

COUNTY YOUTH SERVICES COMMISSION

PLANNING

Hudson County

Instructions

This section will allow you to describe to the public your county's planning process regarding identifying the needs of youth in your county. Your answers to each of the following questions should describe your county's planning *process*, **not the results/outcome** of the planning process. Answer all questions using this form.

Planning Process

1. Briefly describe your county's YSC planning process for determining funding decisions. Include the work of the CYSC, its subcommittees and other collaborations. Also include any key factors like trends or funding levels that may have impacted the YSC's thoughts and conversations around youth services in the county.

Funding for the Youth Services Commission is informed by the planning subcommittee. The planning subcommittee held nine (9) planning meetings to date this year on March 16, 2023, April 5, 2023, May 10, 2023, June 7, 2023, August 9, 2023, August 29, 2023 and September 9, 2022.

2. How does the CYSC stay informed of best practices or evidence-based programming for serving youth? Does the CYSC mandate that funded programs implement best practice and or evidence-based programming? Please describe CYSC efforts to ensure funded programs follow best practices or evidence-based programming, if applicable.

The Youth Services Administrator attends conferences and receives information from OJJDP, the Annie E. Casey Foundation and juvenile justice advocacy organizations on a regular basis and shares this information with providers and the YSC to ensure an awareness of best practices and evidence-based programming. The YSC administrator also shares the CSOC CIACC training schedule to give providers an opportunity to attend free training on best practices and children's mental health. Guest speakers at YSC meetings also address these topics. Providers are also given an opportunity to share best practices with one another during provider meetings. Many of the organizations that the Hudson County YSC funds are grassroots organizations that provide programming based on immediate need of unique neighborhoods in the community and therefore do not closely adhere to a prescribed evidence-based model. However, providers do ascribe to, and embrace, best practices related to youth services, including trauma-informed care and social and emotional learning, the promotion of resiliency and protective factors and positive youth development.

- As a JDAI site, list topics and discussion points that were shared between the Youth Services Commission and the County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement and any activities that helped to facilitate the completion of this Comprehensive Plan.

A JDAI report is given at every Youth Services Commission meeting. Commission members are provided the opportunity to comment and ask questions. JDAI has had a direct impact on the County YSC planning process. The JDAI committee works in conjunction with the YSC in developing programs and services that will reduce the detention population length of stay by implementing effective alternatives. JDAI and YSC have collaborated to create and/or enhance our detention alternatives such as the Evening Reporting Center. Through the combined efforts of JDAI and YSC, Guazabara Insights Inc has developed an career exploration and employment program funded by the Innovations grant which provides job training, employment opportunities and incentives for juveniles involved with the Family Court System. The collaboration between JDAI and YSC has resulted in important feedback about services needed that have been incorporated into this plan. .

- Describe efforts made by the YSC to seek additional funding to supplement the funding received through the JJC. Complete the below chart to show what funding the YSC has reviewed as a potential funding opportunity.

Date	Grantor and Name	Eligible	Applied	Approved or Denied	Comments
<i>6/1/2019</i>	<i>OVC FY 2019 Enhancing Community Responses to the Opioid Crisis: Serving Our Youngest Crime Victims</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>County did not apply but forwarded to YSC membership</i>
10/1/22 - 9/30/25	2022 United States Department of Justice STOP School Violence Program	Yes	Yes	Approved	Program provides training, technical assistance and programming targeted at reducing student and community violence and improving mental health outcomes through social and emotional learning (SEL)-based curriculum. Programming is available to all YSC providers.
1/1/23- 10/31/26	Federal American Rescue Plan	Yes	n/a	n/a	Hudson County DHHS has used American Rescue Plan funding to meet the needs of at risk youth impacted by the pandemic through services including respite, mental health and counseling, support

					groups, tutoring, mentoring, arts and recreational activities.
August 2021 - ongoing	Credible Messenger Program	NA	NA	Approved	The Department of Health and Human Services requested funding from the County Administration to implement the Credible Messenger program through a contact with Guazabara Insights to provide transformative mentoring to young people with extensive justice involvement.
February 2022	Community Detention Liaison	NA	NA	Approved	The Department of Health and Human Services requesting funding from County Administration to hire a community detention liaison to meet with youth in juvenile detention centers on a weekly basis to ensure their safety and health and to gain feedback on their experiences. The Liaison also enhances communication between the Juvenile Detention Centers and organizations serving youth in detention.

Community Participation

The work of the Youth Services Commission impacts youth, families, and communities. It is therefore critical that the Youth Service Commission’s planning include participation by and input from youth, families, and the community.

1. Describe what the county has done or will do to increase public awareness about the Youth Services Commission. For example, describe any materials that have been distributed through marketing or advertising campaigns or any “community forums” or “open houses” that have been held to educate the community about the YSCs purpose and role. Indicate when these activities occurred and/or when they will occur.

The County and YSC Administrator has raised public awareness of YSC through monthly participation in a number of community meetings including Hudson County CIACC, HSAC, LACADA, and CASS. In addition, the YSC Administrator provides a monthly update on YSC at CIACC meetings. The YSC Administrator has also presented to the Hudson County Youth Leadership Council on the role of the YSC. On January 18, 2022, the Hudson County YSC and CIACC held a forum on community violence and gained feedback from participants regarding community needs and services to address gun violence. The YSC Administrator and other Division of Children and Youth Services staff have participated in a number of community events to share information about YSC and YSC-funded providers to families and young people.

2. Describe what the county has done or will do to increase participation on the YSC by youth, families, and the community, including people impacted by the youth legal system. Such efforts might include, for example, researching the best times and locations for public attendance and adjusting meetings accordingly; publicizing the meetings in a way that is more accessible to the community (beyond posting on county’s website and in county buildings); having YSC committee members serve as liaisons to community groups so they can report back to the YSC; and creating subcommittees on youth, families and/or community engagement that include representatives from each of these groups and that meet at a time convenient to these members.

The County is currently reviewing options to increase participation on the YSC by youth, families and the community. Experience from similar groups in the County (CIACC) has highlighted the difficulty for youth and families to attend meetings during the day and the availability/willingness of providers to attend meetings after 5 pm. Currently, there are two members that represent the community within Hudson County. YSC committee members from Hudson Partnership CMO are able to report out from a family and community perspective given the nature of their work and community involvement. Puertorriagueros Asociados for Community Organization (PACO) is another community-based member of YSC that represents a community perspective.. Meeting information is shared through community listservs and through the CIACC mailing list of 300 members that include families, advocates, and community based organizations.

3. Describe how the county has or will ensure youth, families, and community members, including people impacted by the youth legal system participate in the development of the YSC’s comprehensive plan.

In past planning years, the YSC Administrator has worked closely with providers to ensure that the voices and perspectives of youth and families are captured during the planning process through surveys, focus groups and individual interviews and these practices will continue. The YSC Administrator will work closely with the Hudson County Community Detention Liaison to capture the concerns and perspectives of Hudson County youth in detention. The Hudson County Credible Messengers program will also be utilized to reach out to families and youth to capture their feedback. In addition, the YSC will hold a number of community focus groups to elicit recommendations and experiences to inform the plan.

4. Describe youth, family, and community membership on the current YSC, including people impacted by the youth legal system. If there are no members who fit this category or if membership is limited, what steps will be taken to increase their membership?

Community membership includes representation from the Puertorriegenos Asociados for Community Organization (PACO). The YSC Administrator will continue to work with providers, Hudson Partnership CMO, Hudson County Family Partners Family Support Organization, the Community Detention Liaison and the community to identify youth and families for YSC membership.

5. Additional Comments:

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

- When answering questions regarding trends, describe *whether* any change has occurred, the *direction* of any change (e.g., increase, decrease), and the *size* of any change (e.g., small, moderate, large).
- When answering questions regarding rank orders, draw comparisons between categories (e.g., using terms like least/smallest, most/largest).

DEMOGRAPHICS

YOUTH POPULATION

For Questions 1-3, use Tables 1 through 3 (County Youth Population).

1. Using the data in Table 1 (Total County Youth Population, under 18, by Gender) between 2018 and 2020, describe how the male, female and total youth population has changed between 2018 and 2020. For each category, describe whether a change has occurred, the direction of the change and the size of the change.

In 2020 the total youth population of Hudson County was 154,910, a decrease of 1.2% from the 2018 total of 156,25. In 2018, the youth female population was 76,493 which decreased to 75,682 in 2020. Similarly, the youth male population decreased from 80,246 in 2018 to 79,228 in 2020.

2. Using the data in Table 2 (Total County Youth Population, under 18, by Race 2018-2020). Describe youth population by race in 2018 and in 2020 for each category. Then, rank the categories for each year, beginning with the group that has the highest percent change. Describe the rank order by drawing comparisons between the categories. Describe trends by indicating whether any change has occurred, the direction of any change and the size of any change.

The White youth population in 2018 was 100,581 and 98,809 in 2020. The Black youth population in 2018 was 30,281 and 30,016 in 2020. The youth population described as "other" was 25,877 in 2018 and 26,085 in 2020.

For 2018 and 2020 the ranking of the population by race is as follows:

- 1) White (-1.8% decrease in population)
- 2) Black (-0.9% decrease in population)
- 3) Other (0.8% increase in population)

3. Using the data in Table 3 (Total County Youth Population, under 18, by Ethnicity 2018-2020). Describe youth population by ethnicity 2018 and in 2020 for each category. Then, rank the categories for each year, beginning with the group that has the highest percent change. Describe the rank order by drawing comparisons between the categories. Describe

trends by indicating whether any change has occurred, the direction of any change and the size of any change.

The Hispanic youth population in 2018 was 78,394 and 76,845 in 2020. The non-Hispanic youth population in 2018 was 78,345 and 78,065 in 2020.

For 2018 and 2020 the ranking of the population by ethnicity is as follows:

- 1) Hispanic (-2.0% decrease in population)
- 2) Non-Hispanic (-0.4% decrease in population)

4. Using the information in Questions 1, 2 and 3, what does this information tell you about the nature of your county's overall youth population by gender, race, and ethnicity in 2020? How has the population changed since 2018?

The data indicates that there has been a 1.2% decrease in the overall youth population under the age of 18 years old. It also shows that numbers in the categories of gender, race and ethnicity have declined since 2018 except for the race category "other" which has increased by 0.8% from 2018 to 2020.

NATURE & EXTENT OF DELINQUENCY

JUVENILE ARRESTS

For Questions 5-7, use Table 7 (County Juvenile Arrests by Offense Category).

5. Using Table 4, (County Juvenile Arrests by Offense Category, 2018, 2019 and 2020), describe changes in delinquency arrest categories and in total juvenile arrests by highlighting findings regarding the number of juvenile arrests for each category, the percent of all juvenile arrests for each category, the rate per 1,000 youth for each category, and the trends in percent change for each category in 2018 and in 2020.

Juvenile arrests for violent offenses in 2018 numbered 162 and 87 in 2020; violent offenses arrests accounted for 15.4% of all juvenile arrests in 2018 and 13.0% in 2020. The rate per 1,000 youth for violent offense arrests was 1.03 in 2018 and 0.6 in 2020. The overall percentage change for juvenile arrests for violent offenses between 2018 and 2020 is -46.3%.

The juvenile arrest numbers for weapons offenses in 2018 were 46 and 34 in 2020; weapons offense arrests accounted for 4.4% of all juvenile arrests in 2018 and 5.1% in 2020, The rate per 1,000 youth for weapons offense arrests was 0.3 in 2018 and 0.2 in 2020, The overall percentage change for juvenile arrests for weapons offenses between 2018 and 2020 is -26.1%.

There were 245 juvenile arrests for property offenses in 2018 and 141 in 2020; property offense arrests accounted for 23.3% of all juvenile arrests in 2018 and 21.1% in 2020, The rate per 1,000 youth for property offense arrests was 1.6 in 2018 and 0.9 in 2020. The overall percentage change for juvenile arrest for property offenses between 2018 and 2020 is -42.4%.

The juvenile arrest for drug/alcohol offenses in 2018 was 157 and 181 in 2020; drug/alcohol offense arrests accounted for 14.9% of all juvenile arrest in 2018 and 27.1% in 2020; the rate per 1,000 youth for drug/alcohol offense arrests was 1.0 in 2018 and 1.2 in 2020. The overall percentage change of juvenile arrests for drug/alcohol offenses between 2018 and 2020 is 15.3%.

The juvenile arrest number for special needs offenses in 2018 was 10 and 24 in 2020; special needs offense arrests accounted for 0.9% of all juvenile arrests in 2018 and 3.6% in 2020. The rate per 1,000 youth for special needs offense arrests was 0.1 in 2018 and 0.2 in 2020. The overall percentage change for juvenile arrests for special needs offenses between 2018 and 2020 is 140.0%.

The juvenile arrest number for public order and status offenses in 2018 was 258 and 99 in 2020; public order and status offenses arrest accounted for 24.5% of all juvenile arrest in 2018 and 14.8% in 2020. The rate per 1,000 youth for public order and status offenses arrest was 1.6 in 2018 and 0.6 in 2020. The overall percentage change for juvenile arrests for public order and status offenses between 2018 and 2020 is -61.6%.

The juvenile arrest for all other offenses in 2018 was 175 and 101 in 2020; all other offenses arrest accounted for 16.6% of all juvenile arrest in 2018 and 15.1% in 2020; the rate per 1,000 youth for all other offenses arrest was 1.1 in 2018 and 0.7 in 2020; the overall percentage of change for juvenile arrest for all other offenses between 2018 and 2020 is -42.3%.

The total for juvenile arrests in 2018 was 1,053 and 667 in 2020; the rate per 1,000 youth for all juvenile arrest was 6.7 in 2018 and 4.3 in 2020. The overall percentage change for all juvenile arrests between 2018 and 2020 is -36.7%.

6. Using the 2020 data from Table 4 (County Juvenile Arrests by Offense Category, 2018, 2019 and 2020), rank the offense categories from the highest number to the lowest number. Describe how the categories are ranked and draw comparisons between the categories.

The 2020 ranking of highest to lowest number of arrests for offense categories is as follows:

- 1) Drug/Alcohol Offenses (181 juvenile arrests)
- 2) Property Offenses (141 juvenile arrests)
- 3) All other Offenses (101 juvenile arrests)
- 4) Public Order & Status Offenses (99 juvenile arrests)
- 5) Violent Offenses (87 juvenile arrests)
- 6) Weapons Offenses (34 juvenile arrests)
- 7) Special Needs Offenses (24 juvenile arrests)

7. Using the % Change in the Number of Arrests column from 2018-2020 column from Table 4 (County Juvenile Arrests by Offense Category, 2018, 2019 and 2020), rank the juvenile arrest offense categories beginning with the highest percent change between 2018 and 2020. Describe the rank order by making comparisons between the categories.

The 2020 ranking of highest to lowest percentage of change for offense categories is as follows:

- 1) Special Needs Offenses (140.0% increase)
- 2) Public Order & Status Offenses (61.6% decrease)
- 3) Violent Offenses (46.3% decrease)
- 4) Property Offenses (42.4% decrease)
- 5) All Other Offenses (42.3% decrease)
- 6) Weapons Offenses (26.1% decrease)
- 7) Drug/Alcohol Offenses (15.3% increase)

8. Using the information in Questions 5, 6 and 7, what does this information tell you about extent of your county's overall juvenile arrests in 2020? How has the nature of juvenile arrests changed since 2018?

Overall juvenile arrests in Hudson County decreased by 36.7% between 2018 and 2020. There has been a drastic uptick in Special Needs Offenses which increased by 140.0% and an increase in Drug/Alcohol Offenses which rose

by 15.3%. Every other category of offense decreased between 2018 and 2020 with Violent Offenses and Weapons Offenses decreasing by 46.3% and 26.1% respectively.

DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONTACT

For Questions 9-14, use Tables 5 and 6 (Juvenile Arrest and Youth Population Compared to Juvenile Arrests).

9. Using Table 5 (Total County Youth Population Compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race, 2018 & 2020), describe the youth population by race, juvenile arrests by race and the percent of the youth population arrested by race in 2020. Highlight any data that shows disproportionate contact.

The White youth population was 98,809 in 2020. The Black youth population was 30,016 in 2020. The youth population described as "other" was 26,085 in 2020.

The number of White juvenile arrests in 2020 was 11, representing 0.0% of the youth population arrested. The number of Black juvenile arrests in 2020 was 65, representing 0.2% of the youth population arrested. There were 75 arrests of the youth population described as "other" in 2020, representing 0.3% of the youth population arrested.

The data shows that even though the White youth population represented 63.8% of the total youth population in 2020 (total youth population in 2020: 154,910), the number of White juvenile arrests was drastically lower than both Black and "other" juvenile arrests.

10. Using Table 5 (Total County Youth Population Compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race, 2018 & 2020), compare the youth population, juvenile arrests and the percent of youth population arrested for 2018 and for 2020, describe whether any change has occurred, the direction of any change and the size of any change, highlighting any data that shows disproportionate minority contact.

The White youth population in 2018 was 100,581 and 98,809 in 2020. The Black youth population in 2018 was 30,281 and 30,016 in 2020. The youth population described as "other" was 25,877 in 2018 and 26,085 in 2020.

The number of White juvenile arrests in 2018 was 50 representing 0.0% of the youth population and in 2020 there were 11 arrests representing 0.0% of the youth population. The number of Black juvenile arrests in 2018 was 12 representing 0.0% of the youth population while in 2020 there were 65 arrests representing 0.2% of the youth population. The youth population described as "other" had 45 arrests in 2018 representing 0.2% of the youth population while there were 75 arrests in 2020 representing 0.3% of the youth population.

There was an overall decrease of 1.8% in the White youth population and 78% decrease in arrests between 2018 and 2020. There was an overall decrease of 0.9% in the Black youth population but a 441.7% increase in arrests between 2018 and 2020. There was an overall increase of 0.8% in the youth population described as "other" with a 66.7% increase in arrests between 2018 and 2020.

Table 5 clearly shows that within three years there was a 441.7% increase in total arrests among the Black youth population which reflects a direct connection to disproportionate minority contact when compared to the White and Hispanic youth.

11. Using Table 5 (Total County Youth Population Compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race, 2018-2020), compare the percent change 2018-2020 in youth population and in juvenile arrests for

each category, highlighting any data that shows disproportionate minority contact. Then, rank the top three categories of juvenile arrest by race for 2018 and 2020 by percent change, beginning with the largest percent change. Draw comparisons between the categories.

The White youth population had a 1.8% decrease in population and a 78.0% decrease in juvenile arrests between 2018-2020. The Black youth population had a 0.9% decrease in population and a 441.7% increase in juvenile arrests between 2018-2020. The youth population described as "other" had a 0.8% increase in population and a 66.7% increase in juvenile arrests between 2018-2020. All youth populations have had a significant increase in juvenile arrests except for the White youth population which had a large decrease in juvenile arrests between 2018-2020.

2018-2020 ranking of highest to lowest percentage of change in juvenile arrests by race categories is as follows:

- 1) Black Youth Population (441.7% increase)
- 2) Youth Population Described as "Other" (66.7% increase)
- 3) White Youth Population (78.0% decrease)

12. Using Table 6 (Total County Youth Population Compared to Juvenile Arrests by Ethnicity, 2018 & 2020), describe the youth population by ethnicity, juvenile arrests by ethnicity and the percent of the youth population arrested by ethnicity in 2020. Highlight any data that shows disproportionate contact.

The Hispanic youth population was 76,845 in 2020. The non-Hispanic youth population was 78,065 in 2020.

The number of Hispanic juvenile arrests in 2020 was 11 representing 0.0% of the youth population arrested. The number of non-Hispanic juvenile arrests in 2020 was 65 representing 0.1% of the youth population arrested.

The number of Hispanic juvenile arrests is almost six times less than that of non-Hispanic juvenile arrests.

13. Using Table 6 (Total County Youth Population Compared to Juvenile Arrests by Ethnicity, 2018 & 2020), compare the youth population, juvenile arrests and the percent of youth population arrested for 2018 and for 2020, describe whether any change has occurred, the direction of any change and the size of any change, highlighting any data that shows disproportionate minority contact.

The Hispanic youth population in 2018 was 78,394 and 76,845 in 2020. The non-Hispanic youth population in 2018 was 78,345 and 78,065 in 2020.

The number of Hispanic juvenile arrests in 2018 was 100 representing 0.1% of the youth population while in 2020 there were 11 arrests representing 0.0% of the youth population arrested. The number of non-Hispanic juvenile arrests in 2018 was 50 representing 0.1% of the youth population while in 2020 there were 65 arrests representing 0.1% of the youth population

There was an overall decrease of 2.0% in the Hispanic youth population and an 89.0% decrease in arrests between 2018 and 2020. There was an overall decrease of 0.4% in the non-Hispanic youth population but a 30.0% increase in arrests between 2018 and 2020.

Table 6 reflects that within three years the non-Hispanic youth population seen a 30.0% increase in total arrest compared to the 89.0% decrease in total arrest of the Hispanic youth population.

14. Using Table 6 (Total County Youth Population Compared to Juvenile Arrests by Ethnicity, 2018-2020), compare the percent change 2018-2020 in youth population and in juvenile

arrests for each category, highlighting any data that shows disproportionate minority contact. Then, rank the top three categories of juvenile arrest by ethnicity for 2018 and 2022 by percent change, beginning with the largest percent change. Draw comparisons between the categories.

The Hispanic youth population had a 2.0% decrease in population and a 89.0% decrease in juvenile arrests between 2018-2020. The non-Hispanic youth population had a 0.4% decrease in population and a 30.0% increase in juvenile arrests between 2018-2020. The non-Hispanic youth population had a large increase in juvenile arrests while the Hispanic youth population had a significant decrease in juvenile arrests between 2018-2020.

The 2018-2020 ranking of highest to lowest percentage of change in juvenile arrests by ethnicity is as follows:

- 1) Hispanic Youth Population (89.0% decrease)
- 2) Non-Hispanic Youth Population (30.0% increase)

15. Using the information from Questions 9-14, what does this information tell you about the extent of juvenile arrests by race and ethnicity in 2020? How has the nature of juvenile arrests by race and ethnicity changed since 2018?

The data reflects that in 2020 there was a significant rise in the arrests of minorities, especially among the Black youth population. Juvenile arrests have decreased in the areas of violent crimes and weapons offenses and there has been an increase in drug/alcohol and special needs-based offenses since 2018.

VIOLENCE, VANDALISM, WEAPONS, AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE IN COUNTY SCHOOLS

For Questions 16-18, use Table 7 (Violence, Vandalism, Weapons, and Substance Abuse in County Schools).

16. Using Table 7 (Violence, Vandalism and Substance Abuse in County Schools, 2017-2018 and 2021-2022), describe the overall change in total school-based incidents over the academic periods 2019-2020 and 2021-2022.

School-based incidents have decreased by 15.9% overall, dropping from 610 in 2017-2018 to 513 from 2021-2022.

17. Using Table 7 (Violence, Vandalism and Substance Abuse in County Schools, 2017-2018 and 2021-2022), rank school-based incidents in the 2020-2021 academic year, beginning with the category that has the greatest number of incidents. Draw comparisons between the categories.

The 2020-2021 ranking of highest to lowest number of school-based incidents by category is as follows:

- 1) Incidents of Violence (264 total)
- 2) Incidents of Substances (139 total)
- 3) Incidents of Weapons (68 total)
- 4) Incidents of Vandalism (42 total)

18. Using Table 7 (Violence, Vandalism and Substance Abuse in County Schools, 2017-2018 and 2021-2022, Column 6), rank the percent change in school-based incidents, beginning with the category that has the largest percent change. Draw comparisons between the categories.

Ranking of highest to lowest percentage of change in school-based incidents by category is as follows:

- 1) Incidents of Weapons (33.3% increase)
- 2) Incidents of Violence (20.7% decrease)
- 3) Incidents of Substances (20.6% decrease)
- 4) Incidents of Vandalism (17.6% decrease)

19. Using the information in Questions 16-18, what does the information tell you about the extent of your county’s school-based incidents over the academic period 2021-2022? How has the nature of school-based incidents changed since the academic period 2017-2018?

Over the academic period of 2021-2022 incidents of violence and substance use account for about 78.6% of all incidents reported. The overall number of incidents reported has decreased by 15.9% since 2017-2018 with a decrease of incidents in the areas of violence and substances but incidents of weapons have increased by 33.3% over this period.

NATURE & EXTENT OF COMMUNITY FACTORS THAT PUT YOUTH AT RISK

ENROLLMENT IN AND DROPOUTS FROM COUNTY SCHOOLS

For Question 20 use Table 8 (Enrollment in and Dropouts from County Schools)

20. Using Table 8 (Enrollment in and Dropouts from County Schools, 2019-2020 and 2021-2022), describe the Percent Change Over Years (Column K) and describe how enrollment in schools and dropouts has changed between academic periods 2019-2020 and 2021-2022. Draw comparisons between the categories.

There has been an overall decrease of 4.4% in total enrollment between the academic periods of 2019-2020 and 2021-2022, declining from 86,267 to 82,464 enrolled. There has been an overall increase of 72.8% in total dropouts reported between the academic periods of 2019-2020 and 2021-2022 rising from 537 to 928.

COMMUNITY INDICATORS OF CHILDREN AT RISK

- **For Questions 21 & 22, use Table 9 (Community Indicators of Children At Risk).**

21. Using Table 9 (Community Indicators of Children at Risk, 2018-2022), rank the community indicators of children at risk for the most recent year available, 2020,2021, or 2022 from largest of change to smallest. Draw comparisons between the categories.

Ranking of community indicators of children at risk from highest to lowest percentage of change is as follows:

- 1) Child abuse/neglect substantiations (52% decrease from 2018 - 2021; 291 in 2018 and 139 in 2021)
- 2) Children Receiving TANF (Welfare) - (11% increase from 2018 - 2022; 2,680 in 2018 and 2,985 in 2022)
- 3) Births to adolescents (ages 10-19) - (7% decrease from 2018 - 2020; 241 in 2018 and 224 in 2020)
- 4) Children receiving NJ SNAP (formerly food stamps) - (3% increase from 2018 - 2022; 42,258 in 2018 and 43,429 in 2022)

22. Using information from your county's Municipal Alliance Plan, describe the overall risk and protective factors for each domain. How was this information used in your planning process?

The latest Municipal Alliance Plan data identified the most prevalent overall risks as favorable attitudes, community norms and low perception of risk for the alcohol and marijuana domains (the only domains for which data was available). Note that the risks for marijuana are particularly exacerbated by the legalization of recreational marijuana in the State of New Jersey and the impact and implications it may have on the community. Protective factors identified included taxes, laws and educational outreach. The most recent survey conducted by the Hudson County Behavioral Health and Addictions Services Office among high school youth and substance use treatment providers in Hudson County highlighted several areas that remain a concern of Hudson County: increase in the use of vaping and e-cigarettes, lack of education on substance use abuse and its effects and relaxed attitudes towards marijuana use. Prevention providers noted during their focus group their belief that schools are not always equipped with adequate support and resources to fully tackle substance use concerns. The YSC Planning process considered and addressed the risk and significant impact of marijuana legalization by incorporating targeted substance use education and prevention activities in prevention programming for the next three years.

23. Using the information in Questions 20-22, what does the information tell you about the extent community factors that put children at risk? How has the nature of community factors that put children at risk changed over time?

The data indicates that a large portion of the children at risk suffer from food insecurity and poverty, as TANF and SNAP rates have increased over the time-period. The number of children at risk has decreased by 52% in the area of child abuse/neglect which reflects the category with the largest percentage of change over time.

Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need – Delinquency Prevention Programs

Was additional data used in your county's planning process? (If other data was used submit a copy of the data in Chapter 11.

24. What does any other available data tell you about how your County's overall need for prevention programs has changed in recent years and which offense categories and which indicators of youth at risk seem reasonable to address through your county's prevention programs/services? Are there additional data that relates to Disproportionate Minority Contact and or racial and ethnic disparities? How does this additional data further inform your county's delinquency prevention plan?

Both key informant interviews and focus groups identified the need for more extracurricular programs for young people. One participant summarized the group consensus of one focus group by stating the "lack of activities for youth results in delinquency". Another factor identified through focus groups and interviews is the need for positive role models and reinforcement for good behaviors. Prevention programming that provides positive youth development activities and positive mentoring can help further delinquency prevention in Hudson County.

IMPLICATIONS FOR DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

25. Review the data and the answers to questions 4,8,15,19, 23 and 24. Based on the totality of this information, what are the County Youth Services Commission’s program or strategy recommendations for the county prevention plan? Recommendations and strategies should align with addressing problems and county trends, particularly through lens of race and ethnicity. What recommendations is the County Youth Services Commission making to improve the county’s policies or practices related to delinquency prevention, particularly through the lens of race? What recommendations or strategies is the County Youth Services Commission making to ensure similar outcomes for similarly situated youth? List recommendations and priorities below.

PJ*	What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
A	School-based incidents attributed to violence, substance use, weapons and vandalism	<p>“Table 7 (Violence, Vandalism and Substance Abuse in County Schools)”</p> <p>2020-2021 ranking of highest to lowest number of school-based incidents by category is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Incidents of Violence (264 total) 2) Incidents of Substances (139 total) 3) Incidents of Weapons (68 total) 4) Incidents of Vandalism (42 total) 	<p>Prevention programs targeting youth in the community which focus on cultural-empowerment and the development of key social emotional competencies such as self-awareness. In addition, violence prevention programs will help to address increases in arrests.</p>
B	Address increase in Black juvenile arrest	<p>Table 5 (Total County Youth Population Compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race, 2018 & 2020),</p> <p>The data shows that even though the White youth population represented 63.8% of the total youth population in 2020, (total youth population in 2020: 154,910) the number of White juvenile</p>	<p>Provide services to empower children and youth with age-appropriate essential life skills and prosocial activities, while concentrating programs and services in communities most at-risk and in need of services, which are predominately Black and Hispanic neighborhoods.</p>

		arrest was drastically lower than both Black and "other" juvenile arrest.	
C	Address lack of prosocial activities and opportunities for positive youth development	Chapter 11: Through key informant interviews, one particular finding stated "lack of activities for youth result in delinquency". This statement indicates the need for additional prevention services for young people in Hudson County. Another factor is the need for positive role models and reinforcement for good behaviors. Through prevention programming, providing activities and positive mentoring can address delinquency prevention. In addition, through Key Informant Interviews and Planning Subcommittee meeting discussions were conducted as a component of the Comprehensive Plan and indicated there is a significant need for care, services and programming for many young people returning from residential, detention or a secure facility.	Provide pro-social activities and mentors to increase positive youth development and promote self-sufficiency to prevent youth from engaging in the justice system or recidivism.
D			
E			
F			
G			

*Plan Justification (PJ): Use this letter to identify the funded program or service to address this recommendation.

Comments:

DIVERSION ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

- When answering questions regarding trends, describe *whether* any change has occurred, the *direction* of any change (e.g., increase, decrease), and the *size* of any change (e.g., small, moderate, large).
- When answering questions regarding rank orders, draw comparisons between categories (e.g., using terms like least/smallest, most/largest).

NATURE & EXTENT OF DIVERTED CASES

LAW ENFORCEMENT STATION HOUSE ADJUSTMENTS: Data collected by each county for 2018-2022, or the most recent year that is available.

Data Regarding the Nature and Extent of Diverted Cases – Law Enforcement Diversion

1. Describe the data used to understand the nature and extent of the use of diversion in your county. Submit a copy of the data in Chapter 11.
The County uses data provided by the Division of Criminal Justice, available on the New Jersey Attorney General’s website, to understand the nature and extent of the use of diversion in Hudson County. In addition, 2021 Stationhouse Adjustment quarterly reports for Hudson County were compiled to assist in this analysis. Note that this was the most recent year for which this information was available.
2. Describe the use of stationhouse adjustments by police in 2018 and in 2022 or in the most recent year.
In 2021, there were 393 total stationhouse adjustments reported throughout Hudson County.
3. Describe the use of stationhouse adjustments by race/ethnicity in 2018 and in 2022, or the most recent year, for each category. Then, calculate the percent change between 2018 and 2022 overall and by category. Rank the categories, beginning with the group that has the highest percent change. Describe the overall change in the use of stationhouse adjustments and the rank order by drawing comparisons between the categories.

The rank of stationhouse adjustments by race/ethnicity in 2021 is as follows:

Hispanic – 218
Caucasian – 97
Black – 54
Asian – 8
Other – 2

In 2021, Hispanic youth received the most stationhouse adjustments and youth categorized as “Other” (American Indian, Unknown) received the least stationhouse adjustments throughout Hudson County.

4. Using the answers to Questions 1-3, what are the most significant findings about your county's overall use of stationhouse adjustments and the use of stationhouse adjustments by race, and by ethnicity in 2022, or the most recent year? How has the use of diversion changed overall and through the lens of race/ethnicity since 2018?

In 2021 (the most recent year for which data was provided), the following municipalities used stationhouse adjustment. Note that the list below is ordered by the number of stationhouse adjustment cases used by each municipality during 2021 ranging from highest usage to lowest.

Bayonne – 113
 West New York – 104
 Kearny – 69
 Secaucus – 49
 Jersey City – 14
 Harrison – 13
 Union City – 11
 Hoboken – 6
 Weehawken – 5
 East Newark – 2
 Guttenberg – 1

It appears that stationhouse adjustments were underutilized by a number of municipalities. The significant number of Hispanic young people in the stationhouse adjustment program can be attributed to municipalities in the Northern Hudson area (particularly West New York as well as Union City, Weehawken and Guttenberg) utilizing stationhouse adjustment more frequently, as this area is predominately Hispanic.

FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION UNITS

➤ For Questions 5-6, use Table 1 (FCIU Caseload by Category).

5. Using the data in Table 1, describe the FCIU Caseload overall and by category in 2018 and in 2022. Rank the caseloads from largest to smallest for 2022.

Rank	Categories	Number	% of Total Caseload
1	Serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile	2,684	95.7%
2	Other	66	2.4%
3	Serious threat to the well-being/physical	31	1.1%

	safety of juvenile		
4	Unauthorized absence by a juvenile for more than 24 hours	11	0.4%
5	Truancy	7	0.2%
6	Disorderly/Petty Disorderly Persons offense diverted to FCIU	5	0.2%

6. Using the data in Table 1, (Columns H & I), rank the categories, beginning with the category that has the highest percent change. Describe the total percent change and the rank order by indicating whether any change has occurred, the direction of any change and the size of any change.

Rank	Categories	Change in Number overall	% Change in Number of Cases 2018-2022
1	Serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile	1,548	136.3%
2	Serious threat to the well-being/physical safety of juvenile	294	-90.5%
3	Truancy	40	-85.1%
4	Other	189	-74.1%
5	Disorderly/Petty Disorderly Persons offense diverted to FCIU	4	40%
6	Unauthorized absence by a juvenile for more than 24 hours	2	-15.4%

The category of “serious conflict between parent/guardian” received the highest-ranking percent change in the number of cases during 2018-2022. In 2018 there were 1,136 reported cases of conflict between parent/guardian. In 2022 the number jumped to 2,684 cases with a percent change of 136%.

7. Using the answers to Questions 5-6, what are the most significant findings related to your county’s overall FCIU caseload in 2022? What are the most significant findings about how the FCIU caseload has changed between 2018 and 2022?

The most significant finding related to the FCIU caseload is the increase of cases involving serious conflicts between parent/guardians and juveniles in 2022. Another notable observation is the decrease in reported truancy cases and the decline in serious threats to the well-being/physical safety of juveniles from 2018 and 2022 in FCIU caseload categories.

➤ **For Questions 8-9, use Table 2 (FCIU Petitions Filed by Petition Type, 2018, 2021, 2022).**

8. Using the data in Table 2, describe the FCIU Petitions Filed by Petition Type overall and by category in 2018 and in 2022. Rank and discuss the caseloads from largest to smallest for 2022.

As is demonstrated below, the number of caseloads filed by petition type has significantly decreased since 2018, resulting in a -87.5% change.

2018 – 24 overall caseloads
 2021 – 8 overall caseloads
 2022 – 3 overall caseloads

9. Using the data in Table 2, Percent Change in Petitions Filed 2018-2022, describe the change in total petitions filed, and rank the categories beginning with the category with the largest percent change. Draw comparisons between the categories.

Out-of-home petitions from 2018 to 2022 declined 100% from 4 to 0 respectively. Juveniles/Family Crisis petition filings decreased 85% from 20 petitions in 2018 to 3 petitions in year 2022. Juvenile/Family Crisis petitions were used exclusively in 2022 (100%). There were no out-of-home placement petitions filed in 2022. In 2018, Juvenile Crisis petition filings comprised 83.3% of the total petitions filed (24). Out of home represented 16.7% of filings in 2018.

10. Using the answers to Questions 8-9, what are the most significant findings related to your county’s overall FCIU filed petitions and FCIU petitions filed by category in 2022? What are the most significant findings about how the FCIU petitions filed has changed since

2018?

There has been a significant decrease in petition types filed from 2018 to 2022. In 2018 there were 24 petitions filed and in 2022 only 3 overall petition types were filed.

➤ **For Questions 11-12, use Table 3a (FCIU Referrals by Referral Type).**

11. Using the data in Table 3a, describe FCIU Referrals by Referral Type overall and by category in 2018 and in 2022. Rank and discuss the referral types from largest to smallest for 2022.

Referrals made to other outside agencies – 94

Referrals made to DCP&P– 12

Referrals made to substance abuse program – 6

Referrals significantly decreased from 2018 to 2022. In 2018 there were a total of 894 overall referrals and in 2022 the total number of referrals was 112. Referrals to FCIU made by DCP&P increased from 1.7% of total referrals in 2018 to 10.7% of all referrals in 2022. Referrals from substance use programs also increased, from 1.7% of total referrals in 2018 to 5.4% in 2022.

12. Using the data in Table 3a, Percent Change in the Number of Referrals Filed 2018-2022, describe the change in total referrals and rank the categories by referral type beginning with the category that has the largest percent change. Draw comparisons between the categories.

Please see below for a list of referral types and the percentage change between 2018 to 2022:

Referrals made to other outside agencies - 89.1%

Referrals made to substance abuse program – 60%

Referrals made to DCP&P – 20%

The percentage change in number of referral types reflects the significant decrease in overall referral numbers from 2018 (894 total) to 2022 (112 total). Referrals to outside agencies declined from 864 in 2018 to 94 in 2022. Referrals to substance use programs decreased from 15 in 2018 to 6 in 2022. DCP&P referrals dropped from 15 in 2018 to 12 in 2022.

13. Using the answers to Questions 11-12, what are the most significant findings related to your county's overall FCIU referrals and FCIU referrals by referral type in 2022? What are the most significant findings about how FCIU referrals and FCIU referrals by referral type have changed since 2018?

FCIU referrals significantly decreased from 2018 to 2022. In 2018 there were a total of 894 overall referrals and in 2022 the total number of referrals was 112. When looking at type of referral by percentage of the total number of referrals for each year, referrals to DCP&P and Substance Use Programs increased from 2018 to 2022. Referrals to DCP&P increased by 9% (from 1.7% to 10.7%) and referrals to substance use programs increased by 3.7% (from 1.7% to 5.4%).

FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION/MOBILE RESPONSE MERGED UNITS data collected by each county using a merged unit for 2018-2022 or the most recent year available.

Data regarding the nature and extent of merged FCIU/Mobile Response Cases

14. Describe the data used to understand the nature and extent of the use of the merged FCIU/mobile response team in your county. Submit a copy of the data in Chapter 11.
Hudson County does not use a merged FCIU/mobile response unit.
15. Describe the FCIU/mobile response caseload in 2018 and in 2022, or in the most recent year.
Hudson County does not use a merged FCIU/mobile response unit.
16. Describe the use of FCIU/mobile response by race/ethnicity in 2018 and in 2022, or the most recent year, for each category. Then, calculate the percent change between 2018 and 2022 overall and by category. Rank the categories, beginning with the group that has the highest percent change. Describe the overall change in the use of FCIU/mobile response and the rank order by drawing comparisons between the categories.
Hudson County does not use a merged FCIU/mobile response unit.
17. Using the answers to Questions 14-16, what are the most significant findings about your county's overall use of FCIU/mobile response and the use of FCIU/mobile response by race, and by ethnicity in 2022, or the most recent year? How has the use of diversion changed overall and through the lens of race/ethnicity since 2018?
Hudson County does not use a merged FCIU/mobile response unit.

JUVENILE COURT REFERRALS (NEW FILINGS)

- **For Questions 18-19, use Table 3b (Total Referrals (New Filings) to Juvenile Court by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 and 2022**

18. Using the data in Table 3b, describe total referrals by race/ethnicity overall and by category in 2018 and in 2022. Rank and discuss the referral types from largest to smallest for 2022.

In 2018 there were a total of 737 new filings to Juvenile Court. The racial/ethnic breakdown of these referrals is as follows: 116 for White juveniles; 267 for Black juveniles; 324 for Hispanic juveniles; and 30 for "other".

In 2022 there a total of 310 new filings in Juvenile Court. The breakdown for these by race/ethnicity is as follows:

“Other” – 288 referrals

Black – 10 referrals

Hispanic – 7 referrals

White – 5 referrals

When looking at race/ethnicity as a percentage of the number of cases per year, the number of filings of youth classified as White declined from 15.7% of the annual number in 2018 to 1.6% in 2022. The total number of filings in 2022 of 1.6% of youth classified as Black declined from 36.2% of the total number of filings in 2018 to 3.2% in 2022. The number of young people classified as Hispanic declined from 44% of the total number of filings in 2018 to 2.3% in 2022. Youth classified as Other increased significantly, comprising 4.1% of the total number of filings in 2018 to 93.9% in 2022.

19. Using the data in Table 3b (Percent Change 2018-2022), describe the percent change in total referrals and rank the categories by race/ethnicity beginning with the category that has the largest change. Draw comparisons between the categories.

Between 2018-2022 there was a 57.9% decrease in total referrals. The race/ethnicity breakdown for these referrals is as follows:

“Other” – 860.0% increase

Hispanic – 97.8% decrease

Black – 96.3% decrease

White – 95.7% decrease

20. Using the answers to Questions 18-19, what are the most significant findings related to your county’s overall new filings and new filings to juvenile court by race/ethnicity in 2022? What are the most significant findings about how new filings overall and new filings by race/ethnicity has changed since 2018?

Th number of referrals for youth categorized as Hispanic, Black or White all decreased by more than 90%, while youth categorized as “Other” increased by 860%.

The extraordinary increase in the category Other for referrals raises questions about how the classification process for new filings changed over the years and if young people were classified appropriately in 2022. It is difficult to deduce any notable observations related to race and ethnicity within this category until we can understand how the use of the category of Other changed.

Disproportionate Minority Contact and Racial And Ethnic Disparities

➤ **For Questions 21-22, use Table 3c Total Referrals (New Filings) to Juvenile Court Compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity, 2018-2020.**

21. Using the data in Table 3c, describe the percent of arrests referred to court overall and by category for 2018 and for 2020.

In 2018, 70% of all arrests were referred to Juvenile Court.
The breakdown of race/ethnicity categories is as follows for 2018:
37.4% of arrested White juveniles were referred to court
36.3 0% of arrested Black juveniles were referred to court
44% of arrested Hispanic juveniles were referred to court
3% of arrested youth in the “Other” category were referred to court.

In 2020, 58.3% of all arrests were referred to court. The race/ethnicity breakdown of these referrals is as follows:

9.2% of White arrested juveniles were referred to court
77.2% of arrested Black youth were referred to court
38.2% of arrested Hispanic youth were referred to court
54% of youth categorized as Other were referred to court.

22. Using the data in Table 3c, describe the percent change in arrests referred to court overall. Rank the percent change in arrests referred to court (2018-2020) by category, beginning with the category that has the largest change. Draw comparisons between the categories.

Between 2018-2020 there was a 47.1% decrease in overall arrests referred to court. The race/ethnicity breakdown of this decrease is as follows:

White – 64.7% decrease
Black – 37.8% decrease
Hispanic – 46.9% decrease
“Other” – 63.3% decrease

23. Using the answers to Questions 21-22, what are the most significant findings related to your county’s percent of arrests referred to family court overall and by category for 2020? What are the most significant findings regarding juvenile arrests and referrals to family court overall and by category since 2018?

In 2018, White youth represented the highest percentage of arrests referred to court (37.7%), which declined significantly to 9.2% in 2020. In contrast, in 2020 Black juveniles had the 2nd highest percentage of arrests referred to court, 77.2%, which rose significantly from the 2018 rate of 36%. In 2020, the percentage of arrests of Hispanic youth declined from 54.7% to 38.2%. The category of “Other” also declined from 2018 to 2020. Black juvenile arrests appear to be filed at a higher rate than those of other of youth in other race/ethnicity

categories.

FAMILY COURT DIVERSIONS

➤ **For Question 24-25, use data from Table 4a (Total Juvenile Cases Diverted, 2018-2022).**

24. Using the data in Table 4a, describe the number and percent of total cases diverted by race/ethnicity overall and by category for 2018 and for 2022. Rank the percent of total cases diverted by category, beginning with the category that has the largest change. Draw comparisons between the categories.

In 2018 there was a total of 413 cases diverted. The race/ethnicity breakdown is as follows:

Hispanic – 181 representing 43.8%
 Black – 128 representing 31.0%
 White – 76 representing 18.4%
 “Other”- 28 representing 6.8%

In 2022 there were a total of 135 cases diverted. The race/ethnicity breakdown is as follows:

White – 83 representing 61.5%
 Black – 52 representing 38.5%
 Hispanic – 0
 “Other” - 0

25. Using the data in Table 4a, describe the percent change in total juvenile cases diverted by race/ethnicity between 2018 and 2022 (see total cases row). Using the last column, rank the categories by percent change in juvenile cases diverted by race/ethnicity between 2018 and 2022. Draw comparisons between the categories.

Between 2018 and 2022 there was a 67.3% decrease in total cases diverted, from 413 to 135 respectively. The race/ethnicity breakdown of the diverted cases is as follows:

Hispanic – 100.0% decrease
 “Other”- 100.0% decrease
 Black – 59.4% decrease
 White – 9.2% increase

26. Using the answers to Questions 24-25, what are the most significant findings related to your county’s use of diversion by race/ethnicity overall and by category in 2022? What are the most significant findings regarding juveniles diverted from family court overall and by category since 2018?

The most notable observation is that there were no cases diverted for Hispanic juveniles in 2022. In contrast, 181 Hispanic juvenile cases were diverted in 2018, which was also the highest amount in race/ethnicity categories for that year (43% of all cases). In addition, the number of Black young people diverted also decreased. It is interesting to note that the number of White youth diverted actually increased over the period.

Disproportionate Minority Contact and Racial and Ethnic Disparities

- **For Questions 27-28, use data from Table 4b (Total Juvenile Cases Diverted Compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity, 2018-2022).**

27. Using the data in Table 4b, describe the percent of arrests diverted from court overall and by category for 2018 and for 2022.

In 2018, 39% of all arrests were diverted from court. The race/ethnicity breakdown for these diversions is as follows:

24.5% for White juveniles
 17.4% for Black juveniles
 30.6% for Hispanic juveniles; and
 28% for juveniles categorized as “Other”.

In 2020 (NOTE: 2022 statistics were not made available), 20.2 % of all arrests were diverted from court. The race/ethnicity breakdown for these diversions is as follows:

18.6% for White juveniles
 24.2% for Black juveniles
 0.0% for Hispanic juveniles
 0.0% for “Other”.

28. Using the data in Table 4b, describe the percent change in arrests diverted from court overall. Rank the percent change in arrests referred to court (2018-2022) by category, beginning with the category that has the largest change. Draw comparisons between the categories.

Between 2018 and 2020 there was a 67.3% decrease in total cases diverted. There was a decrease of 100% for Hispanic young people and those categorized as “Other”. The use of diversion for the arrest of Black youth decreased by 59.4%. In contrast, the use of diversion for White juveniles increased by 9.2%.

29. Using the answers to Questions 27-28, what are the most significant findings related to your county’s percent of arrests diverted from court overall and by category for 2022? What are the most significant findings regarding juvenile arrests diverted from family court overall and

by category since 2018?

In 2020, the use of diversion decreased significantly for youth who were Black, Hispanic and categorized as “Other”. In contrast, the use of diversion for White juveniles increased by nearly 10%. These figures indicate a racial and ethnic disparity in the use of diversion during 2020.

IMPLICATIONS FOR DIVERSION PLAN

Extent and Nature of Need – Law Enforcement Station House Adjustment Program Implications

30. Review the answer to Question 4. What does the data tell you about how county’s overall need for stationhouse adjustment programs? What does the data examining the use of stationhouse adjustments by race/ethnicity tell you about the need for station house adjustment programs through a racial lens? How can your county ensure that youth of color have the same access to stationhouse adjustment programs as White youth?

It is apparent that there needs to be more sustained use of the stationhouse adjustment program in all municipalities in Hudson County and many are under-utilizing the program, including Jersey City.

In 2021, Hispanic youth received the most stationhouse adjustments and youth categorized as “Other” (American Indian, Unknown) received the least stationhouse adjustments throughout Hudson County. The significant number of Hispanic young people in the stationhouse adjustment program can be attributed to municipalities in the Northern Hudson area (particularly West New York as well as Union City, Weehawken and Guttenberg) utilizing stationhouse adjustment more frequently, as this area is predominately Hispanic.

The County will partner with its two contacted stationhouse adjustment program providers to identify, and outreach to, municipal police departments in areas where youth of color reside and where there is the most need. The Youth Services Commission Administrator will present at County juvenile officer meetings throughout the year to promote the program as well.

Extent and Nature of Need - Family Crisis Intervention Unit/FCIU/Mobile Response Program Implications

31. Review the answers to Questions 7, 10 and 13 (or Question 17 for merged FCIU/mobile response program). What does the extent and nature data tell you about your county’s need for FCIU or Merged FCIU/mobile response programming overall and through the lens of race/ethnicity? Which types of crises seem reasonable to address through your county’s FCIU diversion programs? How can your county ensure that youth of color have the same access to FCIU/mobile response programs as White youth?

The number of referrals to FCIU has significantly decreased from 2018 to 2022, by 87.5%. Serious conflict between parent/guardian was the most prevalent crisis reported, followed by referrals. In order to address this issue, the County will provide community-based mentoring services for youth and their families that will focus on identifying and address the sources of conflict. The program will have a particular focus on Black and Hispanic males because they have been disproportionately represented as is made evident by the data.

Extent and Nature of Need - Family Court Diversion Program Implications

32. Review the answers to Questions 26 and 29. What does the extent and nature data tell you about your county’s need for family court diversion programs overall and through the lens of race/ethnicity? How can your county ensure that youth of color have the same access to diversion programs as White youth?

In 2020, the use of diversion decreased significantly for youth who were Black, Hispanic and categorized as “Other”. In contrast, the use of diversion for White juveniles increased by nearly 10%. These figures indicate a racial and ethnic disparity in the use of diversion during 2020. The decline overall in the use of diversion may also reflect the impacts of the Pandemic upon police and court practices.

There is a need for Family Court diversion programs such as community-based mentoring services. The County will ensure that youth of color have the same access to diversion programs as White youth by concentrating services in the areas where youth of color reside and where there is the most need.

Disproportionate Minority Contact and Racial and Ethnic Disparities

33. Looking at the answers to Questions 30, 31 and 32, what recommendations or strategies would your county make with regards to diversion policy and practice through the lens of race and ethnicity? What recommendations or strategies would your county consider to ensure similar outcomes for similarly situated youth?

Hudson County plans to concentrate diversion services for children and youth in under-resourced neighborhoods that are predominately Black and Hispanic in order to address racial and ethnic disparities in the justice system and in the use of the family crisis intervention unit.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Law Enforcement Station House Adjustment Program Recommendations

34. Looking at your answers to Question 30, what is the County’s programming plan to address problems and county trends in this category?
 Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend. State how the CYSC plan to address the need and/or service gap.

PJ*	What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
A	Underutilization of the Stationhouse Adjustment Program in certain municipalities	<p>Data provided by the Division of Criminal Justice, available on the New Jersey Attorney General’s website:</p> <p>In 2021 (the most recent year for which data was provided), the following municipalities used stationhouse adjustment. Note that the list is in order of those with the largest number of stationhouse adjustment usage to those municipalities with the smallest numbers.</p> <p>Bayonne – 113 West New York – 104 Kearny – 69 Secaucus – 49 Jersey City – 14 Harrison – 13 Union City – 11 Hoboken – 6 Weehawken – 5 East Newark – 2 Guttenberg – 1</p>	The county will contract with providers to implement two Stationhouse Adjustment programs in different geographic areas of the County to ensure that all departments can use for stationhouse adjustments and enable youth to receive services.
I			
C			
D			

E			
F			
G			

*Plan Justification (PJ): Use this letter to identify the funded program or service to address this recommendation.

Comments:

Family Crisis Intervention Unit/Family Crisis Intervention/Mobile Response Unit Program Recommendations

35. Looking at your answers to Question 31, what is the County’s programming plan to address problems and county trends in this category?
 Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend. State how the CYSC plan to address the need and/or service gap.

PJ*	What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
A	The most significant finding related to the FCIU caseload is the increase of cases involving serious conflicts between parent/guardians and juveniles in 2022.	Data in Table 1, (Columns H & I): The category of “serious conflict between parent/guardian” received the highest-ranking percent change in the number of cases during 2018-2022. In 2018 there were 1,136 reported cases of conflict between parent/guardian. In 2022 the number jumped to 2,684 cases with a percent change of 136%.	The County will contract with a provider to implement a community-based mentoring program that features in-home meetings with the family to identify and address family conflict.
B			
C			
D			
E			
F			
G			

*Plan Justification (PJ): Use this letter to identify the funded program or service to address this recommendation.

Comments:

Family Court Diversion Program Recommendations

36. Looking at your answers to Question 32, what is the County’s programming plan to address problems and county trends in this category?
 Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend. State how the CYSC plan to address the need and/or service gap.

PJ*	What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
A	<p>In 2020, the use of diversion decreased significantly for youth who were Black, Hispanic and categorized as “Other”. In contrast, the use of diversion for White juveniles increased by nearly 10%. These figures indicate a racial and ethnic disparity in the use of diversion during 2020.</p>	<p>Table 4B: Between 2018 and 2020 there was a 67.3% decrease in total cases diverted. There was a decrease of 100% for Hispanic young people and those categorized as “Other”. The use of diversion for the arrest of Black youth decreased by 59.4%. In contrast the use of diversion for White juveniles increased by 9.2%.</p>	<p>The County will contract with a provider to implement a community based mentoring program in those areas that are traditionally underserved and where youth of color predominantly reside.</p>
B			
C			
D			
E			
F			
G			

*Plan Justification (PJ): Use this letter to identify the funded program or service to address this recommendation.

DETENTION & DETENTION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

Using your completed data worksheet and your Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative All Sites data report, describe in your answers trends or changes in the data analyzed.

- **When answering questions regarding trends, describe *whether* any change has occurred, the *direction* of any change (e.g., increase/up, decrease/down), and the *size* of any change (e.g., small, moderate, large).**
- **When answering questions regarding rank orders, draw comparisons between categories (e.g., using terms like least/smallest, most/largest).**

NATURE & EXTENT OF DETENTION AND DETENTION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM UTILIZATION

JUVENILE DETENTION ADMISSIONS & AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION

- **For Questions 1-3, use Table 1 (Juvenile Detention Admissions by Race/Ethnicity and Gender).**

1. Using the data in Table 1, describe total detention admissions, detention admissions by race/ethnicity, and detention admissions by gender in 2022.

There were 149 total detention admissions in 2022. In 2022 there were 8 White, 80 Black and 61 Hispanic detention admissions. There were also 136 male and 13 female admissions in detention.

2. Using the data in Table 1, (% Change in detention admissions by race/ethnicity and gender 2018-2022 column), describe the total change in detention admissions, from 2018 to 2022. Rank total % changes in detention admissions by race/ethnicity and by gender between 2018 and 2022. Describe changes in total detention admissions by race/ethnicity and gender since 2018.

From 2018 to 2022 there was a total decrease of 42.2% of detention admissions.

The rank of percentage change in detention admissions (greatest - least) between 2018 and 2022 by race/ethnicity and gender is as follows:

- 1) White Females (66.7% decrease)
- 2) Black Males (46.6% decrease)
- 3) Hispanic Females (40.0% decrease)
- 4) Hispanic Males (38.9% decrease)
- 5) Black Females (18.2% decrease)
- 6) White Males (0.0% change)

7) Other Males & Females (Not enough information recorded)

3. Rank the percent change in admissions by race/ethnicity and gender (e.g., White male, Black male, etc.), beginning with the category that has the highest percent change. Describe changes in detention admissions by race/ethnicity and gender since 2018, drawing comparisons between the categories.

Detention admissions for White females had a decrease of 66.7% going from 3 in 2018 to 1 in 2022. Black males had a decrease of 46.6% in detention admissions between 2018 and 2022 going from 133 in 2018, 96 in 2021 to 71 in 2022. Hispanic females had a decrease of 40.0% in detention admissions between 2018 and 2022 going from 5 in 2018, 6 in 2021 to 3 in 2022. Hispanic males had a decrease of 38.9% in detention admissions between 2018 and 2022 going from 95 in 2018, 49 in 2021 to 58 in 2022. Detention admissions for Black females had a decrease of 18.2% going from 11 in 2018, 5 in 2021 to 9 in 2022. The category of White males had no change, remaining 7 detention admissions for 2018 and 2022. There was not enough information recorded to give accurate data about the change in detention admissions for the categories "other males/females".

Using the answers to questions 1-3, what are the most significant findings about overall detention admissions, admissions by race/ethnicity and admissions by gender in 2022? What are the most significant findings about the changes in total detention admissions, total detention admissions by race/ethnicity, admissions by race/ethnicity and gender since 2018?

The most significant findings in 2022 are that Black and Hispanic male detention admissions decreased a great amount and had the largest percentage of change but at the same time still largely outnumbered any other race or gender admissions. In 2018 and 2022 there was no change in the number of White male detention admissions (which remained at 7) over the period while Black male admissions were 133 in 2018 and 71 in 2022 representing a 46.6% decrease.

➤ **For Questions 5-, use Table 2 (Juvenile Detention Admissions Compared to Referrals to Court by Race/Ethnicity)**

4. Using the data in Table 2 (% Change 2018-2022 column), describe the total percent change in referrals to court and the total percent change in detention admissions. Rank the percent change in referrals to court by race/ethnicity and gender (e.g., White male, Black male), starting with the category that has the highest percent change. Describe the percent change in referrals to court, drawing comparisons between the categories. Rank the percent change in detention admissions by race/ethnicity and gender, beginning with the category that has the highest percent change. Describe the percent change in detention admissions since 2018, drawing comparisons between the categories. Draw comparisons between the total percent change in referrals to court and the total percent change in detention admissions and by race/ethnicity and gender since 2018.

From 2018 - 2022 there was a 57.9% decrease in referrals to court and a 42.2% decrease in detention admissions.

The rank of percentage of change (greatest to lowest) for referrals to court by race/ethnicity between 2018-2022 is as follows:

- 1) Category listed as "other" (860.0% increase)
- 2) Hispanic (97.8% decrease)
- 3) Black (96.3% decrease)
- 4) White (95.7% decrease)

There was a large increase in referrals to court for the category listed as "other". In 2018 there were 30 referrals in the "other" category and 288 in 2022 reflecting an 860.0% increase. In 2018 there were 324 referrals to court for Hispanics and 7 in 2022 reflecting a 97.8% decrease. The total number of referrals dropped significantly for Blacks dropping from 267 in 2018 to just 10 in 2022 reflecting a 96.3% decrease. In 2018 there were 116 referrals to court for Whites and 5 in 2022 reflecting a 95.7% decrease.

The rank of percentage of change (greatest to lowest) for detention admissions by race/ethnicity between 2018-2022 is as follows:

- 1) Category listed as "other" (100.0% decrease)
- 2) Black (44.4% decrease)
- 3) Hispanic (39.0% decrease)
- 4) White (20.0% decrease)

The category listed as "other" had 4 detention admissions in 2018 and 0 in 2022 reflecting a 100.0% decrease. There were 144 Black detention admissions in 2018 and 80 in 2022 reflecting a 44.4% decrease. There were 100 Hispanic detention admissions in 2018 and 61 in 2022 reflecting a 39.0% decrease. There were 10 White detention admissions in 2018 and 8 in 2022 reflecting a 20.0% decrease.

The category listed as "other" had 30 referrals to court and 4 detention admissions in 2018; and 288 referrals to court and 0 detention admissions in 2022. These changes reflect a 860.0% increase in referrals but a 100.0% decrease in actual detention admissions. The category listed as "Black" had 267 referrals to court and 144 detention admissions in 2018; 10 referrals to court and 80 detention admissions in 2022; there was a 96.3% decrease in referrals with a 44.4% decrease in actual detention admissions. The category listed as "Hispanic" had 324 referrals to court and 100 detention admissions in 2018; 7 referrals to court and 61 detention admissions in 2022; there was a 97.8% decrease in referrals with a 39.0% decrease in actual detention admissions. The category listed as "White" had 116 referrals to court and 10 detention admissions in 2018; 5 referrals to court and 8 detention admissions in 2022; there was a 95.7% decrease in referrals with a 20.0% decrease in actual detention admissions.

5. Using the answers to questions 4-5 what are the most significant findings about juvenile detention admissions and juvenile detention admissions by race/ethnicity and gender in 2022? What are the most significant findings about juvenile detention admissions and juvenile detention admissions by race/ethnicity since 2018? What are the most significant findings about referrals to court, detention admissions and the percent of referrals admitted to detention in total and by category in 2022? What are the most significant finds about referrals to court in total and by category since 2018? What are the most significant findings

about detention admissions in total and by category since 2018? What are the most significant findings from the comparison of the percent change in referrals to court and the percent change in admissions to detention since 2018?

One of the most significant findings in 2022 is that the category listed as "other" had 288 referrals to court but 0% of the referrals were admitted to detention. Also, Blacks had 10 and Hispanics had 7 referrals to court but both had large numbers of detention admissions with Blacks having 80 and Hispanics having 61 in 2022. In 2018 it seems that Blacks and Hispanics are the only groups that have triple-digit referrals to court and admissions to detention while the rest have low double-digit and even single-digit detention admissions. In 2022 Blacks had 800.0% of all referrals to court admitted to detention and 871.4% of Hispanic referrals to court being admitted to detention. These numbers indicate that youth in these categories may have originally been categorized as "other" during referral to court and then re-categorized when admitted to detention. In 2018 there were 737 total referrals to court with Blacks and Hispanics representing 80% of all referrals. In 2018 there were 258 total detention admissions with Blacks and Hispanics representing 95% of all admissions. Since 2018 the category listed as "other" had a 860.0% increase in referrals to court going from 30 in 2018 to 288 in 2022 but even with such a large increase in referrals, 0 individuals under "other" were admitted to detention in 2022 which reflects a 100.0% decrease since 2018. The increase in the category of "other" makes it difficult to deduce any significant observations regarding referrals. More information is required to determine why the use of the category increased so substantially in 2022.

➤ **For Questions 7-10, use Table 3 (Juvenile Detention Population 2018-2022)**

6. Using the data in Table 3, describe the overall Average Daily Population (ADP) 2022.

In 2022 the overall average daily population was 16.9.

7. Using the data in Table 3, (% Change 2018-2022 column), describe the total change in ADP between 2018 and 2022.

Between 2018-2022 there was a 32.4% decrease in the average daily population going from 25 in 2018, 17.8 in 2021 to 16.9 in 2022.

8. Using the data in Table 3, describe the overall Average Length of Stay (ALOS) 2022.

In 2022 the overall average length of stay was 29.7.

9. Using the data in Table 3, (% Change 2018-2022 column), describe the total percent change in ALOS between 2018 and 2022.

Between 2018-2022 there was a 2.4% increase in the average length of stay going from 29 in 2018, 22.5 in 2021 to 29.7 in 2022.

10. Using the answers to questions 7-10, what are the most significant findings about overall

ADP and ALOS in 2022? What are the most significant findings about the percent change in ADP and in ALOS since 2018?

The most significant finding in 2022 is that even though there is a average length of stay of 29.7, there is an daily population average of 16.9. Between 2018-2022 the percentage of change for ADP decreased by 32.4% but the ALOS barely changed and increased by 2.4%.

CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH IN DETENTION

➤ **For Questions 12-15, use the data files (2022 Detention admission by age, degree of offense, most serious current offense, and municipality of residence) provided by the JJC.**

11. Rank the top three municipalities of residence for youth admitted to detention in 2022, beginning with the municipality with the highest frequency. Name the top three municipalities and describe the number of detained youth and the percent of all detained youth for each municipality within the county.

Jersey City was the municipality with the highest number of youth detained in 2022, with a total of 79 out of 149 youth admitted to detention, resulting in 53% of youth. Union City ranked the second highest municipality of youth detained, with a total of 17 out of 149 youth, resulting in 11.4% of youth detained in 2022. Lastly, Bayonne was the third highest municipality of youth detained in 2022, with 12 youth admitted to detention out of 149 total youth admitted to detention, resulting in 8.1% of youth detained.

12. Review the detention admissions by age data. Describe the age range youth admitted to detention by number and percent of total, the average age of detention admission and the median age of detention admission in 2022. Rank each age by percent of total, beginning with the highest percent. Draw comparisons between the categories.

Rank	Age	Total # of youth	% within County
1	17	42	28.6%
2	16	39	26.5%
3	15	31	21.1%
4	14	11	7.5%
5	13	9	6.1%
6	18	8	5.4%
7	19	6	4.1%
8	12	1	0.7%

Youth aged 17 were the group most frequently admitted to detention with a percent of 28.6% of total youth. Youth aged 12 has the lowest frequency of admittance into detention. The average age admitted to detention in 2022 is 16 years old.

13. Review the Detention Admissions by Most Serious Current Offense data for 2022 (frequency and percent). Rank the offenses beginning with the offense that has the highest

number/percent of total. Draw comparisons between the categories.

Rank	Offense	Frequency	Percentage
1	2 nd Degree Possession of Firearm, Explosives, or Destructive Device	38	25.5%
2	2 nd Degree Robbery	21	14.1%
3	Violation of Probation	12	8.1%
4	1 st Degree Robbery	10	6.7%
5	2 nd Degree Robbery	10	6.7%
6	Violation of Detention Alternative/Alternative Custody	9	6.0%
7	1 st Degree Murder, Attempted Murder, Conspiracy to Commit Murder	6	4.0%
8	1 st Degree Carjacking	5	3.4%
9	2 nd Degree CDS Offenses	5	3.4%
10	3 rd Degree Aggravated Assault	5	3.4%

The highest-ranking offense in 2022 was 2nd degree possession of a firearm, explosives or destructive device with 38 admissions to detention representing 25.5% of total youth admitted to detention.

14. Review the Detention Admissions by Degree of Offense data for 2022. Rank the degree of offenses beginning with the category that has the highest number/percent of total. Draw comparisons between the categories.

Rank	Degree	# of youth	Percentage
1	2 nd	81	54.4%
2	No Delinquency/NA	27	18.1%
3	1 st	25	16.8%
4	3 rd	14	9.4%
5	4 th	1	0.7%
6	DP/PDP	1	0.7%

In 2022, the highest-ranking degree was 2nd offense, with a total of 81 youth, resulting in 54.4% of youth admitted to detention. The lowest ranking offense was a DP/PDP with a total of 1 youth, resulting in .7% of youth admitted to detention.

15. Using the answers to questions 12-15, Describe the most significant findings related to the characteristics of young people who were detained in 2022 (municipality, age, offense, offense degree). Please use the information from all four answers in your response.

Jersey City ranked the highest municipality of youth detained in 2022, with a total of 79 out of 149 youth admitted to detention, resulting in 53% of youth. The category of youth aged 17 has the highest number of young people admitted to detention with a percentage of 28.6% of total youth, and youth aged 12 had the lowest number of youth admitted to detention. The highest-ranking offense in 2022 was 2nd-degree possession of a firearm, explosives or destructive device, with 38 admissions to detention resulting in 25.5% of total youth. In 2022, the highest-ranking degree was 2nd offense, with a total of 81 youth, resulting in 54.4% of youth admitted

to detention.

DETENTION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM UTILIZATION AND OUTCOMES

JUVENILE DETENTION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM ADMISSIONS & AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION

➤ **For Questions 17-18, use Table 4 (Juvenile Detention Alternatives Program Population)**

16. Using the data in Table 4, describe the average daily detention alternative population and average monthly detention alternative population admissions in 2022.

In 2022 the average daily detention alternative population was 29.7 and the average monthly detention alternative population admissions was 20.1.

17. Using the data in Table 4, (% Change 2018-2022 column), describe the percent change in the average daily population of detention alternative programs between 2018 and 2022. Describe the percent change in average monthly admissions between 2018 and 2022.

There was a 18.8% increase in the average daily population of detention alternative programs between 2018-2022. There was a 44.6% decrease in the average monthly admissions between 2018-2022.

18. Using the answers to questions 17-18, what are the most significant findings about the average daily population in detention alternative programs and in average monthly admissions to detention alternative programs in 2022? What are the most significant findings about average daily population in detention alternative programs and average monthly admissions to detention since 2018?

In 2018 a significant finding is that the average daily population is lower than the average monthly admissions which can be attributed to more youth being in detention for a shorter amount of time. In 2022 a significant finding is that the average daily population is higher than the average monthly admission which can be attributed to a small group of youth staying in for significantly longer periods of time.

JUVENILE DETENTION ALTERNATIVE AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY

➤ **For Questions 20-21, use Table 5 (Juvenile Detention Alternative ALOS by Race/Ethnicity)**

19. Using the data in Table 5, describe the ALOS in detention alternative programs overall and

by race/ethnicity in 2022.

In 2022 the total ALOS in detention alternative programs was 115 with 61 White youth, 28 Black youth and 26 Hispanic youth.

20. Using the data in Table 5, (% Change 2018-2022 column), describe the total percent change in ALOS between 2018 and 2022. Using the data in Table 5, (% Change 2018-2022), rank the percent change in ALOS in detention alternatives by race/ethnicity, beginning with the group that has the highest percent change. Describe the overall percent change in detention alternative program ALOS and describe the ranking of changes in ALOS by category by drawing comparisons between the categories.

Between 2018 and 2022 there was a 144.7% increase in the ALOS going from 47 in 2018 to 115 in 2022.

The rank of percentage of change (greatest to lowest) for ALOS by race/ethnicity between 2018-2022 is as follows:

- 1) White (771.4% increase)
- 2) Hispanic (36.8% increase)
- 3) Black (33.3% increase)

The White youth population had a ALOS of 7 in 2018, 28 in 2021 and 61 in 2022 resulting in a 771.4% increase. The Black youth population had a ALOS of 21 in 2018, 28 in 2021 and 28 in 2022 resulting in a 33.3% increase. The Hispanic youth population had a ALOS of 19 in 2018, 12 in 2021 and 26 in 2022 resulting in a 36.8% increase.

21. Using the answers to questions 20-21, what are the most significant findings about ALOS overall and about ALOS for each racial/ethnic group in 2022? What are the most significant findings about ALOS for each racial/ethnic groups and about overall ALOS in detention alternative programs since 2018?

In 2022 both the White and Hispanic youth population had a higher number for ALOS than the previous year while the Black youth population had the same number for ALOS in 2022 and the previous year. In 2022 the overall number for ALOS increased to 115. Since 2018 every racial/ethnic group seen a rise in ALOS which represents the increase of 144.7% between 2018-2022.

DETENTION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM UTILIZATION & OUTCOMES

- **For Questions 23-26, use Table 6 (Juvenile Detention Alternative Program Outcomes).**

22. Using the data in Table 6, describe the number of successful completions of detention alternative programs in 2022 and the percent change (% Change 2018-2022 column) in the success rate of detention alternative programming between 2018 and 2022.

In 2022 there were 81 successful completions of the detention alternative programs. Between 2018-2022 there was a decrease of 0.4% in terms of successful completions.

23. Using the data in Table 6, describe the number of new charge violations of detention alternative programs in 2022 and describe the percent change (% Change 2018-2022 column) in detention alternative program violations tied to new charges between 2018 and 2022.

In 2022 there were 2.7 new charge violations of detention alternative programs. Between 2018-2022 there was a decrease of 71.3% in detention alternative program violations tied to new charges.

24. Using the data in Table 6, describe the number of violations of detention alternative programs tied to a technical violation/non-compliance in 2022 and describe the percent change (% Change 2018-2022 column), change in technical violations/non-compliance of detention alternative programs between 2018 and 2022.

In 2022 there were 10.6 violations/non-compliances of detention alternative programs. Between 2018-2022 there was an increase of 12.8% in violations/non-compliances.

25. Using the answers to questions 23-25, what are the most significant findings about the number of successful completions, the number of violations due to new charges and the number of violations due to technical violations/non-compliance of detention alternative programs in 2022? What are the most significant findings about the total number/percentage change in the detention alternative program success rate, new charge violations and technical violations/non-compliance since 2018?

In 2022 there was an increase in successful completions from the previous year while the new charges and violations/non-compliances decreased from the previous year. Since 2018, each year successful completions outnumber both new charges and violations/non-compliances.

➤ **For Questions 27, use JAMS data.**

26. Looking at each program on the detention point of the continuum (Total Intakes by Program, 2018 & 2022 column), describe detention alternative program admissions, by program, in 2022. Looking at the percent change 2018-2022 column, rank the detention alternative programs starting with the program that has the highest percent change. Describe how detention alternative utilization by program has changed since 2018.

In 2018, 12 youth were admitted to the Youth Employment Program and in 2022, a total of 17 youth were admitted to the Youth Career Exploration and Employment Program. These were the sole detention alternative programs during 2018 and 2022.

➤ **Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need**

27. Was additional data, not provided by the JJC, was used in your county's planning process? (If other data was used attach a copy.) If so, what does that data tell you about how your County's overall need for secure detention and detention alternative programs has changed in recent years and about the needs and characteristics of youth that should be addressed through your county's juvenile detention plan? Are there additional data that relates to Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial and Ethnic Disparities?

IMPLICATIONS FOR JUVENILE DETENTION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS PLAN

Extent and Nature of Need- Detention Utilization

28. Taken collectively, what do the answers to questions 4,6, 11, 16 and 28 tell you about your county's detention admissions, average daily population, and the characteristics of detained young people? How does this information inform the need for detention alternative programs?

Although the county has a high admission rate of 149, specifically for Black and Hispanic youth, the average daily population has been decreasing since 2018 to 17, reflecting that youth are committing crimes that do not require long admission stays. This information informs the need for detention alternative programs as an alternative to short stays in detention.

Extent and Nature of Need- Detention Alternative Programs

29. Taken collectively, what do the answer to questions 19, 22, 26, 27 and 28 tell you about your county's use of detention alternative programming and their outcomes? How does this information inform the need for detention alternative programs?

Outcomes between the years of 2018-2022 indicate that there have been significantly more successful completions of alternative programs than of new charges and violations or non-compliance. In 2022, there were 81 successful completions, 2.7 new charges and 10.6 violations for non-compliance. The data overall reflects that participation in alternative programs results in successful outcomes for young people and informs the need for detention alternative programs.

31. What does this information tell you collectively about the status of disproportionate minority contact and racial/ethnic disparities at this point of the juvenile justice continuum within your county?

Disproportionate minority contact and racial/ethnic disparities across all detention data is substantial and alarming. Black and Hispanic youth p are admitted to detention at significantly higher rates than White youth. In 2018 alone there were 8 (.03%) White youth detention admissions compared to a combined 244 detention admissions (96%) for Black and Hispanic youth, representing 3% and 96% of total detention admissions respectively. In 2022, these figures did not change significantly. Five percent of the total detention admissions were of White youth and 95% were of Black and Hispanic young people.

RECOMMENDATIONS

29. Looking at your answers to questions, what is the County’s juvenile detention plan to address problems and county trends. Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend. State how the CYSC plan to address the need and/or service gap.

PJ*	What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
A	Address the use of Electronic Monitoring devices	<p>The most significant findings in 2022 are that Black and Hispanic male detention admissions decreased a great amount and had the largest percentage of change but at the same time still largely outnumbered any other race or gender admissions. In 2018 and 2022 there was no change in the number of White male detention admissions which remained at 7 reflecting no change in admissions statistics. However, Black males admissions in 2018 were 133 and 71 in 2022 representing a 46.6% decrease.</p> <p>The decrease in detention admissions reflects the County’s current policy of utilizing Electronic Monitoring devices in place of detention when safe and appropriate. The goal of the County is to keep youth in their communities of origin and out of detention when it is appropriate and safe to do so as continued participation in school and placement with the family is preferable.</p>	<p>The County will continue to utilize Electronic Monitoring devices to provide a detention alternative for the use of the court and youth on probation. The program will monitor and supervise the whereabouts of youth 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. In addition, the program will offer incentives for youth with consistent positive behavior.</p>
B			
C			
D			

E			
F			
G			

*Plan Justification: Use this letter to identify the funded program or service to address this recommendation.

Comments:

30. In reviewing all the above analysis questions, what recommendations or strategies would your county make with regards to Juvenile Detention policy and practice through the lens of race and ethnicity? What recommendations or strategies would your county consider ensuring similar outcomes for similarly situated youth?

Comments:

DISPOSITION ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

- When answering questions regarding trends, describe *whether* any change has occurred, the *direction* of any change (e.g., increase, decrease), and the *size* of any change (e.g., small, moderate, large).
- When answering questions regarding rank orders, draw comparisons between categories (e.g., using terms like least/smallest, most/largest).

NATURE & EXTENT OF THE DISPOSED POPULATION

JUVENILES ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT

- For Questions 1-2, use Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender 2018 and 2022.
1. Using the data in Table 1, describe the total number of young people adjudicated delinquent and the number and percent of total of young people adjudicated by gender in 2022.

In 2022 there was a total of 120 young people adjudicated delinquent. There were 107 males representing 89.2% and 13 females representing 10.8%.
 2. Using the data in Table 1 (% Change in Juveniles Adjudicated by Gender 2018-2022 column), describe the percent change in adjudications overall. Rank the percent change in adjudications by gender. Describe changes in adjudications by gender since 2018.

There was a decrease of 63.2% between 2018-2022 for adjudications.

Rank of percentage change (highest to lowest) for adjudications by gender:

 - 1) Females (71.7% decrease)
 - 2) Males (61.8% decrease)

Since 2018 the number of males adjudicated dropped from 280 in 2018 to 107 in 2022. The number of females adjudicated declined from 46 in 2018 to 13 in 2022.
 3. Using the answers in questions 1-2, what are the most significant findings about adjudications and adjudications by gender in 2022? What are the most significant findings about changes in adjudications overall and changes in adjudications by gender since 2018?

One notable observation is that the number of males adjudicated decreased by 173 and the number of females decreased by 33 in 2022. In 2018 there were a total of 326 juveniles adjudicated and males represented 280, or 85.9%, of all those adjudicated.

➤ **For Questions 3-5, use Table 2: Juvenile Cases Adjudicated Delinquent with Probation and Incarceration Dispositions 2018 and 2022.**

4. Using the data in Table 2, describe the number of adjudicated juvenile cases by probation and incarceration category and in total for 2022.

In 2022, out of 131 youth, 118 were adjudicated as juveniles on probation, 2 received a short-term commitment and 11 were JJC committed.

5. Using the data in Table 2, (% Change in Dispositions 2018-2022 column), describe the total percent change in juvenile cases adjudicated delinquent with probation and incarceration dispositions since 2018. Rank the disposition categories, beginning with the category that has the highest percent change. Describe how adjudications resulting in probation or incarceration has changed since 2018.

Between 2018-2022 there has been a 63.2% decrease in juvenile cases adjudicated delinquent with probation and incarceration dispositions.

Rank of percentage change (highest to lowest) for disposition categories:

- 1) Probation (55.8% decrease)
- 2) Short-term Commitment (50.0% decrease)
- 3) JJC Committed (37.5% increase)

Since 2018 the total number of juveniles in disposition categories has decreased from 279 in 2018 to 131 in 2022.

6. Using the answers in questions 4-5, what are the most significant findings about juvenile cases adjudicated delinquent with probation or incarceration dispositions in 2022? What are the most significant findings about changes in juvenile cases adjudicated delinquent resulting in probation or incarceration since 2018?

In 2022 every category of disposition showed a decrease with the exception of the category of JJC committed, which increased by 37.5%. A notable observation for 2018 is that probation dispositions accounted for 96% (267) of 279 juvenile cases adjudicated delinquent, compared to 90% of cases in 2022.

➤ **For Questions 7-9, use Table 3: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race 2018 and 2022.**

7. Using the data in Table 3, describe the total number of adjudicated juveniles by race in 2022. Describe the number and percent of total of adjudicated juveniles by race/ethnicity category in 2022.

In 2022 there were 120 total juveniles adjudicated. Of these young people, there were no White juveniles adjudicated, four Black juveniles adjudicated, four Hispanic juveniles adjudicated and 112 young adjudicated people were categorized as "other". Juveniles listed as "other" made up 93.3% of the total number of juveniles adjudicated in 2022. The method of reporting adjudicated juveniles by race/ethnicity changed in 2022, as a result this data is not accurate in regard of race/ethnicity.

8. Using the data in Table 3 (% Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race 2018-2022 column), rank the race/ethnicity categories by percent change, beginning with the category that has the highest change. Describe how juveniles adjudicated delinquent by race/ethnicity has changed since 2018.

There were 30 White young people adjudicated delinquent in 2018, 15 in 2020 and none in 2022. One hundred and thirty-nine Black youth were adjudicated delinquent in 2018, 109 in 2020 and 4 in 2022. The data indicates that there were 149 Hispanic youth adjudicated delinquent in 2018, 28 in 2020 and 4 in 2022. Eight young people categorized as "other" were adjudicated delinquent in 2018, 5 in 2020 and 112 in 2022.

Rank of percentage change (highest to lowest) of race/ethnicity categories between 2018-2022:

- 1) Other (93.3% increase)
- 2) Black (3.3% increase)
- 3) Hispanic (3.3%% increase)
- 4) White (0% change)

9. Using the answers to questions 7-8, what are the most significant findings about juveniles adjudicated delinquent by race/ethnicity in 2022? What are the most significant findings about juveniles adjudicated delinquent by race/ethnicity since 2018?

In 2022 the category listed as "other" outnumbered all other races, representing 93.3% (112) of the total number of adjudicated youth. There were small increases to the number of adjudicated Black and Hispanic youth during this period and no change in the number of White youth adjudicated. It is difficult to discern any significant findings as to race and ethnicity within this category as it reflects a significant change in the reporting and categorization of youth since 2018.

➤ **For Questions 10-13, use Table 4: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent Compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity 2018 and 2020.**

10. Using the data from Table 4, describe the total number of juvenile arrests, juvenile arrests by race/ethnicity, the total number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent, the number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent by race/ethnicity, the total percent of arrestees adjudicated delinquent, and the percent of arrestees adjudicated delinquent by race/ethnicity in 2020.

In 2020, there was a total of 667 juvenile arrests. The breakdown by race is as follows: 446 White, 215 Black, and 6 "other". Four hundred and fifty of the 667 youth arrested were Hispanic and 217 were Non-Hispanic. In 2020, the breakdown of race/ethnicity of arrested adjudicated

delinquents is as follows:

- White - 446 juvenile arrests, 15 adjudicated (2.2% of arrests adjudicated delinquent).
- Black - 215 juvenile arrests, 109 adjudicated (16.3% of arrests adjudicated delinquent).
- Hispanic - 450 juvenile arrests, 28 adjudicated (4.1% of arrests adjudicated delinquent).
- Other - 6 juvenile arrests, 5 adjudicated (0.7% of arrests adjudicated delinquent).

11. Using the data from Table 4 (% Change 2018-2020 column), describe the total percent change in juvenile arrests since 2020, then rank the percent change in juvenile arrests by race/ethnicity beginning with the category that has the highest change. Describe how juvenile arrests have changed by race/ethnicity since 2020.

The total number of juvenile arrests significantly decreased from 2018 to 2020. However, the method of reporting race/ethnicity in 2020 was presented differently than in 2018, therefore the data does not accurately depict the overall change by percentage. In 2018 there was a total of 1,053 arrests and in 2020 the number decreased by 51.8% to 667 total arrests.

12. Using the data from Table 4 (% Change 2018-2020 column), describe the total percent change in juveniles adjudicated delinquent since 2018, then rank the percent change in juveniles adjudicated delinquent by race/ethnicity, beginning with the category that has the highest change. Describe how juvenile adjudication by race/ethnicity has changed since 2018.

Overall juvenile arrests and juveniles adjudicated delinquent have decreased since 2018. The total percent change (ranking highest to least) in juvenile arrests from 2018 to 2020 by race/ethnicity is as follows:
 Hispanic - 149 adjudicated delinquent in 2018, 28 adjudicated delinquent in 2020 (81.2% decrease)
 White - 30 adjudicated delinquent in 2018, 15 adjudicated delinquent in 2020 (50% decrease)
 Black - 139 adjudicated delinquent in 2018, 109 adjudicated delinquent in 2020 (21.6%)
 Other- 8 adjudicated delinquent in 2018, 5 adjudicated delinquent in 2020 (37.5% decrease)

13. Using the answers to questions 10-12, what are the most significant findings about the total number of juvenile arrests, juvenile arrests by race/ethnicity, the total number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent, the number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent by race/ethnicity, the total percent of arrestees adjudicated delinquent, and the percent of arrestees adjudicated delinquent by race/ethnicity in 2020. What is the most significant findings about the percent change in juvenile arrests and the percent change in juvenile arrests by race ethnicity since 2018? What is the most significant change in the total percent change in juveniles adjudicated delinquent and in juveniles adjudicated delinquent by race/ethnicity since 2018?

It is difficult to draw conclusions from the data because of the change in reporting race/ethnicity between 2018 and 2022. The most significant finding is that although their numbers declined with arrest numbers overall, Black and Hispanic male young people continue to comprise the majority of arrested and adjudicated delinquent youth from 2018 to 2020. In 2022, White youth were adjudicated delinquent at a significantly lower rate (2.2%), than Black (16.3%) or Hispanic youth (4.1%).

➤ **For Questions 14-16, use Table 5: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age, 2018 and 2022.**

14. Using the data from Table 5, describe the total number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent, the

number of juveniles adjudicated by age and the percent of juveniles adjudicated by age in 2022.

In 2022 there were 120 juveniles adjudicated delinquent. There were 0 for the age group 6-10 representing 0.0%; 6 for the age group 11-12 representing 5.0%; 22 for the age group 13-14 representing 18.3%; 52 for the age group 15-16 representing 43.3%; 40 for the age 17 representing 33.3%; and 0 for the age group 18 and over.

15. Using the data from Table 5 (% Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age 2018-2022 column), rank the percent change in juveniles adjudicated by age, beginning with the category that has the highest change. Describe how juveniles adjudicated delinquent by age has changed since 2018.

Rank of percent change (highest to lowest) for juveniles adjudicated by age:

- 1) 15-16 years old (68.5% decrease)
- 2) 13-14 years old (62.7% decrease)
- 3) 17 years old (59.2% decrease)
- 4) 11-12 years old (50.0% increase)
- 5) 6-10 years old (0.0% change)
- 6) 18 and over (0.0% change)

16. Using the answers to questions 14-15, what are the most significant findings about juveniles adjudicated by age in 2022? What are the most significant findings in the percent change in juveniles adjudicated delinquent by age since 2018?

In 2022 the ages 15-16 and 17 accounted for 76.6% of all juveniles adjudicated. In 2018 the ages 15-16 alone accounted for 50.6% of all juveniles adjudicated with 165 out of the total 326. In 2022, the number of youth 11-12 years old rose by 50%.

PROBATION PLACEMENTS

- **For Questions 17-19, use Table 6: Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity 2018 and 2022.**

17. Using the data from Table 6, describe the total number of juvenile probation placements, the number of juvenile probation placements, by race/ethnicity and the percent of total probation placements by race/ethnicity in 2022.

In 2022 there were 63 total juvenile probation placements; 0 White juveniles; 1 Black juvenile representing 1.6%; 1 Hispanic juvenile representing 1.6%; and 61 juveniles listed as "other" representing 96.8%.

18. Using the data from Table 6 (% Change in Probation Placements 2018-2022 column), rank the categories by race/ethnicity beginning with the category that has the most change. Describe how probation placements have changed since 2018.

Rank of categories by race/ethnicity with most change (highest to lowest) since 2018:

- 1) White (100.0% decrease)
- 2) Black (80.0% decrease)
- 3) "Other" (22.0% increase)
- 4) Hispanic (0.0% change)

The white juvenile population decreased from 2 probation placements in 2018 to 0 in 2022. The Black juvenile population decreased from 5 probation placements in 2018 to 1 in 2022. The Hispanic juvenile population stayed consistent with 1 probation placement in 2018 and 2022. The race/ethnic category listed as "other" increased from 50 in 2018 to 61 in 2022.

19. Using the answers to questions 17-18, what are the most significant findings about probation placements by race/ethnicity in 2022? What are the most significant findings about the change in probation placements since 2018?

In 2022 the race/ethnic group listed as "other" accounted for 96.8% of all probation placements with a total number of 61. The same can be seen in 2018 with this group accounting for 86.2% of all probation placements with a total of 50 placements.

- For Questions 20-23, use Table 7: Juvenile Probation Placements Compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 and 2022.

20. Using the data from Table 7, describe the total number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent, the number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent by race, ethnicity, the total number of juveniles placed on probation, the number of juveniles placed on probation by race/ethnicity and the percent of adjudicated juveniles placed on probation by race/ethnicity in 2022.

In 2022 there were a total of 18 juveniles adjudicated delinquent and 63 placed on probation. Of these, there were 3 White youth adjudicated delinquent with 0 placed on probation representing 0.0%; 4 Black youth adjudicated delinquent with 1 placed on probation representing 25.0%; 5 Hispanic youth adjudicated delinquent with 1 placed on probations representing 20.0%; and 61 young people categorized as "other" adjudicated delinquent with 6 placed on probation representing 1016.7%.

21. Using the data from Table 7 (% Change 2018-2022), rank the percent change in juveniles adjudicated delinquent by race beginning with the category that has the highest change. Describe the change in juveniles adjudicated delinquent by race/ethnicity has changed since 2018.

Rank of percentage change (highest to lowest) by race/ethnicity since 2018:

- 1) White (200.0% increase)
- 2) Black (100.0% increase)
- 3) Hispanic (66.7% increase)
- 4) "Other" (50.0% increase)

The white juvenile population increased from 1 adjudicated delinquent in 2018 to 3 in 2022. The black juvenile population increased from 2 adjudicated delinquents in 2018 to 4 in 2022. The hispanic juvenile population increased from 3 adjudicated delinquents in 2018 to 5 in 2022. The race/ethnic category listed as "other" seen a increase in adjudicated delinquents going from 4 in 2018 to 6 in 2022.

22. Using the data from Table 7 (% Change 2018-2022), rank the percent change in juvenile probation placements by race/ethnicity, beginning with the category that has the largest percent change. Describe the change in juveniles placed on probation by race/ethnicity since 2018.

Rank of percentage change (highest to lowest) by race/ethnicity since 2018:

- 1) White (100.0% decrease)
- 2) Black (80.0% decrease)
- 3) "Other" (22.0% increase)
- 4) Hispanic (0.0% change)

The white juvenile population decreased from 2 probation placements in 2018 to 0 in 2022. The Black juvenile population decreased from 5 probation placements in 2018 to 1 in 2022. The Hispanic juvenile population stayed consistent with 1 probation placement in 2018 and 2022. The race/ethnic category listed as "other" increased in probation placements from 50 in 2018 to 61 in 2022.

23. Using the answers to questions 20-22, what are the most significant findings about describe the total number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent, the number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent by race, ethnicity, the total number of juveniles placed on probation, the number of juveniles placed on probation by race/ethnicity and the percent of adjudicated juveniles placed on probation by race/ethnicity in 2022? What are the most significant findings about the comparison between the percent change in juveniles adjudicated delinquent and probation placements by race/ethnicity since 2018?

It is difficult to discern any significant racial or ethnicity findings from the data because of the change in the categorization of many young people to the "other" category. In 2022 the race/ethnic group listed as "other" accounted for 96.8% (61) of all probation placements and accounted for 86.2% of all probation placements in 2018 (50). The same category of youth comprised a small number of juveniles being adjudicated delinquent with 4 in 2018 and 6 in 2022.

SECURE PLACEMENTS

- **For Questions 24-26, use Table 8: Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 and 2022.**

24. Using Table 8, describe the total number of juveniles securely placed, the number of juveniles securely placed by race/ethnicity and the percent of total secure placements by race/ethnicity in 2022.

In 2022 there were a total of 7 juveniles securely placed; 1 youth categorized as White representing 14.3% of the total population; 4 youth categorized as "Black" representing 57.1%; 2 Hispanic

young people representing 28.6%; and 0 categorized as "other".

25. Using Table 8 (% Change in Secure Placements 2018-2022 column) rank the percent change in juveniles securely placed by race/ethnicity, beginning with the category that has the highest change. Describe how the secure placement of juveniles by race/ethnicity has changed since 2018.

Rank of percentage change (highest to lowest) by race/ethnicity since 2018:

- 1) White (100.0% increase)
- 2) Hispanic (100.0% increase)
- 3) "Other" (100.0% decrease)
- 4) Black (20.0% decrease)

The White juvenile population increased from 0 secure placements in 2018 to 1 in 2022. The Black juvenile population decreased from 5 secured placements in 2018 to 4 in 2022. The Hispanic juvenile population increased from 1 secured placement in 2018 to 2 in 2022. The race/ethnic category listed as "other" decreased in secured placements from 1 in 2018 to 0 in 2022.

26. Using the answers to questions 24-25, what are the most significant findings about the secure placement of juveniles in 2022? What are the most significant findings about how the secure placement of juveniles by race/ethnicity has changed since 2018?

In 2022 the black juvenile population accounts for 57.1% of all secured placements and in 2018 accounts for 71.4% of all secured placements. The most significant finding is that a majority of youth in secure placements are Black, which is a disproportionate representation of the youth population in Hudson County.

- **For Questions 27-30, use Table 9: Secure Placements Compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 and 2022.**

27. Using Table 9, describe the total number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent, juveniles adjudicated delinquent by race/ethnicity, the total number of juveniles securely placed, the number of juveniles securely placed by race/ethnicity and the percent of adjudications resulting in secure confinement by race/ethnicity in 2022.

In 2022 there were a total of 14 juveniles adjudicated delinquent and 7 juveniles securely placed.

During the year, two White youth were adjudicated delinquent and 1 was securely placed resulting in 50.0% receiving secure confinement; 3 Black young people were adjudicated delinquent with 4 secured placements resulting in 133.3% receiving secure confinement; 4 Hispanic juveniles adjudicated delinquent received 2 secure placements resulting in 50.0%; 5 youth categorized as "other" who were adjudicated delinquent received no secure confinement.

28. Using Table 9 (% Change 2018-2022), rank the percent change in juveniles adjudicated delinquent race/ethnicity categories beginning with the category that has the highest change. Describe the changes in juveniles adjudicated delinquent since 2018.

Rank of percentage change (highest to lowest) by race/ethnicity since 2018:

- 1) White (100.0% increase)
- 2) Black (50.0% increase)
- 3) Hispanic (33.3% increase)
- 4) "Other" (25.0% increase)

The White juvenile population increased from 1 adjudicated delinquent in 2018 to 2 in 2022. The Black juvenile population increased from 2 adjudicated delinquent in 2018 to 3 in 2022. The Hispanic juvenile population increased from 3 adjudicated delinquent in 2018 to 4 in 2022. The race/ethnic category listed as "other" increased in adjudicated delinquent from 4 in 2018 to 5 in 2022.

29. Using Table 9 (% Change 2018-2022), rank the percent change in secure placements by race/ethnicity category, beginning with the category that has the highest change. Describe the changes in juveniles securely placed by race/ethnicity since 2018.

Rank of percentage change (highest to lowest) by race/ethnicity since 2018:

- 1) White (100.0% increase)
- 2) Hispanic (100.0% increase)
- 3) "Other" (100.0% decrease)
- 4) Black (20.0% decrease)

The White juvenile population increased from 0 secure placements in 2018 to 1 in 2022. The Black juvenile population decreased from 5 secured placements in 2018 to 4 in 2022. The Hispanic juvenile population increased from 1 secured placement in 2018 to 2 in 2022. The race/ethnic category listed as "other" decreased in secured placements from 1 in 2018 to 0 in 2022.

30. Using the answers to questions 27-29, what are the most significant findings about the total number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent, juveniles adjudicated delinquent by race/ethnicity, the total number of juveniles securely placed, the number of juveniles securely placed by race/ethnicity and the percent of adjudications resulting in secure confinement by race/ethnicity in 2022? What are the most significant findings about the comparison between the percent change in juveniles adjudicated delinquent and in juveniles securely placed overall by race/ethnicity since 2018?

The use of the "other" category in 2022 makes it difficult to discern significant race/ethnicity findings across the period. However, it is evident that the Black juvenile population disproportionately represents the majority of youth in secure confinement. In 2022 the black juvenile population accounts for 57.1% of all secured placements and in 2018 accounted for 71.4% of all secured placements.

JAMS DISPOSITION PROGRAM INFORMATION 2022

- **For Questions 31-35, run the following JAMS reports for 2022: intakes by gender, race, and age, and by problem areas, services intervention provided, and services intervention needed. Use these reports to answer questions 31-35.**

31. Looking at each disposition program, describe disposition program intakes by program in 2022.
In 2022, there were a total of 24 disposition intakes in JAMS.

32. Looking at each dispositional program, describe dispositional program intakes by gender, race, and age by in 2022.

In 2022, there were a total of 21 males and 3 females intakes for dispositional programs. Intakes by race in 2022 are as follows: 8 Black, 11 Hispanic, 2 Other and 1 White. Please note, JAMS does not generate dispositional program intakes by age reports.

33. Using Table 10, look at the ranking of problem areas in 2022, describe the problem areas identified in your county starting with the problem area that has the highest total.

In 2022 the problem areas identified were as follows: 37 reported personality/behavior; 28 reported family circumstances/parenting; 24 reported attitudes/orientation; 19 reported peer relations; 12 reported education; 11 reported vocational skills/employment; 5 reported substance use; 1 with medical problems; 1 reported "other".

34. Using Table 11, look at the ranking of service interventions provided in 2022, describe the service interventions identified in your county starting with the service intervention category that has the highest total.

In 2022 the service interventions identified were sex offender services (15); anger management training (9); counseling/individual (9); supervision (9); decision making skills training (8); life skills training (8); role model/mentor (8); interpersonal skills training(7); substance use treatment (7); and recreation/socialization (5).

35. Using Table 12, look at the ranking of service interventions needed in 2022, describe the service interventions needed in your county starting with the services needed category that has the highest total.

In 2022 the service interventions needed were supervision (4); role model/mentor (3); academic education (3); case management (2); medication/monitoring (1); and substance use treatment (1).

36. Using the answers to questions 31-35, what are the most significant findings about program intakes by program gender, race, and age, and by, problem areas, service interventions identified, and service interventions needed in 2022?

Program intake data analyzed by gender, race/ethnicity age indicates that a majority of dispositional intakes are Black and Hispanic males in need of the following services and interventions: sex

offender treatment, anger management, individual counseling and mentoring/role modeling.

OTHER DATA

➤ **Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need**

37. Was additional data used in your county's planning process? (If other data was used, please attach a copy.) If so, what does that data tell you about how your County's overall need for disposition programs has changed in recent years and about the needs and characteristics of youth that should be addressed through your county's juvenile disposition plan? Are there additional data that relates to Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial and Ethnic Disparities?

YSC staff conducted key informant interviews and focus groups to identify priority service needs and gaps. Findings revealed a high need for dispositional option programs and services and actions that address Disproportionate Minority Contact and/or Racial And Ethnic Disparities.

IMPLICATIONS FOR COMMUNITY-BASED DISPOSITION PROGRAMS PLAN

Extent and Nature of Need: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent

38. Taken together, what does the answers to questions 6,9,13 and 16 tell you about your county's juvenile adjudicated population by gender, by race/ethnicity, by age, by disposition, and as compared to arrests in 2022 and since 2018? How does this information inform the need for disposition programs in your county?

Overall, the data reveals that Black and Hispanic males between the ages of 15 to 17 are in need of disposition programs in Hudson County. In 2022 the ages between 15 and 17 accounted for 76.6% of all juveniles adjudicated. In 2018 the ages 15-16 accounted for 50.6% of all juveniles adjudicated, representing 165 out of a total of 326.

Extent and Nature of Need: Juveniles Disposed to JJC Probation Placements

39. Taken together, what do the answers to questions 19 and 23 tell you about total probation placements, the change in probation placements by race/ethnicity, probation placements compared to juveniles adjudicated delinquent by race/ethnicity in 2022 and since 2018? How does this information inform the need for disposition programs in your county?

In 2018, it is notable that probation accounted for 95% (267) out of the total number of 279 juvenile cases adjudicated delinquent.. During 2018 to 2022, the probation placements intakes by race/ethnicity were reported as Other. In 2022 the race/ethnic group listed as "other" accounted for 96.8% of all probation placements. This data does not accurately describe probation placements and juveniles adjudicated delinquent and therefore it is difficult to draw productive race/ethnicity conclusions from the data.

Extent and Nature of Need: Juveniles Disposed to JJC Secure Placements

40. Taken together, what do the answers to questions 26 and 29 tell you about total secure placements, the change in secure placements by race/ethnicity and secure placements compared to juveniles adjudicated delinquent by race/ethnicity in 2022 and since 2018? How does this information inform the need for disposition programs in your county?

Collectively, the information from the reponses to questions 26 and 29 support the evidence that the majority of secure placements and adjudicated delinquent by race/ethnicity are Black youth.

Extent and Nature of Need: Other County Data

41. Review the answers to question 37, what are the most significant findings overall, through the lens of racial and ethnic disparities and through the lens of disproportionate minority contact? How does this information inform the need for disposition programs in your county?

Through the lens of racial and ethnic disparities and disproportionate minority contact, the information provided informs the need for disposition programs for Black and Hispanic males and to concentrate services in areas where the majority of Black and Hispanic youth reside in Hudson County.

Problem Areas and Funded Disposition Programs in 2022

42. Review the answer to question 36, what are the most significant findings about program intakes by gender, race, and age and by problem areas, service intervention provided, and services intervention needed in 2022. How does this information inform the need for disposition programs in your county?

The data provided demonstrates the need for the following services and interventions for dispositional programs in Hudson County: sex offender treatment, anger management, individual counseling and a role model/mentor program. In addition, qualitative data through key informant interviews supports the need to provide young people with positive youth development and pro-social experiences.

RECOMMENDATIONS

43. Looking at your answers to Questions 22, 23, 24 and 25, state the problem or county trends to be addressed. Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend. State how will the CYSC address the problem or county trend.

PJ*	What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
A	The need for age-appropriate sex offender treatment	<p>Table 11: In 2022 the service interventions identified were sex offender service with 15; anger management training with 9; counseling/individual with 9; supervision with 9; decision making skills training with 8; life skills training with 8; role model/mentor with 8; interpersonal skills training with 7; substance use treatment with 7; and recreation/socialization with 5. The information informs the need for the following services and interventions for dispositional programs in Hudson County: sex offender treatment, anger management, individual counseling and a role model or mentor.</p>	The County will address sex offenders by providing age-appropriate treatment, separating youth ages 10 to 17 from youth 18 and over with a juvenile sex offense.
B	Address behavior, peer relations, academic support and positive youth development	<p>Table 2 and 3: the information shows that Black and Hispanic Males between the ages of 15 to 17 are in need for disposition programs in Hudson County. In 2022 the ages between 15 and 17 accounted for 76.6% of all juveniles adjudicated. In 2018 the ages 15-16 accounted for 50.6% of all juveniles adjudicated with 165 out of the total 326.</p> <p>In 2022 the problem areas identified were 37 reported personality/behavior; 28 reported family circumstances/parenting; 24 reported attitudes/orientation; 19 reported peer relations; 12 reported education; 11 reported vocational skills/employment; substance use with 5; medical</p>	The County will provide an Evening Reporting Center that will assist youth pre- and post-adjudication who are involved in Juvenile Court. Services will run in the evenings and on weekends.

		problems with 1; and "other" with 1. Key Informant Interviews indicated the need to provide youth with positive youth development and pro-social experiences.	
C	Address lack of parent support for parents and caregivers of system-involved youth.	In 2022 the problem areas identified were 37 reported personality/behavior; 28 reported family circumstances/parenting; 24 reported attitudes/orientation; 19 reported peer relations; 12 reported education; 11 reported vocational skills/employment; substance use with 5; medical problems with 1; and "other" with 1. Key Informant Interviews indicated the need for parent support and assistance for parents of children in the justice system.	The County will provide Juvenile Justice Family Services to connect parents and caregivers of system involved youth to appropriate resources needed as they navigate the justice system.
D			
E			
F			
G			

*Plan Justification: Use this letter to identify the funded program or service to address this recommendation.

Comments:

44. In reviewing all the above analysis questions, what recommendations or strategies would your county make with regards to disposition policies and practices through the lens of race and ethnicity? What recommendations or strategies would your county consider to ensure similar outcomes for similarly situated youth?

Comments:

REENTRY ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

- **When answering questions regarding trends, describe *whether* any change has occurred, the *direction* of any change (e.g., increase, decrease), and the *size* of any change (e.g., small, moderate, large).**
- **When answering questions regarding rank order, draw comparisons between categories (e.g., using terms like least/smallest, most/largest).**

NATURE & EXTENT OF REENTRY POPULATION

JUVENILE PROBATIONERS ADMITTED TO JJC RESIDENTIAL

1. Using the data in Table 1 (Juvenile Probationers Admitted to JJC Residential by Race/Ethnicity 2018-2022), describe the total number of youth admitted as a probationer to JJC residential, the number of youth admitted by race/ethnicity and % of total for each category in 2022.
 In 2022, the total number of youth admitted as a probationer to JJC residential was 3 youth. 66% of youth were Black youth and 33% were Hispanic youth.

2. Using the data in Table 1 (% Change in Juvenile Probationers Admitted to JJC Residential by Race/Ethnicity, 2018-2022 column). Describe the total percent change, then rank the categories by percent change, starting with the category that has the highest percent change. Describe the rank order by drawing comparisons between the categories. Describe trends by indicating whether any change has occurred, the direction of any change and the size of any change.
 The rank of percentage change (greatest to least) from 2018 to 2022 in probationers admitted to JJC residential by race/ethnicity is as follows:
 - 1) White (100% decrease: 8 youth in 2018 compared to 0 youth in 2022)
 - 2) Black (60% decrease: 5 youth in 2018 compared to 2 youth in 2022)
 - 3) Hispanic (0% change: 1 youth in 2018 remained the same in 2022)
 - 4) Other (0 youth reported in 2018 and 0 in 2022)

3. Using the information in Questions 1-2, what does this information tell you about the Juvenile Probationers Admitted in the year 2022? How has the total number of juvenile probationers admitted to JJC residential programs changed since 2018? How has probationer admissions by race/ethnicity changed since 2018?
 The number of juvenile probationers admitted to JJC residential has significantly decreased since 2018. In 2018, there was a total of 14 youth admitted to JJC residential and in 2022 there were only 3 youth admitted to JJC residential.

JUVENILES RELEASED TO PROBATION REENTRY SUPERVISION

4. Using the data in Table 2 (Juvenile Probationers Released by Type, 2018-2022), describe the total number of juvenile probationers released from a residential program in 2022.

In 2022, there were 4 youth released from JJC residential.

5. Using the data in Table 3 (Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential Programs by Race and Gender) describe total released, releases by race/ethnicity category and releases by gender in 2022.

In 2022, there were a total of 4 Black Male youth released from JJC residential. No other race/ethnicity or females were released in 2022.

6. Using the data in Table 3 (Percent Change in Probationers Released, 2018-2022 column), describe the total percent change, then rank the race/ethnicity categories by percent change starting with the category that has the highest change. Rank the gender categories by percent change starting with the category that has the highest changes. Describe the rank order by drawing comparisons between the categories.

The rank of percentage change in probationers released from JJC residential programs between 2018 to 2022 by race/ethnicity is as follows:

- 1) Black Males (400% increase: 0 Black Males in 2018 and 4 Black Males in 2022)
- 2) Black Females (100% decrease: 5 Black Females in 2018 and 0 Black Females in 2022)
- 3) White Males (100% decrease: 1 White Male in 2018 and 0 White Males in 2022)

7. Using the data in Table 4: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential Programs by Age, 2018-2022, describe the total number of juvenile probationers released from a residential program, the number of probationers released by each age category, and the percent of total for each age category in 2022.

In 2022, there were a total of 4 probationers released from JJC residential programs, 2 youth were between the ages of 17-18, 1 youth between the ages of 15-16, 1 youth ages 14 and under and 0 youth ages 19 and over. The age with the highest percentage change between 2018 and 2022 is ages 15 to 16 years old, with a 200% change (In 2018, 3 youth between the ages of 15-16)

8. Using the data in Table 5 (Offenses of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers by Type, 2018-2022 column) describe the number of offenses and the % of total for each category in 2022.

In 2022, there were 2 Persons Offenses and 2 Weapons Offenses for probationers placed in residential.

9. Using the data in Table 5 (% Change in Offenses by Type column), rank the categories starting with the categories that have the highest percent change. Describe the rank order by drawing comparisons between the categories.

The rank of percentage change of offenses by residentially placed juvenile probationers by type between 2018 and 2022 is as follows:

- 1) Property (100% decrease: 1 Property offense in 2018 and 2 Property offenses in 2022)
- 2) Weapons (33% decrease: 3 Weapons offenses in 2018 and 2 Weapons offenses in 2022)
- 3) Persons (0% change)
- 4) CDS (0% change)

- 5) Public Order (0% change)
- 6) VOP (0% change)

10. Using the data in Table 6 (Juvenile Probationers Released from Pinelands, 2018-2022), describe the number of juvenile probationers released from Pinelands in 2022 and describe the percent change in juvenile probationers released from Pinelands since 2018.

In 2018, two (2) youth were released from Pinelands and in 2022, zero (0) youth were released.

11. Using the answers to questions 4-10, what are the most significant about juvenile probationers released from residential programs in 2022? What are the most significant findings about probationers released from residential program since 2018?

The most significant findings about probationers released from residential programs between 2018 and 2022 is that the number of youth admitted has substantially decreased.

COMMITTED JUVENILES TO THE JJC

12. Using the data in Table 7 (Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC by Race/Ethnicity, 2018-2022), describe the total number of juveniles committed to the JJC and the number and percent of total for each race/ethnicity category in 2022.

From 2018 to 2022 the total remained the same, with 7 youth committed juveniles admitted to JJC. In 2022, there was a total of 4 Black youth, 2 Hispanic youth and 1 White youth.

13. Using the data in Table 7 (% Change in Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC, 2018-2022 column), rank the percent change in committed juveniles admitted to JJC between 2018 and 2022, beginning with the category that has the highest percent change. Describe the rank order by drawing comparisons between the categories.

From 2018 to 2022 there was a 100% increase of Hispanic and White committed juveniles admitted to JJC, while there was 100% decrease for youth listed as Other, and 20% decrease for Black youth.

- 1) Hispanic (100% increase)
- 2) White (100% increase)
- 3) Other (100% decrease)
- 4) Black (20% decrease)

14. Using the answers to questions 12-13, what are the most significant findings about juveniles committed to the JJC?

The total number of youth committed to JJC has remained the same between 2018 and 2022.

COMMITTED JUVENILES RELEASED FROM THE JJC

15. Using the data in Table 8 (Committed Juveniles Released to Juvenile Parole Supervision, 2018-2022), describe the total number of committed juveniles released to juvenile parole

supervision in 2018 & in 2022. Describe the percent change in committed juveniles released to parole supervision between 2018 and 2022.

In 2018, there were 5 youth released to parole and in 2022 there were 2 youth released from parole, with a 60% decrease in change between 2018 and 2022.

16. Using the data in Table 9 (Average Length of Stay of Committed Juveniles Released (in months), 2018-2022), describe the average length of stay in committed juveniles released in 2018 and in 2022. Describe the percent change in average length of stay since 2018.

There was a significant decrease in the average length of stay for committed juveniles released. In 2018 the average length of stay of committed juveniles released was 29.7 months, and in 2022 the average length of stay was only 4 months. The average length of stay between 2018 and 2022 decreased by 86.5%.

17. Using the data in Table 10 (Committed Juveniles Released by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2018-2022), describe total releases, releases by race/ethnicity category and releases by gender in 2022.

In 2022, there was a total of 2 releases: 1 Black Male and 1 Hispanic Male.

18. Using the data in Table 10 (% Change in Committed Juveniles Released by Race/Ethnicity and Gender, 2018-2022 column), rank the race/ethnicity categories by percent change beginning with the category that has the highest change. Describe the rank order by drawing comparisons between the categories. Rank the gender categories by percent change, beginning with the category that has the highest change. Describe the rank order by drawing comparisons between the categories.

The rank of percentage change in committed juveniles released by race/ethnicity and gender between 2018 and 2022 is as follows:

- 1) Other Males (100% decrease: 1 Other Male in 2018 and 0 Other Males in 2022)
- 2) Black Males (80 decrease: 5 Black Males in 2018 and 1 Black Male in 2022)
- 3) Hispanic Males (0% change: 1 Hispanic Male in 2018 and 1 Hispanic Male in 2022)
- 4) Hispanic Females (0% change: 0 youth in 2018 and 2022)
- 5) White Males and Females (0% change: 0 youth in 2018 and 2022)

19. Using the data in Table 11 (Committed Juveniles Released by Age, 2018-2022), describe total releases and releases by age category in 2022.

In 2022, the only age group for committed juveniles released was 17-18 years old, with a total of 2 youth.

20. Using the data in Table 11 (% Change Committed Juveniles Released by Age, 2018-2022 column), rank the age categories by percent change beginning with the category that has the highest change. Describe the rank order by drawing comparisons between the categories.

The rank of percentage change in committed juveniles released by age between 2018 and 2022 is as follows:

- 1) Ages 19 and over (100% decrease: 4 youth in 2018 and 0 youth in 2022)
- 2) Ages 17-18 (33.3% decrease: 3 youth in 2018 and 2 youth in 2022)
- 3) Ages 14 and under (0% change: 0 youth in 2018 and 2022)
- 4) Ages 15-16 (0% change: 0 youth in 2018 and 2022)

21. Using the data in Table 12 (Offenses of Committed Juveniles by Type, 2018-2022), describe the offenses of committed juveniles by type by category in 2022.

In 2022, there was a total of 1 Weapons offense and 1 Property offense of committed juveniles admitted to the JJC.

22. Using the data in Table 12 (% Change in Offenses of Committed Juveniles by Type, 2018-2022 column), rank the categories by percent change, beginning with the category that has the highest change. Describe the rank order by drawing comparisons between the categories.

The rank of percentage change in offenses of committed juveniles by type between 2018 and 2022 is as follows:

- 1) Weapons (100% increase: 0 offenses in 2018 and 1 offense in 2022)
- 2) Persons (100% decrease: 2 offenses in 2018 and 0 offenses in 2022)
- 3) VOP (100% decrease: 2 offenses in 2018 and 0 offenses in 2022)
- 4) Public Order (100% decrease: 1 offense in 2018 and 0 offenses in 2022)
- 5) Property (0% change: 1 offense in 2018 and 1 offense in 2022)
- 6) CDS (0% change: 0 offenses in 2018 and 0 offenses in 2022)

23. Using the data in Table 13, (Committed Juveniles with a Sex Offense Charge in their History, 2018-2022), describe the number of committed juveniles who had a sex offense charge in their history in 2018 and in 2022. Using the percent change column, describe the percent change in committed juveniles who had a sex offense charge in their history.

There was a 100% decrease in committed juveniles with a sex offense charge in their history. In 2018 there were 3 youth with a sex offense charge and in 2022 there were 0 youth with a sex offense charge in their history.

24. Using the answers to questions 15-23, what are your most significant findings about committed juveniles released from JJC?

The most significant findings about committed juveniles released from JJC is the number of youth admitted, released, average length of stay, committed to JJC and with a sex offense charge in their history has decreased between 2018 and 2022.

JUVENILE AUTOMATED MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JAMS): REENTRY PROGRAMMING

- **For Questions 25-30, run the following JAMS reports for 2022: intakes by gender, race, and age, and by problem areas, services intervention provided, and services intervention needed. Use these reports to answer questions 25-29.**

25. Looking at each reentry program, describe reentry program intakes by program in 2022.

Hudson County did not provide reentry services through Youth Services Commission funding in 2022.

26. Looking at each reentry program, describe reentry program intakes by gender, race and age by in 2022.

Hudson County did not provide reentry services through Youth Services Commission funding in 2022.

27. Using Table 14, look at the ranking of problem areas in 2022, describe the problem areas identified in your county starting with the problem area that has the highest total.
Hudson County did not provide reentry services through Youth Services Commission funding in 2022.

28. Using Table 15, look at the ranking of service interventions provided in 2022, describe the service interventions identified in your county starting with the service intervention category that has the highest total.
Hudson County did not provide reentry services through Youth Services Commission funding in 2022.

29. Using Table 16, look at the ranking of service interventions needed in 2022, describe the service interventions needed in your county starting with the services needed category that has the highest total.
Hudson County did not provide reentry services through Youth Services Commission funding in 2022.

30. Using the answers to questions 25-29, what are the most significant findings about program intakes by gender, race, and age and by problem areas, service interventions identified, and service interventions needed in 2022?
Hudson County did not provide reentry services through Youth Services Commission funding in 2022.

OTHER DATA

- **Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need**
31. Was additional data used in your county's planning process? (If other data was used, please attach a copy.) If so, what does that data tell you about how your County's overall need for reentry programs has changed in recent years and about the needs and characteristics of youth that should be addressed through your county's juvenile reentry plan? Are there additional data that relates to Disproportionate Minority Contact or Racial and Ethnic Disparities?

IMPLICATIONS FOR REENTRY PLAN

Extent and Nature of Need- Juvenile Probationers

32. Using the information from your answers to question 3 and question 11, describe how your county will support young people returning home from residential placement on probation with programming.

Hudson County plans to implement services for youth returning home residential placement on probation by providing support and resources to prevent recidivism and promote self-sufficiency.

Extent and Nature of Need-Committed Youth

33. Using the information from your answers to question 14 and questions 24, describe your county's need for programs to support young people returning home on parole with programming.

The number of youth returning home on parole is significantly low. In 2018, a total of 5 youth returned home on parole, and in 2022 the number decreased to a total of 2 youth returning home on parole.

Extent and Nature of Need: Other County Data

34. Review the answer to question 31, what are the most significant findings overall, through the lens of racial and ethnic disparities and through the lens of disproportionate minority contact? How does this information inform the need for reentry programs in your county?

Programming Findings

35. Review the answer to question 30, what are the most significant findings about program intakes by gender, race, and age and by problem areas, service intervention provided, and services intervention needed in 2022. How does this information inform the need for reentry programs in your county?

Hudson County did not provide reentry services through Youth Services Commission funding in 2022. As a result, the County does not have data regarding program intakes by gender, race and age by problem areas, service intervention provided and services intervention needed in 2022.

Reentry Racial and Ethnic Disparities Policy Recommendations

36. In reviewing all the above analysis questions, what recommendations or strategies would your county make with regards to Reentry policy and practice through the lens of race and ethnicity? What recommendations or strategies would your county consider to ensure similar outcomes for similarly situated youth?

Our County does not plan to provide programming or services in Reentry.

RECOMMENDATIONS

37. Using your answers to questions 32-36, state the problems and county trends that need to be addressed. Cite the data that indicates the problem or need. State how the CYSC plan to address the problem or county trend.

PJ*	What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
A			
B			
C			
D			
E			
F			
G			

*Plan Justification: Use this letter to identify the funded program or service to address this recommendation.

Comments:

VISION

Hudson County

The types of programs listed, should represent what your County's ideal Continuum of Care would look like, regardless of funding limitations.

PREVENTION

Delinquency Prevention Programs are strategies and services designed to increase the likelihood that youth will remain free from initial involvement with the formal or informal juvenile justice system. The goal of delinquency prevention is to prevent youth from engaging in anti-social and delinquent behavior and from taking part in other problem behaviors that are pathways to delinquency. Primary Delinquency Prevention programs are those directed at the entire juvenile population without regard to risk of involvement in the juvenile justice system. Secondary Delinquency Prevention programs are those directed at youth who are at higher risk of involvement in the juvenile justice system than the general population. Given this goal, Delinquency Prevention programs developed through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing services that address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

PREVENTION				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by the YSC County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	Primary Prevention (ages 8-12)	No	No	No
2	Primary Prevention (ages 13-17)	No	No	No
3	New Entry Services	No	No	No
4	Secondary Delinquency Prevention	No	No	No
5	Violence Prevention	Yes	Yes	No

DIVERSION

The Diversion stage of the juvenile justice system offers alleged juvenile offenders an opportunity to avoid arrest and/or prosecution by providing alternatives to the formal juvenile justice system process. The goal of Diversion is to provide services and/or informal sanctions to youth who have begun to engage in antisocial and low level delinquent behavior in an effort to prevent youth from continuing on a delinquent pathway. Youth who do not successfully complete a diversion program may ultimately have their case referred for formal processing by the juvenile court. Given this goal, Diversion programs developed through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing services and/or informal sanctions that address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

LAW ENFORCEMENT				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by the YSC County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	Community Based Mentoring	Yes	Yes	No
2	Northern Stationhouse Adjustment	No	No	No
3	Central Stationhouse Adjustment	Yes	Yes	No
4				
5				

FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION UNIT (FCIU)				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by the YSC County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				

FAMILY COURT (DIVERSION)				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by the YSC County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1				
2				

3				
4				
5				

DETENTION

“Detention” is defined as the temporary care of juveniles in physically restricting facilities pending court disposition (N.J.A.C. 13:92-1.2).

An objective of detention is to provide secure custody for those juveniles who are deemed a threat to the physical safety of the community and/or whose confinement is necessary to insure their presence at the next court hearing (N.J.A.C. 13:92-1.3). For the purpose of this plan a limited amount of funding may be provided to support court ordered evaluations for adjudicated youth who reside in the detention center, if all other resources have been exhausted.

DETENTION				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by the YSC County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	Electronic Monitoring	Yes	Yes	No
2				
3				
4				
5				

DETENTION ALTERNATIVES

Detention Alternative Programs provide supervision to juveniles who would otherwise be placed in a secure detention facility while awaiting their adjudicatory hearing, expanding the array of pre-adjudication placement options available to the judiciary. Detention Alternative Programs/Services are not to be provided in the detention center. These programs are designed to provide short-term (30 – 60 days) supervision sufficient to safely maintain appropriate youth in the community while awaiting the final disposition of their case. Additionally, programs are designed to link to the middle category of the detention screening tool and to also provide options to judges that allow for the safe pre-dispositional release of youth admitted to detention. As such, these programs help to reduce the overall detention population and relieve detention overcrowding and its related problems where it exists.

DETENTION ALTERNATIVES				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently	Program / Service Currently Funded by the	Program / Service is not meeting need

		Exists	YSC County	therefore is a Gap
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				

DISPOSITION

Disposition is the phase of the juvenile justice system where youth adjudicated delinquent are ordered by the court to comply with specific sanctions, supervision, and services as a consequence for their delinquent behavior and as a means to redirect behavior, promote rehabilitation, and support youth on a path to success. In New Jersey, the range of dispositions available to the court include but are not limited to restitution/fines, community service, probation, and commitment to the Juvenile Justice Commission. For youth disposed to a term of probation supervision, among the conditions of probation that might be imposed by the court is the completion of a Dispositional Option Program. The structure of these Dispositional Option Programs varies, but common among these options are intensive supervision programs, day and evening reporting centers, and structured day and residential programs. Given this goal, Disposition programs developed through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing sanctions, supervision, and services that address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

DISPOSITION				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by the YSC County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	Evening Reporting Center	Yes	Yes	No
2	Juvenile Justice Family Service	No	No	No
3	Specialized Behavior Treatment	Yes	Yes	No
4	Specialized Behavior Treatment for youth ages 18+	No	No	No
5				

REENTRY

For the purposes of this plan, the use of the term Reentry only applies to committed youth paroled from a Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC) facility and supervised by the JJC’s Office of Juvenile Parole and Transitional Services and to juveniles disposed to a JJC program as a condition of probation and supervised by the Department of Probation. Reentry is a mechanism for providing additional support during this transitional period in order to foster the successful reintegration of juveniles into their communities. Given this goal, Reentry programs developed

through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing services to youth, regardless of their age, that address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

REENTRY				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by the YSC County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				