

A GUIDE TO JUVENILE DETENTION REFORM

FORGING PARTNERSHIPS WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT



JUVENILE DETENTION ALTERNATIVES INITIATIVE A PROJECT OF THE ANNIE E. CASEY FOUNDATION

executive summary

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was written by Lisa H. Thureau, Esq., the founder and executive director of Strategies for Youth, and Richard A. Mendel, an independent writer and researcher.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation is a private philanthropy that creates a brighter future for the nation's children by developing solutions to strengthen families, build paths to economic opportunity and transform struggling communities into safer and healthier places to live, work and grow. For more information, visit www.aecf.org.

Over the past quarter century, the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative® (JDAI™) has spread to nearly 300 counties in 39 states nationwide, becoming the widely recognized standard in the juvenile justice field for the use of secure detention. As the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative reaches its 25th anniversary, one of its more important lessons has been that successful and sustainable efforts to safely reduce the use of detention require much more than a single leader or government agency.



collaboration is key. Without it, even well-designed reforms are likely to flounder, get subverted or fail to reach their potential. In virtually every JDAI site, the local steering committee can count on the committed involvement of one or more juvenile court judges and usually the juvenile prosecutor, defense attorney and probation chief as well. Most often, leaders from several community organizations, service providers and advocacy organizations are also active JDAI champions.

Yet in far too many jurisdictions, law enforcement leaders are less involved in JDAI, less aware of JDAI's underlying philosophy and therefore less committed to its success. Patrol officers and their supervisors may be completely unaware of or uninvolved in JDAI and may lack any relevant training about JDAI's core principles and the research behind them. The simple fact is that many JDAI sites have not made it a priority to forge close ties with local law enforcement.

The lack of consistent engagement with law enforcement is troubling for two reasons. First, JDAI works better when law enforcement agencies are active partners, and cooperation with JDAI often benefits law enforcement as well by easing frustrations and reducing inefficiencies police and sheriff's departments experience when dealing with the juvenile justice system. Second, law enforcement is the key actor at the first and arguably the most important stage of the juvenile justice process, arrest — the stage where racial and ethnic disparities are most glaring.

The full practice guide will help JDAI site leaders substantially improve their youth and public safety outcomes through strategic, energetic collaboration with law enforcement. It is a call to action for JDAI sites and a playbook for juvenile justice reformers to work with law enforcement to implement proven approaches that reduce unnecessary detention and develop new strategies that recognize the harm and waste caused when young people who pose minimal risk to public safety are arrested and detained. It offers a wealth of practical advice and numerous examples of how JDAI sites can forge effective partnerships with law enforcement.

JDAI WORKS BETTER WHEN LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES ARE ACTIVE PARTNERS

“Law enforcement personnel don't usually sit at the table, and if they do sit at the table their participation is limited,” says Marcia Rincon-Gallardo, who served as Pima County, Arizona's first JDAI coordinator from 2005 to 2010, and since then as a technical assistance provider for other JDAI sites. “When law enforcement does participate actively,” adds Rincon-Gallardo, “it makes a big, big difference.”

How big a difference? Consider these examples:

◦ **Diversion and quick assessment for low-risk youth — Multnomah County (Portland), Oregon.** As one of JDAI's initial pilot sites in the 1990s, Multnomah County developed the nation's first juvenile reception center — a new venue designed to screen and assess lower-risk youth who are not candidates for detention. A forward-thinking law enforcement leader, Commander Bob Kauffman of the Portland Police Bureau, played an important role in this effort, providing free space for the center in the central police precinct during its first six months of operation and developing a training program to familiarize patrol officers with the new procedures. The reception center model has since been replicated in many JDAI sites across the nation.

◦ **Domestic violence alternatives — Pima County (Tucson), Arizona.** Soon after Pima County launched its JDAI effort in 2004, stakeholders discovered that more than 1,000 youth were being arrested each year on domestic violence charges and hundreds were being detained, most of them posing little risk to public safety. “A lot of kids were being dragged into the system unnecessarily,” says Captain Paul Sayre of the Tucson Police Department. To address the problem, the county developed a Domestic Violence Alternative Center (DVAC) where officers could take lower-risk youth arrested on misdemeanor domestic assault charges for screening, assessment and referral to needed mental health and family support services. By 2011, the DVAC handled more than three-fourths of all misdemeanor domestic violence cases, and only 42 resulted in detention admissions — down from 415 in 2004.¹ “Dropping youth at the DVAC is easier and faster than detention,” says Sayre. “[My patrol officers] can drop a kid off...and get back out on the street.”

◦ **Reducing school-based arrests for youth of color — Ramsey County (St. Paul), Minnesota.** Until he took over as commander of the Youth Service Section of the St. Paul Police Department in 2008, Gene Polyak believed that his department was upholding the law in a race-neutral way. However, once he began studying the data with the local JDAI steering committee, Polyak says, “I began to see unfairness.”² After noting that African-American youth were frequently being arrested for disorderly conduct, St. Paul narrowed its definition of what kind of behavior warranted arrest, and it worked with the public schools to reduce the role of police in addressing school discipline. Since then, arrests for disorderly conduct and related offenses have dropped by 50 percent.³

◦ **Officer training to reduce unnecessary arrests — Tippecanoe County (Lafayette), Indiana.** When local stakeholders examined arrest trends in 2013, they saw that youth of color were being arrested in disproportionate numbers for resisting law enforcement, disorderly conduct and battery against a public safety officer — all of which involved significant discretion on the part of the arresting officer. “The data collected by JDAI made us realize we had to change how we responded to kids,” recalls Kurt Wolf, captain of patrol in the Lafayette Police Department. Since then, the department has trained officers on adolescent development and implicit bias, and it has made arrests for the identified offenses a standing topic in JDAI collaborative meetings. By 2015, arrests for these offenses had declined 32 percent, including a 39 percent drop among youth of color.⁴

◦ **Diversion in lieu of arrest at school — Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.** Under the leadership of then-Deputy Police Commissioner Kevin Bethel, the Philadelphia Police Department revised its school policing practices in 2014, prohibiting arrests for an array of common misdemeanor offenses. Bethel credits JDAI for helping the city connect youth to local social service providers for counseling and support in lieu of arrest. “The beauty of [the JDAI] collaborative is that we had all the right people in the room,” Bethel says. “Everyone was on the same page, and there was already an environment of trust.”

UNDERSTANDING YOUR LAW ENFORCEMENT PARTNERS

JDAI stakeholders are more likely to form successful partnerships with law enforcement when they clearly understand the common characteristics of law enforcement agencies (LEAs). The following four dynamics are central to understanding how LEAs handle their interactions with young people and how they view the juvenile justice system.

Limited attention to juvenile justice. When the International Association of Chiefs of Police surveyed top executives from nearly 1,000 LEAs nationwide in 2013, the overwhelming majority said they agreed with the ideals of juvenile justice and believed that public safety is well served by efforts to divert lower-risk youth from the formal justice system. Nearly four in five (79 percent) said that law enforcement leaders have a significant role to play in juvenile justice. However, despite these beliefs, fewer than one-fourth of LEAs said they participate in a juvenile justice advisory group, and just one of every six LEAs said that juvenile justice agencies or community organizations often consult them about youth-related issues.⁵

the full practice guide *will help JDAI site leaders substantially improve their youth and public safety outcomes through strategic, energetic collaboration with law enforcement*

The demands facing law enforcement leaders are often extreme, unpredictable and intense. For most, the primary focus is on apprehending offenders and disrupting criminal activity today. Adjusting policing practices to improve the prospects for young people's long-term well-being is rarely a front-burner issue. Few law enforcement agencies issue extensive or updated policy statements detailing how officers should approach their duties in incidents involving youth, and law enforcement leaders or high-level commanders rarely articulate clear expectations for how patrol officers should interact with youth. In the absence of explicit policies or clear guidance from command staff on developmentally appropriate, trauma-informed handling of youth, officers may see no important differences in how they should police young people, as opposed to adults.

A crippling lack of training. Law enforcement officers represent the first and often the only point of contact for youth with the justice system. A growing body of evidence finds that the choices officers make about arrest, as well as youths' perceptions of the fairness demonstrated by officers, can have powerful consequences for young people's long-term well-being and likelihood of committing offenses in the future. Yet law enforcement officers in most jurisdictions receive no training — or next to none — regarding the critical differences between youth and adults or the implications of those differences on how law enforcement should interact with youth.

Nationally, a survey published in 2013 found that state law enforcement academies devote just 1 percent of their training time — about six hours — to youth issues, and most of that is focused solely on juvenile law.⁶ Only two states provided any training on adolescent development and psychology, and just eight states provided any training on best practices for law enforcement personnel on how to communicate and intervene with youth. Also, only eight states provided police academy trainees with any information

about racial and ethnic disparities in the juvenile justice system.⁷ A 2011 survey of law enforcement agencies nationwide also found that training was lacking for officers on the job.⁸

“My officers receive so much firearms training, and yet they rarely fire a shot,” Chief William Weitzel of the Riverside (Illinois) Police Department told his colleagues in 2013 at a summit on youth issues convened by the International Association of Chiefs of Police. In some cases, he said, his officers never fire their weapon in the line of duty. “Meanwhile, they have multiple contacts each day with juveniles.”⁹

Frequent frustration for patrol officers. Many patrol officers — even those who might be most open to expanding diversion from court and alternatives to detention — report frustration in their personal experiences with local juvenile justice and child protection institutions. Because they are under constant pressure to be available to respond to new incidents, patrol staff chafe at juvenile court processes that require them to spend long stretches of time supervising youth while juvenile court or probation staff conduct intake. They might find themselves spending time searching for parents or other adults to whom they can release a youth they have taken into custody. Officers regularly describe feeling irritated, even burned out, when they perceive that juvenile arrests do not have any impact — for example, when youth return home and reoffend, or when youth-serving agencies do not respond robustly to youth and families an officer has identified as in need of protection and assistance.

In the 2013 survey of law enforcement leaders, just 23 percent believed that their local juvenile justice system enhances public safety, and just 29 percent believed that their local juvenile justice system promotes rehabilitation.¹⁰

law enforcement leaders *are increasingly recognizing that improving relations with youth and other community residents is crucial to public safety*

Pervasive tensions with youth of color. Surveys consistently find that youth in low-income urban neighborhoods — and youth of color particularly — harbor negative views of law enforcement,¹¹ motivated in significant part by their own interactions with law enforcement officers or those they witnessed involving other youth.¹² To some extent, tensions between youth and law enforcement in distressed urban communities are inevitable, given the role of law enforcement to maintain public safety in neighborhoods where crime rates are high and poverty and substance abuse are widespread. As the face of the justice system in these neighborhoods, law enforcement can easily become a scapegoat for social ills that have been allowed to fester for generations.

However, law enforcement leaders are increasingly recognizing that improving relations with youth and other community residents is crucial to public safety. This emphasis on building trust may create opportunity for JDAI leaders in their efforts to engage law enforcement. Given the active participation of community organizations and advocates on most JDAI steering committees and JDAI's emphasis on frank and open discussion about racial and ethnic disparities and other community issues, JDAI stakeholders can foster constructive dialogue between law enforcement and leaders of marginalized communities.

STRATEGIES FOR MAKING (OR RESTORING) LAW ENFORCEMENT CONNECTIONS

How should JDAI leaders go about their efforts to forge or reinvigorate partnerships with law enforcement? Interviews with law enforcement leaders and JDAI stakeholders around the nation suggest the following three keys to successful engagement.

Tactical outreach. The first contact sets the tone for future interactions. LEA leaders uniformly recommend that the initial outreach come from the presiding juvenile court judge or other leader of high standing who has the respect of his or her peers in law enforcement. As much as possible, JDAI stakeholders should involve the leader(s) of the major law enforcement agency (or agencies) on the JDAI steering committee. They should seek LEA leaders' input on the detention screening instrument, the process to transfer custody of youth from officers to court officials following an arrest and the protocols for handling cases where youth are involved in domestic disputes or face serious social or human service needs.



At the same time JDAI stakeholders should identify a capable and well-positioned point person, preferably a respected leader in the patrol division, to represent the LEA in working group meetings and other interagency discussions regarding JDAI. Also, JDAI stakeholders should look to build relationships with other officers and commanders throughout the agency, with an eye toward identifying “lane crossers” — respected officers with a track record of working with other public and private agencies on complicated challenges such as domestic violence cases or treatment of offenders with mental health challenges — who might serve as champions for JDAI over the long haul. Ultimately, JDAI’s success will require officers across the LEA to understand and support the policies and practices involved in JDAI, as well as the logic and evidence behind them. Therefore, JDAI stakeholders must seek out opportunities to meet with law enforcement personnel in roll-call meetings, training sessions and other gatherings both to explain JDAI and to listen to officers’ feedback and concerns about its implementation.

Persuasive messages. LEA leaders will embrace JDAI only if they believe it is consistent with public safety, good for youth and the community and beneficial for their agencies. Likewise, patrol officers and commanders will support JDAI and participate constructively only if they understand JDAI and accept the underlying principles behind it. So JDAI stakeholders should prepare and deliver organized, succinct fact-packed presentations on JDAI’s rationale and results, as well as its potential benefits for law enforcement. Specifically, the presentations should provide convincing evidence for the following:

- **Youth are different from adults and require a different approach to policing and court processing.** Because human brains do not fully develop until the mid-20s, adolescents are less able than adults to control impulses, weigh future consequences or resist peer influences, and they are more prone toward risk taking and thrill seeking. As a result, delinquent conduct is common during adolescence. As their brains mature and they assume adult roles in society, most youth age out of this conduct without any intervention. Indeed, a wealth of research finds that arrest, prosecution and detention actually increase young people’s odds of subsequent offending and impede their long-term success.
- **Absent JDAI, detention practices are frequently problematic.** Despite the dangers of detention to worsen youth outcomes and the high cost of confinement, detention is often used for youth who pose minimal risk to public safety. In addition, detention decisions are often inconsistent, subjective and inequitable in terms of race and ethnicity.
- **JDAI is consistent with public safety.** JDAI sites have demonstrated that using objective risk screening, detention alternatives and limited secure detention has been consistent with detention’s two functions: ensuring youth appear for their court dates and keeping the public safe while a youth is awaiting his or her court date.

○ **JDAI works — and is good for the community’s long-term health.** Participating sites have reduced their average detention populations by more than 43 percent since entering JDAI, resulting in more than one million fewer days of detention each year. Fifty-six JDAI sites have closed detention units or whole facilities, reducing their detention capacity by a combined total of 2,050 beds — which translates to an estimated cumulative savings of roughly \$143.5 million per year. The reduced use of detention has also enabled sites to cut the number of youth committed to state custody by 57 percent, while keeping youth in school and connecting them to needed services and supports in the community.¹³

○ **JDAI offers a positive forum for law enforcement agencies to improve community relations and address racial and ethnic disparities.** JDAI steering committees typically include multiple community stakeholders, and most sites have active subcommittees dedicated to combating disparities that provide an ongoing forum for open, frank and purposeful conversations about racial and ethnic equity. For law enforcement leaders seeking to reduce tensions with community residents and foster closer connections, JDAI can offer a ready-made forum for respectful discussion and concerted action.

○ **JDAI benefits law enforcement.** Partnerships with JDAI often help ease officers’ frustration by reducing their time out of service in juvenile cases and decrease LEAs’ need for and cost of overtime. JDAI-law enforcement partnerships can also improve the handling of so-called “frequent flyer” youth who pose minimal threat to public safety but generate repeated calls for service due to unmet psychological or human service needs, or to problems in their families.

Attention to law enforcement concerns. While making the case for JDAI is important, stakeholders’ ultimate success in building strong and sustainable partnerships with law enforcement depend as much on listening as on delivering effective arguments. Asking law enforcement personnel about their concerns with current juvenile justice procedures and soliciting input on issues that directly affect officers can provide a starting point for fruitful dialogue. Especially in existing sites where leaders of the largest local departments are not currently active on the JDAI steering committee, or where they never joined, JDAI stakeholders’ best strategy may be to start discussions about a specific issue of interest to law enforcement.

FORGING CONSENSUS ON DETENTION SCREENING

The creation and use of an objective detention screening tool to guide detention decisions is the bedrock of JDAI. Objective screening may meet some resistance because it limits officers’ discretion to place youth in detention or to threaten detention as a consequence for continued misconduct. Typically, top law enforcement leaders are included in discussions to craft or revise the detention screening instrument. Too often, however, patrol officers and other LEA personnel receive little information about the screening process or detention reform generally. To address this need, JDAI stakeholders should do the following:

- **Provide orientation and training for law enforcement personnel.** Officers at all levels require training to understand the detention screening instrument and the processes for making and implementing the detention decision. “You need to educate everyone,” says Wolf. “It’s important that everyone knows that detention is bad, not good, for youth. It’s important for them to know that [JDAI] isn’t just rhetoric. It’s actually improving the numbers, bringing better outcomes [for youth and public safety].”
- **Solicit and respond to input from patrol officers on detention screening implementation issues.** Rank-and-file law enforcement personnel will be more likely to accept and support the detention screening process if stakeholders listen to their views and make changes when appropriate. “I got some pushback from some officers initially,” says Tim Chatten, the juvenile prosecutor in Camden County, New Jersey. “But I told them to try it, and then come back to me and tell me how it went.” Resistance from officers dissipated quickly. “Once they see that it works,” Chatten adds, “they buy in.”
- **Give officers predictable and timely detention determinations and guidance.** Officers will be far more supportive of the objective detention admissions process if the screening process is consistent and case processing expeditious. In Lake Charles, Louisiana, Chief of Police Don Dixon has described the new Multi-Agency Resource Center (MARC) that opened in 2011 as “a godsend” for law enforcement. The center, where officers take youth arrested on status offenses and low-level misdemeanors, aims to get officers back on the street in just 12 minutes. “Instead of us sitting here and babysitting someone for two or three hours trying to get hold of a parent or guardian, it gets our officers back on the road,” Dixon says, adding that the MARC is also a major cost saver for his department.

BETTER OPTIONS FOR LOW-RISK, HIGH-NEED YOUTH

From the very beginning of the initiative, JDAI sites have been exploring new approaches for frequent flyer youth who come in contact with the justice system repeatedly due to serious personal or family challenges, but pose minimal risk to public safety. Local LEAs — the initial point of contact for these youth — have often been crucial partners in these efforts.

“Cops are problem solvers,” says Sayre, who has been involved with JDAI since it came to Arizona’s Pima County in 2004. “They hate going back again and again to the same problem.”

In numerous JDAI sites, law enforcement leaders have been key partners in creating reception centers and other locations where lower-risk youth can be diverted from court (or even from arrest), assessed and — when necessary — connected to nearby service providers. In other sites, law enforcement has teamed with social service providers and other system stakeholders to create coordinated and service-rich diversionary programs that connect youth directly to needed support and assistance.

if you take care *of the small things effectively with teens, behaviors do not escalate and the big things often take care of themselves* — William Dean, deputy chief of the Virginia Beach Police Department

As William Dean, deputy chief of the Virginia Beach Police Department, puts it, “If you take care of the small things effectively with teens, behaviors do not escalate and the big things often take care of themselves.”¹⁴

JDAI sites have also worked with law enforcement partners to craft new approaches for youth who come in contact with law enforcement due to domestic disturbances in their homes. Rather than requiring the arrest and detention of adolescents involved in a domestic disturbance — as many jurisdictions do regardless of the severity of the situation or the youth’s risk to harm family members — sites in Cuyahoga County (Cleveland), Ohio; Pima County (Tucson), Arizona; and elsewhere are pursuing innovations to shield young people from the trauma and disruption of detention and address the underlying family issues that caused the conflict.

JDAI veterans caution, however, that new protocols to connect youth with services cannot be complex or time consuming for law enforcement officers. “It has to be easier,” says Anthony Pierro, the juvenile prosecutor in Ocean County, New Jersey, which has created a new option for officers to connect youth and their families to crisis intervention units in lieu of arrest. “You can’t make the officer do a 27-page referral that takes hours to fill out. They don’t have time for that, and they don’t have time to sit around to monitor the kid.”

PROMOTING MORE EFFECTIVE LAW ENFORCEMENT STRATEGIES FOR YOUTH

Despite the overwhelming evidence that arresting youth for routine and minor misbehavior is damaging to young people’s futures,¹⁵ harmful to public safety¹⁶ and wasteful financially,¹⁷ law enforcement agencies arrest hundreds of thousands of youth every year on charges of disorderly conduct, shoplifting, fighting, marijuana possession, trespassing, curfew and liquor law violations and other minor offenses.¹⁸ Despite adolescent development and brain science research showing that young people reason and

respond to authority far differently than adults, few LEAs provide training for their officers regarding effective responses to adolescents.

Meanwhile, by far the greatest source of racial and ethnic disparity in the juvenile justice system is the point of arrest — even though studies show only modest racial and ethnic differences in youth offending rates. Disparities at arrest and other points in the juvenile justice process contribute to a lack of perceived legitimacy for law enforcement among many youth, and they heighten community tensions, which can undermine law enforcement’s success in protecting public safety.

Conversations and connections initiated by JDAI in numerous sites have sparked constructive changes to make law enforcement practices toward youth more equitable and effective. In some non-JDAI jurisdictions as well, law enforcement leaders have taken it upon themselves to craft innovative strategies to improve policing practices for youth.

Examples include:

- **Increasing pre-arrest diversion.** Some jurisdictions, most notably Florida with its statewide civil citations program,¹⁹ have developed or expanded the use of pre-arrest diversion, allowing youth apprehended by police for minor lawbreaking to avoid the stain and collateral consequences of an arrest record.



Through this approach, Florida has decreased the number of juvenile misdemeanor arrests, reduced racial and ethnic disparities, lowered recidivism and saved millions of dollars for taxpayers.

◦ **Reducing school arrests.** Many JDAI sites have taken steps to minimize the number of youth arrested at school for routine misbehavior. Indeed, the JDAI site in Clayton County, Georgia, has been a national leader on this issue for more than a decade — and has provided assistance to dozens of JDAI and non-JDAI jurisdictions nationwide. And as noted earlier, the Philadelphia Police Department has taken steps to sharply limit arrests for common misdemeanor offenses.

◦ **Combating racial and ethnic disparities at arrest.** In several JDAI sites, local stakeholders have spurred constructive action to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in arrests by providing data to commanders and supporting and encouraging the adoption of law enforcement strategies to address them. For instance, Robert Stewart, the assistant public safety director in Columbus, Ohio, says that prior to JDAI, “We had no idea what our arrests looked like in the detention center.”

TRAINING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ON POLICING THE TEENAGE BRAIN

Perhaps the most promising strategy for JDAI stakeholders seeking to promote long-term improvement in policing approaches toward youth involves training to help law enforcement commanders and patrol

perhaps the most promising *strategy for JDAI stakeholders seeking to promote long-term improvement in policing approaches toward youth involves training*

officers appreciate the differences between youth and adults. Officers must be aware of the necessity to avoid escalating incidents involving youth. Yet, as noted earlier, law enforcement officers in most jurisdictions receive little or no training on these issues.

Fortunately, there is growing consensus among law enforcement leaders that officers require more and better training on adolescent development and related issues. In 2014, the International Association of Chiefs of Police placed high priority on added training in a report outlining law enforcement's role in juvenile justice reform. Specifically, the report called on police and sheriff's departments to: "Expand officers' capacity to effectively respond to youth by offering cohesive training programs that enable officers to understand adolescent development; cultural differences among youth; mental health and trauma issues; and effective strategies for youth engagement, intervention and crisis response."²⁰ Recent policing controversies have only heightened interest in training among LEAs nationwide. "Everyone is looking for some way to get ahead of this," says Rhonda McKitten, a Philadelphia public defender who has played an integral role in new adolescent development training programs for police officers in Philadelphia and elsewhere.

Of all the law enforcement training efforts underway within the JDAI network, the most ambitious and far reaching has emerged in Indiana where Strategies for Youth (SFY), a Massachusetts-based agency, has provided training on "Policing the Teen Brain" to law enforcement workers in a dozen counties.²¹ According to Captain Wolf: "The training helps officers understand why kids do what they do. And it teaches them about ways to deescalate and deal with kids who are acting out." In addition, as of 2016 recruits at the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy receive in-depth training on adolescent development and behavior. Previously, just four hours (half of 1 percent) of the curriculum at the Indiana academy concerned youth, and most of that focused on juvenile law.

A VALUABLE AND FACT-FILLED RESOURCE

Forging Partnerships With Law Enforcement provides in-depth and practical advice for JDAI stakeholders, along with an extensive toolkit of handouts, lessons learned and resource links. The Casey Foundation hopes the guide will become a helpful and widely used resource for JDAI stakeholders, and that sites throughout the JDAI network will ramp up their efforts to forge or reinvigorate connections with law enforcement partners and work with law enforcement to build consensus and streamline procedures for detention screening; improve system responses for needy but low-risk youth; enhance law enforcement responses to youth; and expand training opportunities for law enforcement officers on detention reform and adolescent development.

KEY STATS

ON ATTITUDES OF LAW ENFORCEMENT LEADERS²²

The overwhelming majority said that public safety is well served by efforts to divert lower-risk youth from the formal justice system.

Nearly four in five said that law enforcement leaders have a significant role to play in juvenile justice.

Fewer than one-third believed that their local juvenile justice system enhances public safety or rehabilitation.

Fewer than one-fourth said they participate in a juvenile justice advisory group.

Just one of every six said that juvenile justice agencies or community organizations often consult them about youth-related issues.

ON TRAINING²³

State law enforcement academies devote just 1 percent of their training time — about six hours — to youth issues, and most of that is spent on juvenile law.

Only two states provide any training on adolescent development and psychology.

Just eight states provide any training on communicating and intervening with youth.

Only eight states provide police academy trainees with any information about racial and ethnic disparities in the juvenile justice system.

ENDNOTES

- 1 The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2014). *Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative Progress Report 2014*. Baltimore, MD: Author. Retrieved from www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/aecf-2014JDAIProgressReport-2014.pdf
- 2 Ramsey County Community Corrections. (2012, Summer). St. Paul police working to reduce disproportionate minority contact. *JDAI News*. Retrieved from www.ramseyjdai.org/pdf/JDAI-Spring%202012%20Newsletter.pdf
- 3 Ross, E., former JDAI Coordinator, Ramsey County, Minnesota (email correspondence with Richard Mendel, February 7, 2017).
- 4 Wolf, K., Captain of Patrol, Lafayette Police Department, Indiana (interview conducted by Lisa T. Thureau, n.d.).
- 5 International Association of Chiefs of Police. (2013, September). *Law enforcement's leadership role in the advancement of promising practices in juvenile justice: Executive officer survey findings*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from www.iacp.org/Portals/0/documents/pdfs/IACPJJExecutiveOfficerSurvey-Findings.pdf
- 6 Strategies for Youth. (2013, February). *If not now, when? A survey of juvenile justice training in America's Police Academies*. Cambridge, MA: Author. Retrieved from http://strategiesforyouth.org/sfysite/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/SFYReport_02-2013_rev.pdf
- 7 Strategies for Youth. (2013, February).
- 8 International Association of Chiefs of Police. (2011, July). *Juvenile justice training needs assessment: A survey of law enforcement*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from www.theiacp.org/portals/0/pdfs/2011juvenilejusticetrainingneedsassessmentoflawenforcement.pdf
- 9 International Association of Chiefs of Police. (2014, July). *Law enforcement's leadership role in juvenile justice reform: Actionable recommendations for practice & policy*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from www.theiacp.org/portals/0/documents/pdfs/juvenilejusticesummitreport.pdf
- 10 International Association of Chiefs of Police. (2013, September).
- 11 Fratello, J., Rengifo, A. F., & Trone, J. (2013). *Coming of age with stop and frisk: Experiences, self-perceptions, and public safety implications*. New York, NY: Vera Institute of Justice. Retrieved from https://storage.googleapis.com/vera-web-assets/downloads/Publications/coming-of-age-with-stop-and-frisk-experiences-self-perceptions-and-public-safety-implications/legacy_downloads/stop-and-frisk-summary-report-v2.pdf
- 12 Gau, J. M., & Brunson, R. K. (2015). Procedural injustice, lost legitimacy, and self-help: Young males' adaptations to perceived unfairness in urban policing tactics. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 32(2).
- 13 The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2014).
- 14 Dean, W., Deputy Chief, Virginia Beach Police Department, Virginia (email correspondence with Lisa T. Thureau, February 13, 2017).
- 15 Sweeten, G. (2006, December). Who will graduate? Disruption of high school education by arrest and court involvement. *Justice Quarterly*, 23(4). Retrieved from www.masslegalservices.org/system/files/library/H.S.ed_and_arrest_-_ct_involvement_study_by_Sweeten.pdf
- 16 Aizer, A., & Doyle Jr., J. J. (2013, June) *Juvenile incarceration, human capital and future crime: Evidence from randomly-assigned judges* [Working Paper 19102]. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from www.nber.org/papers/w19102.pdf

- 17 Justice Policy Institute (2014). *Sticker shock: Calculating the full price tag for youth incarceration*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from www.justicepolicy.org/research/8477
- 18 Puzzanchera, C., & Kang, W. (2014). *Easy access to FBI arrest statistics 1994 – 2012*. Retrieved from www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezaucr/
- 19 To learn more about this program, see Caruthers, D. (2016). *Stepping up: Florida's top juvenile civil citation efforts — Advocating the importance of civil citation programs while recognizing those that do it best*. Tampa, FL: Dewey & Associates. Retrieved from <http://iamforkids.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Study-FINAL-9-7-16-2.pdf>
- 20 International Association of Chiefs of Police. (2014, July).
- 21 Strategies for Youth Executive Director Lisa T. Thurau is a co-author of this report.
- 22 International Association of Chiefs of Police. (2013, September).
- 23 Strategies for Youth. (2013, February).

701 ST. PAUL STREET BALTIMORE, MD 21202 410.547.6600 WWW.AECF.ORG