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Service’s Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) is pleased to provide the results of the 1999 search for ‘best practice’ family strengthening programs [click on Model Programs on the right side of the page].”

Teen risk-taking: promising prevention programs and approaches. Washington, Urban Institute, 2000. 102 p.

[[http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/TeenRiskTaking\\_2.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/TeenRiskTaking_2.pdf)] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“This guidebook and program compendium provides an essential first step in bridging the gap from ‘research to practice.’ It explores some of the practical issues associated with finding, choosing, and starting potentially effective prevention programs for at-risk preteens and teens.”

U.S. General Accounting Office.

Juvenile justice: better documentation of discretionary grant monitoring is needed. Washington, G.A.O., 2001. 37 p. (GAO-02-65; Oct. 10, 2001) [<http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/useftp.cgi?IPaddress=162.140.64.21&filename=d0265.pdf&directory=/diskb/wais/data/gao>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) provides block grants and discretionary funding to help states and communities prevent juvenile delinquency and improve their juvenile justice systems. OJJDP has specific program monitoring and documentation requirements for its discretionary grants. These monitoring requirements include having the grant manager make quarterly telephone calls, undertake on- and off-site grant monitoring visits, and review interim and final products. In a review of OJJDP’s most recent award of grants active in fiscal years 1999 and 2000, GAO found that OJJDP’s grant monitoring activities were not consistently documented.

— Juvenile justice: OJJDP (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention) reporting requirements for discretionary and formula grantees and concerns about evaluation studies. Washington, G.A.O., 2001. 96 p. (GAO-02-23; Oct. 30, 2001)

[<http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/useftp.cgi?IPaddress=162.140.64.21&filename=d0223.pdf&directory=/diskb/wais/data/gao>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) has funded various demonstration, replication, research and evaluation, and training and technical assistance programs to prevent and respond to juvenile delinquency and juvenile victimization. GAO’s review of 16 of OJJDP’s major programs found that, although virtually all grantees must report on their progress twice a year, the information they reported varied.”

U.S. Public Health Service. Office of the Surgeon General.

Youth violence: a report of the Surgeon General. Washington, U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services, U.S. Public Health Service, [2001]. 176 p. HQ799.2.V56U56 2001

[<http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/youthviolence/report.html>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Chapter 5, Prevention and Intervention [<http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/youthviolence/chapter5/sec1.html>]

[as of Dec. 6, 2002]), “highlights 27 specific programs that, based on existing data, help prevent youth violence. The most effective of these programs combine components known to prevent violence by themselves, particularly social skills training for youths and interventions that include parents or entire families. Chapter 5 also highlights important limitations in the current research on youth violence prevention. Little is known about the scientific effectiveness of hundreds of programs now being used in U.S. schools and communities ...

The information presented in Chapter 5 shows that youth violence prevention not only works, it can also be cost-effective.”

## II. Aftercare

Altschuler, David. M. Armstrong, Troy L.

Reintegrating high-risk juvenile offenders into communities: experiences and prospects. *Corrections management quarterly*, v. 5, summer 2001: 72-88.

“This article describes the Intensive Aftercare Program model, explores the reasoning and research underlying the specification of required components in its design, illustrates some implementation options, and points to some of the next steps for the IAP initiative.”

Altschuler, David M. Armstrong, Troy L. MacKenzie, Doris Layton.

Reintegration, supervised release, and intensive aftercare. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1999. 23 p.

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/175715.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Authors “describe the IAP [Intensive Aftercare Program] model, distinguish it from other models and programs that have been implemented and assessed with varying degrees of success, and analyze individual intensive aftercare programs. While other aftercare evaluations have not all been experimental in design, the IAP evaluation uses experimental methodology to gauge the success of the four OJJDP-supported projects currently implementing the IAP model.”

Byrnes, Michele. Macallair, Daniel. Shorter, Andrea.

Aftercare as afterthought: reentry and the California Youth Authority.

San Francisco, CA, Center on Juvenile & Criminal Justice, 2002. 53 p.

[<http://www.cjcj.org/pdf/aftercare.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The reentry process for CYA parolees fails to adequately prepare them for an independent, self-sufficient lifestyle outside of a correctional institution. The current system is highly fragmented and relies heavily on CYA parole agents, who despite the best of intentions, face significant obstacles to providing effective services.”

Josi, D. Sechrest, D.

A pragmatic approach to parole aftercare: evaluation of a community reintegration program for high-risk youthful offenders. *Justice quarterly*, v. 16, no. 1, 1999: 51-80.

“‘Lifeskills 95’ is an interactive aftercare treatment program designed to assist chronic, high-risk juvenile offenders, when released from secure confinement, in their initial efforts at community reintegration. The study compared rates of recidivism between those who participated in the program and control groups of offenders released to the California Youth Authority (CYA) on parole in 1995. To measure the differences between participant groups, the study used semi-structured interviews, treatment facilitator and parole agent surveys, and random drug testing .... Although the study could not find significant differences overall between the ‘Lifeskills 95’ parole cohort and

other 1995 CYA parolees, it did find lower recidivism rates for the “Lifeskills’95” participants during the period of program participation.”

Life on the “outs”: examination of the facility-to-community transition of incarcerated youth. *Exceptional children*, v. 69, fall 2002: 7-22.

The authors “summarize the results of the Transition Research on Adjudicated Youth in Community Settings project, a five-year longitudinal study that examined the facility-to-community transition of 531 incarcerated youth from Oregon’s juvenile justice system. The results point to the importance of providing interventions focused toward work and school placements immediately upon youths’ release from the juvenile correctional system and their return to the community.”

Risk factors for juvenile criminal recidivism: the postrelease community adjustment of juvenile offenders. *Criminal justice and behavior*, v. 27, June 2000: 275-291.

“This study focused on the outcomes of juvenile delinquents (N=140) following their conviction, commitment for residential placement, and return to the community on parole. Participants were followed for a period of 1 year postrelease. A random stratified sampling procedure was used to select participants from urban, suburban, and rural sites. Ratings of poor parole adjustment (73%), as well as observed rates of parole violation (73%) and reoffending (40%) across the entire sample reflected a substantial proportion of unfavorable outcomes during follow-up.”

Stephens, Ronald D. Arnette, June Lane.

From the courthouse to the schoolhouse: making successful transitions. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2000. 15 p.

[[http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/jbul2000\\_02\\_1/contents.html](http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/jbul2000_02_1/contents.html)] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Describes effective approaches to reintegrating youth from juvenile justice system settings into the education mainstream and provides information about promising programs, practices, and resources.”

Wiebush, Richard G. McNulty, Betsie. Le, Thao.

Implementation of the intensive community-based aftercare program. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2000. 19 p. HV9104.W483 2000

[[http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/2000\\_7\\_1/contents.html](http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/2000_7_1/contents.html)] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Provides an overview of the IAP model and describes its implementation over the first 3 years by participating sites in Colorado, Nevada, New Jersey, and Virginia.”

### **III. Boot Camps**

MacKenzie, Doris L. Wilson, David V. Kider, Suzanne B.

Effects of correctional boot camps on offending. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, v. 578, Nov. 2001: 126-143.

“The return to criminal activity or recidivism by boot camp participants was the primary area of interest in this study. The effects found ranged from large reductions to large increases in the risk of recidivating for the boot camp participants relative to the comparison groups, ultimately indicating an almost equal recidivism rate for the average boot camp participant. In conclusion, it was reported that, overall, the meta-analysis found evidence of no effect on recidivism between boot camp participants and comparison samples. It was further determined that the results could not be attributed to differences in study methodology, offender characteristics, or boot camp program components.”

Multi-site evaluation of boot camp programs, final report. Oakland, CA, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 2000. 116 p.

“The evaluations show that boot camp programs are not having the impact on offenders or corrections in accordance with expectations. Although many of the programs have been well-administered and popular with public officials, they have not demonstrated a significant impact on recidivism, prison or jail crowding, or costs, which have been the three core goals of boot camps .... This report concludes that the future of boot camps is not promising; however, it is unlikely that they will disappear completely, as long as they offer a setting where low-risk offenders can be exposed to a more intense level of services in a safe correctional environment, while not being overly expensive to operate, regardless of their limited therapeutic and cost benefits.”

A National study comparing the environments of boot camps with traditional facilities for juvenile offenders. Washington, National Institute of Justice, 2001. 11 p.

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/187680.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

This research found that juveniles and staff in the boot camps perceived their environment as more caring than did those living and working in the comparison facilities .... Youths and staff also believed that the treatment of residents was more just in the boot camps.”

Stinchcomb, Jeanne B. Terry, W. Clinton, III.

Predicting the likelihood of rearrest among shock incarceration graduates: moving beyond another nail in the boot camp coffin. *Crime and delinquency*, v. 47, Apr. 2001: 221-242.

“This study of a 90-day, jail-based shock incarceration program adds to the mounting empirical evidence suggesting that boot camps may not be producing desired results. Realistically, however such results are unlikely to extinguish this politically viable sentencing alternative. In exploring variables beyond program participation that might contribute to recidivism, this study found relationships between the likelihood of being rearrested and race, type of release, number of prior felonies, age, and sentencing points (criminal history).”

Zaehring, Brent.

Juvenile boot camps: cost and effectiveness vs. residential facilities. Topeka, KS, KCI (formerly the Koch Crime Institute), 1998. 16 p.

[[http://www.kci.org/PDF's/white\\_papers/juvbootcamps.pdf](http://www.kci.org/PDF's/white_papers/juvbootcamps.pdf)] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).



“Overall, KCI [Koch Crime Institute] researchers have found that boot camps have not been shown to reduce recidivism or deter crime. However, the recidivism rate of boot camps is only slightly higher than that of traditional juvenile facilities.”

## IV. Corrections

Ain't no place anybody would want to be: conditions of confinement for youth; 1999 annual report. Washington, Coalition for Juvenile Justice, 1999. 76 p.

“Our chief focus is to examine commendable and exemplary juvenile correctional facilities, such as the Texas State School at Giddings. There are horror stories that haunt juvenile correctional facilities across the nation, but we are interested in illustrating how once-troubled facilities, such as the Ferris School in Delaware, can revitalize themselves.”

Puritz, Patricia. Scali, Mary Ann.

Beyond the walls: improving conditions of confinement for youth in custody: report. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1998. 1 v. (various pagings).

[<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/pubs/walls/walls/contents.html>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Partial contents.—Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act in juvenile correctional facilities.—Use of ombudsman programs in juvenile corrections.—Educational advocacy for youth with disabilities.—The Administrative Procedure Act in juvenile corrections.—Self-assessment in juvenile corrections.

Robinson, Milton J.

Best practices in juvenile corrections and detention. Reno, NV, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, 2001. 64 p.

“Developed from the proceedings of the Corrections and Detentions Caucuses conducted during the annual National Conference on Juvenile Justice in the years 1995-2000, this manual identifies issues of concern, probes the current practices and identifies the best practices in corrections.” Among the issues addressed are: secure care, overcrowding, sentencing, transfer of jurisdiction, community reintegration, and the results of the 1998 caucus' assessment and environmental analysis of juvenile corrections and detention.

## V. Courts

### A. General

Butts, Jeffrey A. Harrell, Adele V.

Delinquents or criminals: policy options for young offenders. Washington, Urban Institute, 1998. 15 p.

[<http://www.urban.org/crime/delinq.html>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Suggests that the work to design a new youth justice system should start before states actually begin to abolish the legal concept of delinquency. A good starting point would be to identify the best practices of the many specialty courts

now emerging throughout the country, and to begin blending them more thoroughly with the juvenile court process. Innovative, specialty courts such as drug courts, gun courts, and community-based courts are bringing new ideas and effective new programs to the justice system. Some specialty courts actually resemble the traditional juvenile court in their use of pre-trial diversion, individualized assessments and proactive case management.”

Employment and training for court-involved youth: report from the Task Force on Employment and Training for Court-Involved Youth. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2000. 1 v. (various pagings). HV9104.U534 2000

[[http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/ojjdpreport\\_11\\_2000](http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/ojjdpreport_11_2000)] (as of Jan. 22, 2003; scroll down and click on Table of Contents).

Partial contents.—Overview of the juvenile justice system.—Overview of the workforce development system.—Strategies and promising programs for court-involved youth.—Steps for the future.

Kurlychek, Megan. Torbet, Patricia. Bozynski, Melanie.

Focus on accountability: best practices for juvenile court and probation.

Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1999. 11 p.

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/177611.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Describes what it means to hold juvenile offenders accountable, details the roles of the juvenile court and probation department, and identifies the key elements of programs that promote accountability. Presents examples of exemplary community-based initiatives, including diversion programs, mediation and restitution programs, specialized probation supervision programs, and aftercare programs.”

National Youth Court Center [Web site]. Lexington, KY, American Probation and Parole Association.

[<http://www.youthcourt.net/default.htm>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Serves as a central point of contact for youth court programs across the nation. We serve as an information clearinghouse, provide training and technical assistance, and develop resource materials on how to develop and enhance youth court programs in the United States.”

## **B. Diversion**

### **1. General.**

The Community Corrections Partnership: examining the long-term effects of youth participation in an Afrocentric diversion program. *Crime and delinquency*, v. 47, Oct. 2001: 558-572.

“Using Afrocentric techniques has recently emerged as a promising way of delivering services to African Americans. Briefly, a number of authors have argued that African Americans are better served, especially by substance abuse services, when service delivery utilizes Afrocentric techniques. This study reports an evaluation of an Afrocentric treatment program for male, juvenile, felony offenders in one city. The evaluation uses a twogroup, quasi-

experimental design to compare the 281 African American youths in the Afrocentric treatment program (called the Community Corrections Partnership) with a comparison group of 140 probation youths.”

Diverting children from a life of crime: measuring costs and benefits. Santa Monica, CA, RAND, 1998. 69 p. HV7431.D58 1998

[<http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR699>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“This report assesses the cost-effectiveness of several crime-prevention strategies that involve early intervention in the lives of people at risk of pursuing a criminal career. Because this assessment is based on limited data, the results are subject to large uncertainties. However, in comparing the alternatives with each other and with a repeat-offender minimum-sentence incarceration approach, we find differences large enough to identify some promising alternatives for further demonstration and analysis.”

Shelden, Randall G.

Detention Diversion Advocacy: an evaluation. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1999. 15 p.

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/171155.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“This Bulletin offers an overview of diversion programs and evaluation findings from the Detention Diversion Advocacy Project (DDAP), a disposition case advocacy program operated in San Francisco, CA, and sponsored by the Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice.”

Sturgis, Judith E.

Westmoreland County Youth Commissions: a diversionary program based on balanced and restorative justice. *Juvenile and family court journal*, v. 52, summer 2001: 1-10.

“The program aims to reduce caseloads and costs of the juvenile court, while providing youths with a rehabilitation program with close supervision .... The analysis focused on 489 cases for which records were complete and outcomes could be determined .... Overall, 91 percent of the youths completed the program. Findings indicated that this program appeared to be a viable alternative to juvenile court processing.”

## **2. Restorative Justice.**

Balanced and Restorative Justice Project [Web site]. Fort Lauderdale, FL, Florida Atlanta University.

[<http://www.csscwatch.com>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“BARJ is a non-profit restorative justice training program funded by the United States Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and housed at the Community Justice Institute, Florida Atlantic University, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. BARJ provides training, technical assistance, system leadership development, and community support to those interested in implementing restorative justice initiatives in their agencies or local communities.”

Bazemore, Gordon. Umbreit, Mark.

A comparison of four restorative conferencing models. Washington, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2001. 19 p.

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/184738.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Features four models of restorative conferencing: victim-offender mediation; community reparative boards; family group conferencing; and circle sentencing. These models are compared and contrasted in administration, process, community involvement, and other dimensions, and several related issues and concerns are discussed.”

Bilchik, Shay.

Guide for implementing the balanced and restorative justice model: report. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1998. 1 v. (various pagings). HV9104.G849 1998

[<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/pubs/implementing/contents.html>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Presents practical information and tools to enable juvenile justice professionals to implement the BARJ (Balanced and Restorative Justice) philosophy and mission. The information in this document is based on the experience of juvenile justice practitioners in several BARJ Project pilot sites and in other jurisdictions where this new vision for juvenile justice has inspired experimentation and testing of new ideas. The document is a guide only, not a prescription. There is no single “right way” to implement the BARJ Model. Within the general principles and values of restorative justice, implementation may vary based on local resources, traditions, and culture.”

Griffin, Patrick

Establishing balanced and restorative justice in your juvenile court: the judge’s role. NCJJ [National Center for Juvenile Justice]: in FOCUS, v. 1, fall 1999: 1-10.

[<http://www.ncjfcj.unr.edu/homepage/ncjj/ncjj2/pdf/role.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Discusses “the various roles a judge may play in the effort to transform the culture of juvenile court, along with obstacles that must be overcome, ethical quandaries that must be resolved, and routines and attitudes that must be considered in light of the balanced and restorative model.”

O’Brien, Sandra Pavelka.

Restorative juvenile justice in the states: a national assessment of policy development and implementation; summary of survey findings. Fort Lauderdale, FL, Florida Atlantic University, Balanced and Restorative Justice Project, 2000. 10 p.

[<http://www.fau.edu/barj/survey.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Excerpts, from the full length survey of the same title, Restorative juvenile justice in the states: a national assessment of policy development and implementation, Fort Lauderdale, FL, Florida Atlantic University, Community Justice Institute, 2000. 44 p.

Returning justice to the community: the Indianapolis juvenile restorative justice experiment. Indianapolis, IN, Hudson Institute, 2000. 57 p.

[[http://ccp.hudson.org/files/publications/Restoring\\_Justice\\_Report.pdf](http://ccp.hudson.org/files/publications/Restoring_Justice_Report.pdf)] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The current research, coupled with prior studies, suggests that restorative justice conferences do offer promise as a vehicle for dispensing meaningful, community-based justice. One of the basic findings is that conferences can be successfully implemented in an urban, U.S. setting.”

Umbreit, Mark S. Coates, Robert B.

Multicultural implications of restorative juvenile justice. *Federal probation*, v. 63, Dec. 1999: 46-51.

“Restorative Justice practices—particularly various forms of victim, offender, family, or community dialogue—are proving especially useful in juvenile justice settings. Authors Mark S. Umbreit and Robert B. Coates believe the field must become sensitive to differing cross-cultural perspectives. Working with persons of different cultures can be replete with potential dangers and pitfalls. In this article, the authors present pitfalls that may hamper restorative justice efforts carried out within cross-cultural contexts, along with ways of increasing the likelihood of positive interactions when working with persons of differing cultural backgrounds.”

## C. Drug Courts

Cooper, Caroline S.

Juvenile drug court programs. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2001. 16 p.

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/184744.pdf>](as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“This bulletin aims to provide local officials with the perspectives of juvenile justice practitioners and policymakers who have experience with juvenile drug court programs, which are intensive treatment programs that provide specialized services for drug-involved youth and their families.”

Juvenile and family drug courts: an overview. Washington, U.S. Office of Justice Programs, Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project at the American University, 1998. 19 p. KF9794.J87 1998

[<http://www.american.edu/spa/justice/publications/juvoverview.htm>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Updates the 1996 preliminary report and “reflects information provided by juvenile and family drug courts operating in 17 different states as of January 1, 1998, including one tribal court.”

Juvenile & family drug courts: summary of drug court activity by state and county. Washington, U.S. Office of Justice Programs, Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project at the American University, 2002. 29 p.

[<http://www.american.edu/spa/justice/publications/Juvsumchartgamze.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

A statistical summary of drug court activity, as of Nov. 25, 2002.

Looking at a decade of drug courts; revised 1999. Washington, U.S. Office of Justice Programs, Drug Courts Programs Office, Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project at the American University, 1999. 17 p.  
 [http://www.american.edu/academic.depts/spa/justice/publications/decade1.htm] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Presents “the background of the drug court ‘movement’, the major areas in which drug courts differ from traditional adjudication processes, and salient accomplishments to date.”

## D. Indigent Defense

Indigent defense: fielded programs—tried & true to innovative pilots [Web site]. Washington, U.S. Office of Justice Programs.  
 [http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/indigentdefense/field\_tested\_programs.htm] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Puritz, Patricia. Shang, Wendy Wan Long.

Innovative approaches to juvenile indigent defense. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1998. 7 p.

[http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/171151.pdf] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“High quality defender-based programs that deliver first-rate legal services to juveniles usually have one or more of the following characteristics: ability to limit or control caseloads; support for entering cases early and the flexibility to represent, or refer, clients in related collateral matters ... comprehensive initial and ongoing training and available resource materials; adequate nonlawyer support and resources; hands-on supervision of attorneys; and work environments that value and nurture juvenile court practice.” Includes “a collection of several innovative projects with summaries and evaluations from Roxbury, MA, Washington State, New York, NY, Washington, DC, Cooks County, IL, and Maryland.”

Selling justice short: juvenile indigent defense in Texas; a report by the Texas Appleseed Fair Defense Project on Indigent Defense Practices in Texas—Juvenile Chapter. Austin, TX, Texas Appleseed Fair Defense Project, 2000. 48 p.

[http://www.appleseeds.net/tx/TX\_Appleseed\_Juvenile\_Report\_102400.pdf] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Currently, an indigent child facing charges in a Texas juvenile court has little chance of receiving meaningful representation. Many attorneys are not performing the most basic functions commonly recognized as essential to effective representation. Attorneys routinely fail to have meaningful client interviews, conduct pre-trial investigations, conduct witness interviews, file pre-trial motions, request mental health and education reviews or prepare for trial and disposition. Texas juvenile courts have become ‘plea mills’ with attorneys serving as facilitators rather than advocates.”

## E. Teen Courts

Butts, Jeffrey A. Buck, Janeen. Coggeshall, Mark.

The impact of teen court on young offenders. Washington, Urban Institute, 2002. 48 p.

[<http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410457.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“This is the first report of findings from the Evaluation of Teen Courts (ETC) Project, which was conducted by the Urban Institute and funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The ETC Project studied teen courts in four States: Alaska, Arizona, Maryland, and Missouri. Researchers measured pre-court attitudes and post-court recidivism among more than 500 juveniles referred to teen court for non-violent offenses, such as shoplifting and vandalism. The study compared recidivism outcomes for teen court defendants with outcomes for youth handled by the regular juvenile justice system.”

Godwin, Tracy M. Steinhart, David J. Fulton, Betsy A.

Peer justice and youth empowerment: an implementation guide for teen court programs. Washington, American Probation and Parole Association, 1998.

289 p. KF9779.G63 1998

[<http://www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/PUBS/peerhome.htm>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Provides “program organizers with baseline information on developing, implementing, and enhancing teen court programs within their jurisdictions. Rather than endorsing one particular model of teen court, this manual provides program organizers with a general overview of issues to consider and guides them through a decision-making process for the implementation of a teen court program that fits local needs. Sample forms and other helpful resources also are included as supplementary materials.”

Heward, Michelle E.

The organization and operation of teen courts in the United States: a comparative analysis of legislation. *Juvenile & family court journal*, v. 53, winter 2002: 19-35.

“Programs vary significantly between, and even within, states, making regulation cumbersome. Heward examines teen court legislation from every state, analyzes each, and draws conclusions about teen courts from a legislative perspective.”

Sentence completion and recidivism among juveniles referred to teen courts. *Crime & delinquency*, v. 45, Oct. 1999: 467-480.

“Study focuses on sentence completion and recidivism of juveniles referred to teen courts for disposition by their peers as an alternative to judicial sentencing. More than 70 percent of the referrals completed their sentences, and just less than a third recidivated over a 1-year follow-up. In multivariate models, sentence completion was significantly less likely among persons sentenced to community service, and recidivism was significantly higher among juveniles with prior records and those who were sentenced to curfews.”

## F. Transfers to Criminal Court

Juveniles facing criminal sanctions: three states that changed the rules. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2000. 48 p. KF9820.Z95J88 2000

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/181203.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Partial contents.–Executive summary.–Wisconsin’s case study.–New Mexico’s case study.–Minnesota’s case study.–Lessons learned.

Myers, David L.

Excluding violent youths from juvenile court: the effectiveness of legislative waiver. New York, NY, LFB Scholarly Publishing, 2001. 229 p. KF9812.M97 2001

“Legislative waiver laws excluding youths from juvenile court have been expanded in a growing number of jurisdictions. By examining data from 1994 on 557 violent juvenile offenders, Myers sought to determine the effectiveness of one such policy targeting violent youths in Pennsylvania. Of these 557 youths, 138 were judicially waived. Findings suggest that, compared to offenders retained in juvenile court, those sent to adult court were more likely to be released from secure custody prior to final disposition of their cases. Of the released offenders, waived juveniles exhibited greater recidivism during the pre-dispositional time period than did those facing juvenile court. Despite the subsequent imposition of more certain and severe sanctions in adult court, transferred offenders again displayed greater recidivism during the post-dispositional follow-up period.”

Snyder, Howard N. Sickmund, Melissa. Poe-Yamagata, Eileen.

Juvenile transfers to criminal court in the 1990's: lessons learned from four studies. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2000. 52 p. HV9064.S69 2000

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/181301.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Findings from the project’s four transfer studies can be summarized as follows: juvenile court judges largely concur with prosecutors as to which juveniles should be transferred to criminal court ... transfer decision criteria are consistent with common interpretations of law ... waiver decisions adjust to changing practice ... the system adapts to large changes in structure ... and comparisons between waived and nonwaived juveniles must be made carefully.”

## VI. Curfews

Bannister, Andra J. Carter, David L. Schafer, Joseph.

National police survey on the use of juvenile curfews. *Journal of criminal justice*, v. 29, May-June 2001: 233-240.

“Little is known about the extent and application of curfew ordinances in American communities. This study attempted to explore the utility and perceived effectiveness of curfew ordinances .... Initial data was reported from a national survey of police agencies to determine the extent of curfew use and its perceived effects. Study findings revealed that most jurisdictions with



curfews had them in place for several years. In the majority of cases, curfew was seen as an effective tool to control vandalism, graffiti, nighttime burglary, and auto theft. Jurisdictions that did not have curfews reported its non-existence as a result of political reasons, regardless of police support. The effects of curfews on crime rates and other measures still remains unclear.”

Davidson, Margaret.

Do you know where your children are? Reason, v. 31, Nov. 1999: 38-41.

“Youth curfews are a bad idea whose time has come.”

Males, Mike. Macallair, Dan.

The impact of juvenile curfew laws in California. San Francisco, CA, Justice Policy Institute, 1999. 11 p.

[<http://www.cjcj.org/pubs/curfew/curfew.html>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Through an analysis of official data, this research compared the relative crime rates of jurisdictions with strict curfew enforcement and jurisdictions with less curfew enforcement. In addition, the study examined the effects of curfew enforcement on specific types of crime and the impact of curfew enforcement on juvenile crime rates relative to adults. The current available data provides no basis to the belief that curfew laws are an effective way for communities to prevent youth crime and keep young people safe. On virtually every measure, no discernable effect on juvenile crime was observed. In fact, in many jurisdictions serious juvenile crime increased at the very time officials were toting the crime reduction effects of strict curfew enforcement.”

Privor, Brian.

Dusk ‘til dawn: children’s rights and the effectiveness of juvenile curfew ordinances. Boston University law review, v. 79, Apr. 1999: 415-492.

This article explores two distinct yet interrelated questions regarding juvenile curfew. First, do curfew laws violate the constitutional rights of minors who come within their purview? Second, do curfews truly decrease the rate of crime involving juveniles?

## VII. Drugs

Best practices for comprehensive tobacco control programs – August, 1999. Atlanta, GA, U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health, 1999. 87 p.

[[http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/research\\_data/stat\\_nat\\_data/bestprac-dwnld.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/tobacco/research_data/stat_nat_data/bestprac-dwnld.htm)] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“This document draws upon “best practices” determined by evidence-based analyses of comprehensive State tobacco control programs. Evidence supporting the programmatic recommendations in this guidance document are of two types. Recommendations for chronic disease programs to reduce the burden of tobacco-related diseases, school programs, cessation programs, enforcement, and counter-marketing program elements are based primarily upon published evidence-based practices. Other program categories rely mainly upon the evidence of the efficacy of the large-scale and sustained efforts of two States

(California and Massachusetts) that have been funding comprehensive tobacco prevention and control programs using State tobacco excise taxes.”

Breaking the juvenile drug-crime cycle: a guide for practitioners and policymakers. Washington, National Institute of Justice, 2001. 21 p.

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/186156.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Summarizes existing knowledge about efforts to intervene in the drug-crime cycle and proposes promising interventions and programmatic changes that will successfully address that cycle. A key approach to interrupting the juvenile drug-crime cycle is an integrated case management strategy that coordinates the diverse needs of juveniles from entry into the juvenile justice system until they no longer require services. The most promising models combined both a strengths-based and an assertive, proactive approach by juvenile case managers.”

Enforcing the underage drinking laws program: a compendium of resources, Mar. 2001 [Web site]. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/compendium/2001/contents.html>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Describes programs and lists contacts and source materials to help jurisdictions maximize the effectiveness of the Enforcing the Underage Drinking Laws Program. In addition to listing Federal, State, national and private resources, the Compendium provides contact information for substance abuse agencies in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands.”

Haapanen, Rudy. Britton, Lee.

Drug testing for youthful offenders on parole: an experimental evaluation. *Criminology & public policy*, v. 1, Mar. 2002: 217-244.

Authors “examined parole outcomes and arrests for 1,958 California Youth Authority parolees, randomly assigned to levels of routine drug testing ranging from “no testing” to two tests per month. Results showed no improved outcomes from more frequent drug testing; however, early positive drug tests indicated increased risk of recidivism.”

National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign [Web site]. Washington, U.S. Office of National Drug Control Strategy.

[<http://www.mediacampaign.org>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Using a variety of media, the campaign reaches parents and youth through public service announcements, school-based education materials, Web sites, and brochures. The campaign’s Web site contains an ad gallery that provides links to TV, radio, print, and downloadable Internet banner ads. The site also contains news, publications, and additional related resources.”

The fifth (November 2002) semi-annual evaluation of the Media Campaign is [<http://www.mediacampaign.org/publications/westat5/toc.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

An ounce of prevention, a pound of uncertainty: the cost-effectiveness of school-based drug prevention programs. Santa Monica, CA, Rand, 1999. 194 p. HV5824.Y68094 1994

[<http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR923>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The authors focus on school-based drug prevention programs that have proven effective in formal evaluations. Effectiveness at reducing cocaine consumption is inferred from effectiveness at reducing marijuana initiation, and spillover effects on those not participating in the program are accounted for. The authors conclude that prevention can reduce lifetime cocaine consumption by 2 to 11 percent.”

Partners for Substance Abuse Prevention [Web site]. Sponsored by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

[<http://www.samhsa.gov/preventionpartners/default.asp>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The mission of Partners is to decrease substance use and abuse by bringing effective prevention to every community. To further this mission, the Partners website is a virtual meeting place for all organizations that want to become involved in the substance abuse prevention effort or want to enhance or expand their current substance abuse prevention activities. Substance abuse prevention includes preventing the use of illegal drugs, the abuse of legal drugs or other products (e.g. glue sniffing), underage drinking, and underage tobacco use.”

Promising strategies to reduce substance abuse. Washington, U.S. Office of Justice Programs, 2000. 83 p. HV4999.2.P76 2000

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojp/183152.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Provides communities with information on what approaches are effectively reducing substance abuse and related problems nationwide and is intended to assist them in determining how strategies and programs can address their specific needs.” Includes discussion of strategies to reduce substance abuse by juveniles.

Provision of drug treatment services in the juvenile justice system: a system reform. Journal of behavioral health services and research, v. 27, May 2000: 194-214.

“Proposes a systemic reform of the organizational structure and delivery of substance abuse services for adolescents within the juvenile justice system. It first discusses the impact of substance use on the juvenile justice system and then reviews which drug treatment programs and services are currently available. Following an evaluation of the most effective drug treatment programs and modalities, recommendations for system reform are given.”

Regulatory strategies for preventing youth access to alcohol: best practices.

Bethesda, Md., Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 1999. 60 p.

[<http://www.udetc.org/documents/accesslaws.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Offers guidance for shaping and implementing laws and regulations to restrict the availability of alcohol to youth.”

Rosenbaum, Dennis P. Hanson, Gordon S.

Assessing the effects of school-based drug education: a six year multilevel analysis of Project D.A.R.E. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, v. 35, Nov. 1998: 381-403.

[<http://www.druglibrary.org/schaffer/library/uic.htm>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“A randomized longitudinal field experiment was conducted to estimate the short- and long-term effects of the Drug Abuse Resistance Education program (D.A.R.E.) on students’ attitudes, beliefs, social skills, and drug use behaviors. Students from urban, suburban, and rural schools (N = 1,798) were followed for more than six years, with surveys administered each year from 6th through 12th grades .... The results indicate that D.A.R.E. had no long-term effects on a wide range of drug use measures, nor did it show a lasting impact on hypothesized mediating variables, with one exception. Previously documented short-term effects had dissipated by the conclusion of the study.”

Strategies for success: combating juvenile DUI. Washington, Police Executive Research Forum, 1999. 126 p. HE5620.D72S77 1999

[<http://www.nhtsa.dot.gov/people/injury/alcohol/juveniledui/toc.html>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Part I, ‘Building Programs That Work,’ presents overall strategy and individual steps that the police chief or other local justice official can use to lead the implementation of those components that will work best in the local community. Part II, ‘The Eight Foundation Elements of a Successful DUI (Driving Under the Influence) Strategy,’ presents the building blocks of the comprehensive Juvenile DUI Enforcement Program . . . . Included are short descriptions of innovative programs designed to prevent juveniles from driving under the influence of alcohol or other drugs. Part III, ‘Support Tools for Building Programs That Work,’ contains policies, procedures, press releases, and other information the executive can use to facilitate the process of implementing the eight foundation elements.”

What you need to know about drug testing in schools. Washington, U.S. Office of National Drug Control Policy, 2002. 17 p.

[[http://www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov/pdf/drug\\_testing.pdf](http://www.whitehousedrugpolicy.gov/pdf/drug_testing.pdf)] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Explains, generally, what drug testing is all about, who pays for it, who does the testing, what it tells you about an individual’s drug use, and, equally important, what it does not tell you. The booklet describes what services should be in place for communities to deal effectively with students who test positive for drugs, and it also offers case histories . . . . showing how several schools used testing to address their drug problems.”

## VIII. Gangs

Adolescent gangs: old issues, new approaches. Edited by Curtis Branch. Philadelphia, Brunner/Mazel, 1999. 230 p. HV6439.U5A35 1999

“This edited text is intended to contribute to the very sparse literature on clinical interventions with gang-affiliated adolescents. Specifically, it is designed to provide theory and practice-based experiences as a blueprint for

others to follow in their attempts to find interventions, exclusive of law enforcement approaches, which have been shown to have promise in helping troubled young people who find themselves in gangs.”

Evaluating criminal justice programs designed to reduce crime by targeting repeat gang offenders. *Evaluation and program planning*, v. 23, Feb. 2000: 115-124.

“Used a theory-driven approach to evaluate a gang crime reduction program over 7 years. Data for 237 repeat juvenile offenders admitted to the program indicate a strong relationship between incarceration and gang crime trends and an overall reduction of 47% in gang crime. Discusses implications of the approach for program evaluation.”

Fritsch, Eric J. Caeti, Tory J. Taylor, Robert W.

Gang suppression through saturation patrol, aggressive curfew, and truancy enforcement: a quasi-experimental test of the Dallas anti-gang initiative.

*Crime & delinquency*, v. 45, Jan. 1999: 122-139.

“In 1996, the Dallas Police Department began an anti-gang initiative that was designed to reduce gang violence .... The findings indicated that aggressive curfew and truancy enforcement led to significant reductions in gang violence, whereas simple saturation patrol did not.”

Howell, James C.

Youth gang programs and strategies. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2000. 79 p. HV6439.U5H68 2000

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/171154.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“This Summary outlines programs and strategies that have been and are being used to break the lure and appeal of gangs and reduce gang crime and violence. Evaluations and national assessments of some of these programs are discussed, and an overview of what practitioners and administrators need to know before designing and implementing any gang program or strategy is provided. Although several gang programs have been evaluated, only a few programs are presented here.”

National Youth Gang Center [Web site]. Tallahassee, FL, Institute for Intergovernmental Research.

[<http://www.iir.com/nygc/default.htm>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The purpose of the NYGC is to expand and maintain the body of critical knowledge about youth gangs and effective responses to them. The Center assists state and local jurisdictions in the collection, analysis, and exchange of information on gang-related demographics, legislation, literature, research, and promising program strategies, and coordinates activities of the OJJDP Youth Gang Consortium—a group of federal agencies, gang program representatives, and other service providers. It also provides technical assistance to two OJJDP Programs: Rural Gang Initiative and Gang-Free Schools and Communities Initiative.”

Responding to gangs: evaluation and research. Edited by Winifred L. Reed and Scott H. Decker. Washington, U.S. Office of Justice Programs, 2002. 327 p. V6439.U5R47 2002

Partial contents.—A decade of gang research: findings of the National Institute of Justice gang portfolio.—Youth gang homicides in the United States in the 1990s.—National evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) program.—Evaluating Nevada’s antigang legislation and gang prosecution units.—Evaluation of a task force approach to gangs.—Gang prevention programs for female adolescents: an evaluation.—Reducing gang violence in Boston.—Developing a GIS-based regional gang incident tracking system.

## IX. Girls

Chesney-Lind, M.

Challenging girls’ invisibility in juvenile court. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, v. 564, July 1999: 185-202.

“Despite the fact that girls account for one of four arrests of juveniles, discussions of delinquency and juvenile justice generally ignore young women and their problems. A review of the nature of female delinquency as well as the juvenile justice system’s long-documented bias against girls suggests that careful consideration of girls’ issues would shed considerable light on the shortcomings of the juvenile justice system as a whole.”

Guiding principles for promising female programming: an inventory of best practices. Greene, Peters, & Associates, in collaboration with the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1998. 94 p.

[<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/pubs/principles/contents.html>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“This monograph outlines the promising practices in programming for girls who are already involved in the juvenile justice system or those who are at risk of delinquency. Its purposes are to: provide a comprehensive review of the most relevant theoretical and research studies focusing on the gender-specific needs of at-risk adolescent girls; delineate the risk and protective factors affecting at-risk adolescent girls who may become juvenile delinquents; and present effective gender-specific programming strategies for girls, both within the juvenile justice system and in community settings.”

Juvenile female offenders: a status of the states report. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1998. 121 p.

[<http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/pubs/gender/contents.html>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Describes State efforts to develop and implement programs and policies to address at-risk girls and juvenile female offenders. The strategies presented in this report include developing gender-specific programs for girls, providing training for juvenile personnel who work with adolescent females, and focusing on the prevention of delinquent behavior in girls through the establishment of front-end, community-based services.”

Moving toward justice for female juvenile offenders in the new millennium: modeling gender-specific policies and programs. *Journal of contemporary criminal justice*, v. 18, Feb. 2002: 37-56.

“Presents an overview of national and state efforts to address gender-specific programming and summarizes findings from a statewide assessment in California in 1997 and 1998. Review of the literature and results of data analyses of a cross-sectional survey of program providers and agency representatives, along with information from focus group interviews with program participants and providers, show that the needs of girls and young women in the juvenile justice system are tied to specific, identifiable risk and protective factors, from which it is possible to model gender-appropriate interventions. The results indicate that the family is the most important risk and protective factor for young women.”

Zweig, Janine M. Van Ness, Asheley.

The national study of Girl Neighborhood Power. Washington, Urban Institute, 2002. 65 p.

[[http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410373\\_GNP-Study.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410373_GNP-Study.pdf)] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Girl Neighborhood Power (GNP) is an out-of-school positive youth development program for girls ages 9 to 14. The current study used both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies to examine the types of activities offered through GNP and how GNP assists girls in living healthy lives. The program assists girls living in low-income neighborhoods by providing adult supports, positive peer interaction, and exposure to community service, career building, and knowledge they would not otherwise have. The program seems to have positively influenced girls’ psychological and social adjustment.”

## X. Guns

Bridges, Dennis.

Campus gun violence: strategies for prevention and reaction. Police chief, v. 66, Oct. 1999: 100, 102-104, 107.

“The issue of gun violence on school campuses can be separated into four areas: prevention, physical safeguards, planned response and rational discussion.”

Fighting juvenile gun violence. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2000. 11 p. HV9104.F48 2000

[[http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/2000\\_9\\_3/contents.html](http://www.ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/2000_9_3/contents.html)] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention established the Partnerships To Reduce Juvenile Gun Violence Program, which seeks to increase the effectiveness of existing strategies by enhancing and coordinating prevention, intervention, and suppression efforts and strengthening community linkages. This Bulletin describes the program’s implementation at four demonstration sites in Baton Rouge and Shreveport, LA; Oakland, CA; and Syracuse, NY.”

Lizotte, Alan. Sheppard, David.

Gun use by male juveniles: research and prevention. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2001. 11 p.

[[http://ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/jjbul2001\\_7\\_2/contents.html](http://ncjrs.org/html/ojjdp/jjbul2001_7_2/contents.html)] (as of

Jan. 22, 2003).

Draws “on data from OJJDP’s Rochester Youth Development Study to examine patterns of gun ownership and gun carrying among adolescents. The Bulletin also addresses the interrelationship between gangs and guns. Efforts to reduce the illegal carrying of guns by youth and juvenile gun violence are described, in particular the Boston Gun Initiative, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services’ Youth Firearms Violence Initiative, and OJJDP’s Partnerships To Reduce Juvenile Gun Violence Program.”

Sheppard, David. Bilchik, Shay.

Promising strategies to reduce gun violence: report. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1999. 253 p. HV7436.S54 1999

[[http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/pubs/gun\\_violence/contents.html](http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/pubs/gun_violence/contents.html)] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Includes a blueprint for communities to develop their own comprehensive, strategic violence reduction plan and a wealth of practical information on demonstrated and promising gun violence reduction strategies and programs .... To develop this Report, the U.S. Department of Justice first identified more than 400 gun violence programs from around the country by soliciting input from a wide variety of sources .... The preliminary survey allowed the Department to classify each candidate program according to its level of development and to select 89 programs for further study .... The second-phase review yielded the 60 individual programs and comprehensive strategies included in this Report, each of which was designated as ‘promising’ or ‘demonstrated’; the 10 most promising programs and strategies were also identified.”

Sheppard, David. Kelly, Patricia.

Juvenile gun courts: promoting accountability and providing treatment. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2002. 11 p.

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/187078.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“This Bulletin is part of OJJDP’s Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants (JAIBG) Best Practices Series . . . . The purpose of this Bulletin is twofold: share with local officials the experiences and perspectives of juvenile justice policymakers and practitioners who have been involved with juvenile gun court programs during the past several years to facilitate the development of constructive, well-conceived programs; and provide an indepth look at the Jefferson County (AL) Juvenile Gun Court—one effective gun court program.”

Youth, guns, and the juvenile justice system. Washington, Urban Institute, 2002. 30 p.

[[http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410417\\_youth\\_guns.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410417_youth_guns.pdf)](as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The falling rate of violent crime in the United States is not likely to reduce the need for effective policies and programs to address youth gun violence. The rate of firearm deaths among American youth is still one of the highest in the world. In the coming years, all levels of government, the private sector, and communities will require sound information and practical guidance as they try to reduce gun violence among young people. Funded by the Joyce Foundation,



this report reviews recent trends in youth gun violence, policy responses to gun violence, and the growing variety of data resources for research on the effects of gun laws.”

## XI. School Violence

CMHS (Center for Mental Health Services) Enhancing Resilience Initiative [Web site]. Rockville, MD, U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, The Center for Mental Health Services (CMHS).

[<http://www.mentalhealth.org/schoolviolence/initiative.asp>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The intent of the CMHS Enhancing Resilience Initiative is to fund programs that coordinate families, schools, and communities into a partnership to promote the development of healthy behaviors, competence, and resilience in school-aged children and youth in order to decrease the level of violence in schools.”

Includes the following components: EXHIBIT I: The Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence (CSPV) model and promising programs, [<http://www.mentalhealth.org/schoolviolence/exhibit1.asp>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003); EXHIBIT II: Evidence-based programs that foster resilience, [<http://www.mentalhealth.org/schoolviolence/exhibit2.asp>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003); EXHIBIT III: Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, exemplary, model and promising programs to strengthen families, [<http://www.mentalhealth.org/schoolviolence/exhibit3.asp>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003); and Examples of exemplary/promising programs (Feb. 26, 1999), [<http://www.mentalhealth.org/schoolviolence/Irenelis.asp>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Derzon, James H. Wilson, Sandra Jo. Cunningham, Carole A.

The effectiveness of school-based interventions for preventing and reducing violence; 1999 final report. Nashville, TN, Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies, Center for Evaluation Research and Methodology, 1999.

182 p.

[<http://hamfish.org/pub/arss99sd.pdf>](as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Since early May of 1998, the Center for Evaluation Research and Methodology at the Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies has been compiling and examining the literature on school-based interventions for preventing and reducing violence. The quality and nature of the evidence for the effectiveness of these programs can be summarized along two separate tracts. The first tract reflects the evidence from experimental and quasi-experimental designed studies that allow strong inferences for the interpretation of treatment effects . . . These studies provide the greatest warrant for claims of effectiveness and these studies provide the basis of the body of this report. . . . There is a second level of evidence that we have included in the program summaries presented in Appendix A, but that do not appear in the body of this report.”

Effective [school] violence prevention programs, 2001 [Web site]. Washington, George Washington University, Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence.

[<http://www.hamfish.org/resources/record/11>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“This document presents examples of prevention programs that work—programs that are well designed, have demonstrated effectiveness, and can be implemented as part of a comprehensive school safety plan . . . . While several of the most effective programs are broad in scope, the programs should be viewed as components of a comprehensive school safety plan rather than standalone strategies for reducing school violence. It is important to remember that safe schools are the product of careful planning and attention to physical, social, and cultural environments. A critical component of increasing school safety is choosing programs that can be readily integrated with others to effectively address local needs.”

Exemplary mental health programs: school psychologists as mental health providers (third edition, 2002). Bethesda, MD, National Association of School Psychologists, 2002. 266 p.

[<http://www.naspcenter.org/exemplary.html>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Surveyed school psychologists across the country to locate the most effective school-based mental health programs. The programs were selected on the basis of several criteria including: integrating theory, research and practice; providing a continuum of mental health services; outcomes data; and showing a team-based approach to mental health programming . . . . The programs address a range of critical issues facing schools today including developing social skills, substance abuse prevention, violence prevention, and crisis intervention.”

Federal activities addressing violence in schools [Web site]. Atlanta, GA, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

[<http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/dash/violence/index.htm>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“Many federal agencies actively address the problem of violence in schools by acquiring and disseminating information about school violence and supporting strategies that work to reduce violence. The following inventory of federal activities addressing violence in schools was created through the collaborative effort of many federal agencies and offices. It is designed to facilitate the coordination of federal school violence prevention activities and enhance collaboration on future projects . . . . This inventory will be updated on a semi-annual basis.”

The Final report and findings of the safe school initiative: implications for the prevention of school attacks in the United States. Washington, U.S. Secret Service and U.S. Dept. of Education, 2002. 50 p.

[<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/preventingattacksreport.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

The final report “details how our two agencies studied school-based attacks and what we found. Some of the findings may surprise you. It is clear that there is no simple explanation as to why these attacks have occurred. Nor is there a simple solution to stop this problem. But the findings of the Safe School

Initiative do suggest that some future attacks may be preventable, if those responsible for safety in schools know what questions to ask and where to uncover information that may help with efforts to intervene before a school attack can occur.”

Gottfredson, Denise. Gottfredson, Gary.

Quality of school-based prevention programs: results from a national survey. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency*, v. 39, Feb. 2002: 3-35.

“A national probability sample of 3,691 school-based prevention activities operating in the spring of 1998 is used to describe the quality of implementation of typical school based prevention practices, compare the quality of implementation of prevention practice with what is typical in prevention research, and test hypotheses about predictors of the quality of implementation. Results indicate that the quality of school-based prevention practices as they are implemented in the typical school is low.”

Green, Mary W.

The appropriate and effective use of security technologies in U.S. schools: a guide for schools and law enforcement agencies. Washington, National Institute of Justice, 1999. 129 p. LB3013.3.G74 1999

“This guide should help schools, in concert with their law enforcement partners, analyze their vulnerability to violence, theft, and vandalism, and suggest possible technologies to address these problems in an effective manner. This guide describes existing commercially available technologies and urges thoughtful consideration of not only the potential safety benefits that may accrue from their use but also the costs that schools may incur for capital investments, site modifications, additional staffing, training, and equipment maintenance and repair.”

Koch, Kathy.

School violence. CQ researcher. Oct. 9, 1998: 881-904.

Addresses the following questions: “Would tighter gun control reduce school violence? Should youths who commit adult crimes be tried as adults?”

National School Safety Center [Web site]. Westlake Village, CA, National School Safety Center.

[<http://www.nssc1.org>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The National School Safety Center was created by presidential directive in 1984 to meet the growing need for additional training and preparation in the area of school crime and violence prevention. NSSC is a nonprofit organization whose charge is to promote safe schools - free of crime and violence - and to help ensure quality education for all America’s children. NSSC’s mandate is to focus national attention on cooperative solutions to problems which disrupt the educational process. Special emphasis is placed on efforts to rid schools of crime, violence and drugs, and on programs to improve student discipline, attendance, achievement and school climate. NSSC provides technical assistance, legal and legislative aid, and publications and films.”

Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools (OSDFS) [Web site]. Washington, U.S. Dept. of Education.

[<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/index.html>](as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The Federal Government’s primary vehicle for reducing drug, alcohol, and tobacco use and violence in our Nation’s schools.”

Safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools expert panel [Web site]. Washington, U.S. Dept. of Education, Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program.

[[http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/expert\\_panel/drug-free.html](http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/expert_panel/drug-free.html)] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The purpose of the Panel is to oversee a process for identifying and designating as promising and exemplary school-based programs that promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools. . . . The Expert Panel initiative is a way of enhancing prevention programming by making schools aware of alternative programs that have proven their effectiveness when judged against rigorous criteria.” Includes links to the nine exemplary and thirty-three promising programs identified by the Panel.

## **XII. Evaluating Programs**

Bureau of Justice Assistance evaluation Web site. Washington, Bureau of Justice Assistance.

[<http://www.bja.evaluationwebsite.org>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“The Evaluation Web site is designed to provide State Administrative Agency staff, criminal justice planners, researchers and evaluators, as well as local practitioners with a variety of resources for evaluating criminal justice programs. This Web site is maintained by the Justice Research and Statistics Association.”

Juvenile accountability incentive block grants: strategic planning guide: summary. Washington, U.S. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1999. 51 p. HV9104.J82 1999

[<http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/95081.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

The guide “is intended to serve as a planning tool, providing a conceptual framework to analyze juvenile justice system needs and determine the most effective use of JAIBG funds. The Guide shows how results-based decisionmaking can be applied in the JAIBG program to identify desired results, create and track indicators of progress toward achieving those results, and assess program performance so that adjustments can be made that will improve the delivery of programs and services in the juvenile justice system.”

Juvenile justice evaluation center online [Web site]. Washington, Justice Research and Statistics Association.

[<http://www.jrsa.org/jjec/index.html>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

This extensive site works “with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to improve the evaluation of juvenile justice programs in the States through the JJEC project. The goal of the Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center is to provide training, technical assistance and other resources to States to enhance their evaluation capacity.”

Measuring violence-related attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors among youths: a compendium of assessment tools. Compiled and edited by Linda L. Dahlberg, Susan B. Toal, and Christopher B. Behrens. Atlanta, GA, Division of Violence Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1998. 267 p. HQ779.2.V56U56 2001

[<http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/measure.htm>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“This compendium provides researchers and prevention specialists with a set of tools to evaluate programs to prevent youth violence .... Although this compendium contains more than 100 measures, it is not an exhaustive listing of available measures .... Most of the measures in this compendium are intended for use with youths between 11 and 20 years.”

Mertinko, Elizabeth. Novotney, Lawrence C. Baker, Tara Kelley. Lang, James. Evaluating your program: a beginner’s self-evaluating workbook for mentoring programs. [United States], Information Technology International and [Calverton, MD], Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 2000. 1 v. (various pagings).

[[http://www.itiincorporated.com/sew\\_dl.htm](http://www.itiincorporated.com/sew_dl.htm)] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

“To support projects in conducting local evaluations, OJJDP has asked the staff members of Information Technology International (ITI) and the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (PIRE) to prepare [this workbook]. This publication was prepared as part of our work on the national evaluation of the Juvenile Mentoring Program (JUMP) and will assist you in planning your local evaluation, gathering and assessing data and disseminating your evaluation results.”

Michel, Nancy.

Juvenile justice program evaluation: an overview. Washington, Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center, 2001. 11 p.

[<http://www.jrsa.org/jjec/about/publications/program-evaluation.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Contents.–Introduction.–Step 1: Define the problem.–Step 2: Implement research-based programming.–Step 3: Create a program logic.–Step 4: Develop measures.–Step 5: Collect and analyze data.–Step 6: Report findings.–Step 7: Reassess program logic.–Summary.

Rowe, Wendy. Trahan, Meredith.

Strategies for evaluating small juvenile justice programs. Washington, Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center, 2001. 15 p.

[<http://www.jrsa.org/jjec/about/publications/strategies.pdf>] (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Contents.–Introduction.–What are the goals of evaluation in a small program?–What program planning activities are necessary?–What are effective strategies for collections, analyzing, and reporting data efficiently?–How can funding agencies facilitate the evaluation of small juvenile justice programs?–Summary.

The Seven steps to building a successful prevention program [Web site]. Adapted by the Southeast CAPT (Center for the Application of Prevention Technologies)

from the Web site of the Western Center for the Application of Prevention Technologies.

[<http://www.secapt.org/science.html> (as of Jan. 22, 2003).

Contents.–Step 1: Community readiness.–Step 2: Needs assessment.–Step 3: Prioritizing.–Step 4: Resource assessment.–Step 5: Targeting efforts.–Step 6: Best practices.–Step 7: Evaluation.

Winokur, Kristin Parsons. Tollet, Ted. Jackson, Sherry.

What works in juvenile justice outcome measurement: a comparison of predicted success to observed performance. *Federal probation*, v. 66, Sept. 2002: 50-56.

Authors “discuss their roles in the development of “Program Accountability Measures (PAM) analysis, which is an outcome-based model that has been used to evaluate juvenile day treatment and commitment programs in Florida.”