Project Overview

Recognizing the need to measure and better understand what works to keep youths on the path to successful adulthood when involved in the juvenile justice system, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) launched the Juvenile Reentry Measurement Standards project in October 2015. The project's goal is to provide the field with a set of national standards and outcome measures aligned with adolescent development research that monitor the effectiveness of reentry services and promote practices that result in positive youth outcomes. OJJDP selected the PbS Learning Institute (PbS), the developers of the successful PbS standards continuous improvement model for facilities and residential programs, to lead the project. PbS and its partners, the Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators (CJCA) and the Vera Institute of Justice (Vera), are combining their expertise to develop a set of national measurement standards grounded in research and existing reentry best practices provided from the time a youth is confined through transition and post-release supervision.

The project consists of four main tasks:

1. Identify key indicators for measuring the juvenile reentry process by synthesizing and analyzing current literature and existing reentry services, practices and data.
2. Translate the key indicators identified in task 1 to develop reentry measurement standards that are user-friendly, understandable and aligned with research.
3. Pilot test the measurement standards for essential feedback.
4. Provide revised, final recommendations to OJJDP that are meaningful and feasible for juvenile justice programs and services.

This progress report presents a summary of the first task: literature review.

Establishing a Framework

PbS and partners began by identifying topical domains – areas of youth reentry activity and knowledge – as the framework to focus both the literature review and field scan. To select the domains, PbS reviewed the criteria and other relevant information included in OJJDP's Request for Proposals (RFP), drew upon the team's reentry research knowledge and experience and consulted with reentry and positive youth development experts. PbS drafted an initial list of 11 domains, collected feedback from the project's Technical Working Group members[1] and selected reentry leaders.

Incorporating the feedback, the domains selected were:
- Assessment
- Case Management
- Cross-system Collaboration
- Implementation
- Cost-effectiveness
- Recidivism

---

[1] Technical Working Group comprised of juvenile justice and reentry leaders, programs, researchers and youths.

- Educational Achievement
- Gainful Employment
- Well-being and Health
- Family and Social Supports
- Community Connection and Contribution

Specific practices within each domain were identified initially and the list expanded as the review and scan progressed.[2] A total of 134 practices were examined to learn about the level of research support and prevalence of current implementation across the country.

Literature Review Criteria and Approach

The project team determined criteria for selecting articles to include in the literature review: published between 2000-2016 or considered a reentry classic; research conducted within the United States and focused on reentry practices for youths transitioning from residential custody and community supervision. The review looked at quantitative and qualitative research and included youth- and system-level studies.

Vera began looking at in-house literature searches from prior projects and "classics" (e.g. well-known studies). Next, the snowball technique was used, by which an initial search for studies and reference lists helped to identify existing meta-analyses and systematic reviews. This was followed by an electronic database search (e.g. criminal justice abstracts). Finally, to fill in any remaining gaps and supplement other information gathered, Vera reviewed national juvenile justice organization websites such as the National Institute of Justice's *CrimeSolutions.Gov* website.

Vera identified a total of 173 studies for the literature review. Each study was coded using a tier system ranking based on methodological rigor. More than half (53%) of the studies (92) were categorized as Tier 1, or baseline quality research, 39% (68) were categorized as Tier 2, or moderate quality research and 8% (13) were Tier 3 research, of the highest quality.

General Findings

The review of literature and research studies for the project supports the development of effective youth reentry programs for youths' successful transition and readjustment to their homes and communities. At the same time, implementation of the right programs for the right youths is key. These findings are demonstrated by the following highlights:

- Implement an evidence-based, youth-informed comprehensive reentry planning process that starts at a youth's admission to detention, correctional or residential placement;
- Design reentry and aftercare programs to serve youths' individualized needs, using appropriate risk and needs assessment tools;
- Develop strategies to forge partnerships with stakeholders including families and social supports, and youth-serving agencies and institutions to effectively address youths' needs that are crucial to their success upon re-entry to the community (e.g. education, employment, substance use, family relations, housing); and
- Institute data monitoring systems to track each released youth's reentry planning process and the rates at which youth have further justice system involvement – to continue to identify the services being delivered, what works, gaps and to develop and improve practices and programs as indicated.

---

[2] Please see Progress Report: Field Scan Findings for results of the field scan.

Reentry Practices Strongly-Supported by Research by Domain

The literature review identified the following reentry practices as being strongly supported by research. They are listed below by domain with the cites used in the review.

Assessment Practices

Practice	Cite
Individualized assessments are guided by the risk/ needs/ responsivity framework and guide treatment plan Assessments identify and divert youths better served by other agencies (e.g. mental health, substance use, developmentally delayed)	1. Olver, M. E., Stockdale, K. C., and Wong, S. C. P. (2012). Short and long-term prediction of recidivism using the youth level of service/case management inventory in a sample of serious young offenders. *Law and Human Behavior. 36*(4). 331-344. *(tier 1)*
	2. Schmidt, F., Hoge, R. D., and Gomes, L. (2005). Reliability and validity analyses of the youth level of service/case management inventory. *Criminal Justice and Behavior. 32*(3). 329-344. *(tier 2)*
	3. Bechtel, K., Lowenkamp, C. T., and Latessa, E. (2007). Assessing the risk of reoffending for juvenile offenders using the youth level of service/case management inventory. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation. 45*(3/4). 85-108. *(tier 2)*
Data on youths assessed/ completed assessments are collected, reported and analyzed	1. Singh, J. P., Desmarais, S. L., Sellers, B. G., Hylton, T., Tirotti, M., and VanDom, R. A. (2014). From risk assessment to risk management: Matching interventions to adolescent offenders' strengths and vulnerabilities. *Children and Youth Services Review. 47*. 1-9. *(tier 2)*
	2. Lopez, A., Yoder, J. R., Brisson, D., Lechuga-Pena, S., and Jenson, J. M. (2015). Development and validation of a positive youth development measure: The bridge-positive youth development. *Research on Social Work Practice. 25*(6). 726-736. *(tier 1)*
	3. Bechtel, K., Lowenkamp, C. T., and Latessa, E. (2007). Assessing the risk of reoffending for juvenile offenders using the youth level of service/case management inventory. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation. 45*(3/4). 85-108. *(tier 2)*
	4. Campbell, C., Onifade, E., Barnes, A., Peterson, J., Anderson, V., Davidson, W., and Gordon, D. (2014). Screening offenders: The exploration of a youth level of service/case management inventory (YLS/CMI) brief screener. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation. 53*. 19-34. *(tier 2)*
	5. Schmidt, F., Hoge, R. D., and Gomes, L. (2005). Reliability and validity analyses of the youth level of service/case management inventory. *Criminal Justice and Behavior. 32*(3). 329-344. *(tier 2)*
	6. Schwalbe, C. S. (2008). A meta-analysis of juvenile justice risk assessment instruments: Predictive validity by gender. *Criminal Justice and Behavior. 35*(11). 1367-1381. *(tier 2)*

Implementation Practices

Practice	Cite
Data collected, reported and analyzed about youths' improvement/ corrective action plans and monitored for problems and achievements	1. Spencer, M. B. and Jones-Walker, C. (2004). Interventions and services offered to former juvenile offenders reentering their communities: An analysis of program effectiveness. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice. 2*(1). 88-97. *(tier 1)*
	2. Prichard, M., Nissen, L.B., Farrell, P., Moore, M. (2011). Reclaiming futures: Using communication to drive community and systems change. *Children and Youth Services Review. 33.* S34-S40. *(tier 1)*
	3. Sexton, T., and Turner, C. W. (2010). The effectiveness of functional family therapy for youth with behavioral problems in a community practice setting. *Journal of Family Psychology. 24*(3). 339-348. *(tier 2)*
	4. Singh, J. P., Desmarais, S. L., Sellers, B. G., Hylton, T., Tirotti, M., and VanDom, R. A. (2014). From risk assessment to risk management: Matching interventions to adolescent offenders' strengths and vulnerabilities. *Children and Youth Services Review. 47.* 1-9. *(tier 2)*
	5. Lopez, A., Yoder, J. R., Brisson, D., Lechuga-Pena, S., and Jenson, J. M. (2015). Development and validation of a positive youth development measure: The bridge-positive youth development. *Research on Social Work Practice. 25*(6). 726-736. *(tier 1)*
Program purpose/ approach based on research	1. Rudes, D. S., Lerch, J., and Taxman, F.S. (2011). Implementing a reentry framework at a correctional facility: Challenges to the culture. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation. 50.* 467-491. *(tier 3)*
	2. Lipsey, M. W., Wilson, D. B., and Cothern, L. (2000). Effective intervention for serious juvenile offenders. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Juvenile Justice Bulletin. Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/181201.pdf *(tier 2)*

Educational Achievement Practices

Practice	Cite
Career/ technical education offered	1. Spencer, M. B. and Jones-Walker, C. (2004). Interventions and services offered to former juvenile offenders reentering their communities: An analysis of program effectiveness. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice. 2*(1). 88-97. *(tier 1)*
	2. Prichard, M., Nissen, L.B., Farrell, P., Moore, M. (2011). Reclaiming futures: Using communication to drive community and systems change. *Children and Youth Services Review. 33.* S34-S40. *(tier 1)*
	3. Sexton, T., and Turner, C. W. (2010). The effectiveness of functional family therapy for youth with behavioral problems in a community practice setting. *Journal of Family Psychology. 24*(3). 339-348. *(tier 2)*
	4. Singh, J. P., Desmarais, S. L., Sellers, B. G., Hylton, T., Tirotti, M., and VanDom, R. A. (2014). From risk assessment to risk management: Matching interventions to adolescent offenders' strengths and vulnerabilities. *Children and Youth Services Review. 47.* 1-9. *(tier 2)*
	5. Lopez, A., Yoder, J. R., Brisson, D., Lechuga-Pena, S., and Jenson, J. M. (2015). Development and validation of a positive youth development measure: The bridge-positive youth development. *Research on Social Work Practice. 25*(6). 726-736. *(tier 1)*
Collect and use data to monitor academic progress	1. Unruh, D. K., Gau, J. M., and Waintrup, M. G. (2009). An exploration of factors reducing recidivism rates of formerly incarcerated youth with disabilities participating in a re-entry intervention. *Journal of Child & Family Studies. 18.* 284-293. *(tier 2)*

Educational assessment of youths' competencies, needs and learning style	1. Bouffard, J. A., and Bergeron, L. E. (2006). Reentry works: The implementation and effectiveness of a serious and violent offender reentry initiative. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation. 44* (2/3). 1-29. *(tier 2)*
High school diploma and GED programs	1. Chung, H. L., Schubert, C. A., and Mulvey, E. P. (2007). An empirical portrait of community reentry among serious juvenile offenders in two metropolitan cities. *Criminal Justice Behavior. 34*(11). 1402-1426. *(tier 3)*

Gainful Employment Practices

Practice	Cite
Data on employment time (e.g. types, numbers of kids, hours)	1. Goldkind, L. (2011). A leadership opportunity for school social workers: Bridging the gaps in school reentry for juvenile justice system youths. *Children and Schools. 33*(4). 229-239. *(tier 1)*

Well-being and Health Practices

Practice	Cite
Physical fitness programs promoted	1. Bergseth, K. J., and McDonald, T. D. (2007). Reentry services: An evaluation of a pilot project in Clay County, MN. Retrieved from http://www.claycountycollaborative.org/projects/RSP%20Final%20Report%202007.pdf *(tier 1)*
Identify, facilitate, and encourage available, meaningful family and social connections	1. Madden, E. E., Maher, E. J., McRoy, R. G., Ward, K. J., Peveto, L, and Stanley, A. (2012). Family reunification of youth in foster care with complex mental health needs: Barriers and recommendations. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal. 29*. 221-240. *(tier 1)*
	2. Chuang, E., and Wells, R. (2010). The role of inter-agency collaboration in facilitating receipt of behavioral health services for youth involved with child welfare and juvenile justice. *Children and Youth Services Review. 32*. 1814-1822. *(tier 1)*
	3. Visher, C. A., Lattimore, P. K., Barrick, K., and Tueller, S. (2016). Evaluating the longterm effects of prisoner reentry services on recidivism: What types of services matter? *Justice Quarterly*. DOI: 10.1080/07418825.2015.1115539 *(tier 1)*

Family and Social Supports Practices

Practice	Cite
FSS engaged in treatment and reentry planning (e.g. part of the treatment team)	1. Early, K. W., Chapman, S. F., and Hand, G. A. (2013) Family-focused juvenile reentry services: A quasi-experimental design evaluation of recidivism outcomes. *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Journal of Juvenile Justice. 2*(2). 1-22. *(tier 3)*
	2. Drake, E. K., Aos, S., and Miller, M. G. (2009). Evidence-based public policy options to reduce crime and criminal justice costs: Implications in Washington state. *Victims and Offenders. 4*. 170-196. *(tier 2)*

	3. Prichard, M., Nissen, L.B., Farrell, P., Moore, M. (2011). Reclaiming futures: Using communication to drive community and systems change. *Children and Youth Services Review. 33*. S34-S40. *(tier 1)*
	4. Abrams, L. S. (2006). From corrections to community: Youth offenders' perceptions of the challenges of transition. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation. 44*(2/3). 31-53. *(tier 1)*
	5. Klein, N. C., Alexander, J. F., and Parsons, B. V. (1977). Impact of family systems intervention on recidivism and sibling delinquency: A model of primary prevention and program evaluation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 45*(3).469-474. *(tier 3)*
	6. Sexton, T., and Turner, C. W. (2010). The effectiveness of functional family therapy for youth with behavioral problems in a community practice setting. *Journal of Family Psychology. 24*(3). 339-348. *(tier 2)*
	7. Sells, S., Sullivan, I., and DeVore, D. (2012). Stopping the madness: A new reentry system for juvenile corrections. *Corrections Today. 74*(2). 40-45. *(tier 2)*
Family support services, including counseling	1. Early, K. W., Chapman, S. F., and Hand, G. A. (2013) Family-focused juvenile reentry services: A quasi-experimental design evaluation of recidivism outcomes. *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Journal of Juvenile Justice. 2*(2). 1-22. *(tier 3)*
	2. Abrams, L.S., and Snyder, S. M. (2010). Youth offender reentry: Models for intervention and directions for future inquiry. *Children and Youth Services Review. 32*. 1787-1795. *(tier 1)*
	3. Prichard, M., Nissen, L.B., Farrell, P., Moore, M. (2011). Reclaiming futures: Using communication to drive community and systems change. *Children and Youth Services Review. 33*. S34-S40. *(tier 1)*
	4. Abrams, L. S. (2006). From corrections to community: Youth offenders' perceptions of the challenges of transition. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation. 44*(2/3). 31-53. *(tier 1)*
	5. Klein, N. C., Alexander, J. F., and Parsons, B. V. (1977). Impact of family systems intervention on recidivism and sibling delinquency: A model of primary prevention and program evaluation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 45*(3). 469-474. *(tier 3)*
Flexible hours for frequent phone contact and teleconferencing Flexible visiting hours and inclusive list of allowed visitors (siblings, positive friends, own children)	1. Monahan, K. C., Goldweber, A., Cauffman, E. (2011). The effects of visitation on incarcerated juvenile offenders: How contact with the outside impacts adjustment on the inside. *Law and Human Behavior. 35*(2). 143-151. *(tier 2)*
Use of evidence-based/ supported services (e.g. FFT, MST, MDFT)	1. Drake, E. K., Aos, S., and Miller, M. G. (2009). Evidence-based public policy options to reduce crime and criminal justice costs: Implications in Washington state. *Victims and Offenders. 4*. 170-196. *(tier 2)*
	2. Early, K. W., Chapman, S. F., and Hand, G. A. (2013) Family-focused juvenile reentry services: A quasi-experimental design evaluation of recidivism outcomes. *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Journal of Juvenile Justice. 2*(2). 1-22. *(tier 3)*
	3. Fields, D., and Abrams, L. S. (2010). Gender differences in the perceived needs and barriers of youth offenders preparing for community reentry. *Child & Youth Care Forum. 39*. 253-269. *(tier 1)*
	4. Sexton, T., and Turner, C. W. (2010). The effectiveness of functional family therapy for youth with behavioral problems in a community practice setting. *Journal of Family Psychology. 24*(3). 339-348. *(tier 2)*

| | 5. Timmons-Mitchell, J., Bender, M. B., and Kishna, M. A. (2006). An independent effectiveness trial of multisystemic therapy with juvenile justice youth. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology. 35*(2). 227-236. *(tier 3)* |

Community Connection and Contribution Practices

Practice	Cite
Strong ties to positive peers are identified and developed	1. Jacobi, T. (2008). Writing for change: Engaging juveniles through alternative literacy education. *Journal of Correctional Education. 59*(2). 71-93. *(tier 1)*
Victim conferences, mediation with trained professionals is completed	1. Bergseth, K. J., and Bouffard, J. A. (2007). The long-term impact of restorative justice programming for juvenile offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice. 35*. 433-451. *(tier 2)*
	2. Bouffard, J., Cooper, M., and Bergseth, K. (2016). The effectiveness of various restorative justice interventions on recidivism outcomes among juvenile offenders. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice.* 1-16. *(tier 2)*
	3. De Beus, K., and Rodriguez, N. (2007). Restorative justice practice: An examination of program completion and recidivism. *Journal of Criminal Justice. 35*. 337-347. *(tier 2)*
Youths engage in mentoring	1. Mares, A. S., and Jordan, M. (2012). Federal aftercare programs for transition-aged youth. *Children and Youth Services Review. 34*. 1509-1518. *(tier 1)*
	2. Braga, A. A., Piehl, A. M., and Hureau, D. (2009). Controlling violent offenders released to the community: An evaluation of the Boston reentry initiative. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 46*(4). 411-436. *(tier 2)*
	3. DuBois, D. L., Holloway, B. E., Valentine, J. C., and Cooper, H. (2002). Effectiveness of mentoring programs for youth: A meta-analytic review. *American Journal of Community Psychology. 30*(2). 157-197 *(tier 2)*
	4. Jacobi, T. (2008). Writing for change: Engaging juveniles through alternative literacy education. *Journal of Correctional Education. 59*(2). 71-93. *(tier 1)*
	5. Big Brothers Big Sisters. (2012). Big brothers big sisters' youth outcome report: Executive summary. Retrieved from http://www.bbbssepa.org/atf/cf/%7B5094A2BA-319B-4E8B-9049-EB89383B1832%7D/2012%20YOR%20Executive%20Summary.pdf *(tier 1)*