EXPLORING JUVENILE DIVERSION IN OHIO:
WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY & PRACTICE SUPPORTING EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE AND COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY – MULTI-SYSTEMIC THERAPY (MST) AND WRAPAROUND

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Graduate Faculty of the University of Akron

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Victoria C. Sheppard

August, 2008
EXPLORING JUVENILE DIVERSION IN OHIO:
WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY & PRACTICE SUPPORTING EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE AND COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY – MULTI-SYSTEMIC THERAPY (MST) AND WRAPAROUND

Victoria C. Sheppard

Dissertation

Approved:  
Advisor  
Dr. Margaret Tonkin-Stephens

Accepted:  
Department Chair  
Dr. Charles Monroe

Committee Member  
Dr. Ralph Hummel

Dean of the College  
Dr. Ronald Levant

Committee Member  
Dr. Sonia Alemagno

Dean of the Graduate School  
Dr. George Newkome

Committee Member  
Dr. Nancy Marion

Date

Committee Member  
Dr. Nancy Meyer-Emerick
ABSTRACT

Public policy guiding practices in the U.S. juvenile justice system has at its core two paramount objectives – to protect the public from young criminals and to find ways to manage young offenders so they discontinue antisocial or criminal behavior (Bonta, 1996). One pressing need is identifying specific types of juvenile services that work best for first-time and non-violent offenders (Carney & Buttell, 2003). Use of community-based, juvenile diversion services is one way of not only managing juveniles who get in trouble, it may be used to turn young lives headed for destruction into vessels of potential.

Diversion occurs when the courts use some alternative to formally processing or committing youth to the juvenile justice system (Bynum & Thompson, 2007). The constant struggle in research is identifying what type of diversionary programming works for each individual. This study continues the exploration of the effectiveness of comprehensive diversion strategies aimed at first-time and non-violent youthful offenders by surveying juvenile diversion programs in counties across the state of Ohio. The purpose of this study is twofold: first, to determine whether counties that receive funding from the state of Ohio are designing and implementing juvenile diversion programs that are evidence-based; and second to determine what demographic variations predict the absence or existence of evidence-based components in practice. Data will be obtained
using an Internet survey, telephone interviews and/or paper surveys, as necessary.

Quantitative analysis will be employed. In addition to the survey questionnaire, demographic information will be gathered on all Ohio counties. Information regarding diversion funding, population demographics, high school graduation rates, and crime rates will be examined to see if socio-demographic variations predict the absence or existence of evidence-based practice in juvenile diversion programming in the state of Ohio. The ultimate purpose is to determine whether scientifically authenticated program design is being used for juvenile diversion programs serving first-time offenders in Ohio counties.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study explores juvenile delinquency prevention, in the form of diversion programming. This study is also about policy implementation. It is a study about the public administration of a juvenile correction program. It is an exploration of the implementation of a crime prevention policy - juvenile diversion. Specifically, this study explores the existence of evidence-based practice (EBP) in juvenile diversion programming in the state of Ohio.

Before beginning this study, several definitions must be provided. First, EBP simply means using empirically tested methods in program practice. Second, the term juvenile refers to any person who is below the legal age of majority, the age at which societal laws set the beginning of adulthood. The interesting thing is the term was not used in early colonial America because there was no legal recognition of differences between children and adulthood, no concept of the term adolescence (Bynum & Thompson, 2007). The concept of adolescence actually began when the nation set the legal age of adulthood at 18. The idea of adolescence brought a new word and it provided an explanation for youthful criminal and anti-social behavior (Bynum & Thompson, 2007). Young offenders were now referred to as juvenile delinquents.
Another term that will be used throughout this study is delinquency. Delinquency refers to any violation of the law by a person who is a minor (Agnew, 2005). A juvenile delinquent is different from an adult offender because a child is guilty of breaking the law when he or she uses tobacco or drinks alcohol. Adults are not charged for such offenses (Bartollas, 2006). Finally, the term diversion can be defined as decriminalization because it is based on the belief that when children are subjected to the criminal justice system they are labeled, embarrassed, or stigmatized, so the best way to help them is to divert them away from the justice system (Burfeind & Bartusch, 2006). These terms will be used throughout this study.

Again, this study explores policy implementation because juvenile diversion is a crime prevention policy. Juvenile justice policies and programs are created through the public policy process. This process is influenced by the interplay of political actors, local politicians, local bureaucrats, juvenile justice officials, judges, program administrators, staff, and socioeconomic factors of each community. Juvenile justice practice then is a public policy and public policies contain unique and identifiable designs (Stolz, 2002). Juvenile diversion, an alternative to the formal processing of young lawbreakers in the juvenile court system, can take the form of many designs. One problem is, in the United States, there is no one juvenile justice system, so juvenile diversion programming, its program components, implementation, activities and delivery of treatment and services, may differ in each state, city, county or township. Program practitioners and juvenile court judges in each jurisdiction have the discretion to create diversion programs.
(program design), and deliver program services (program implementation) according to whatever they consider to be important. Another problem occurs at the street level where juvenile diversion services are administered. Here, diversion program providers are the policy makers because they have discretion when delivering day-to-day services (program implementation), basically with very little oversight from the government. The result is a different type of juvenile diversion programming in each jurisdiction. This dissertation examines the differences in juvenile diversion programs throughout the state of Ohio. Several hypotheses about demographic variations will be examined to see if variables predict the absence or existence of evidence-based practice in diversion programming for first-time juvenile offenders.

Describing the criminal justice policy making system, Stolz (2002), asserts that the [juvenile] justice policy making process starts with legislation made at the federal level, however, the creation and the actual implementation of juvenile diversion programming is a criminal justice policy decision that is made at the local and state government level. And, although the federal government provides some resources, such as funding, model program guide information and training for local juvenile justice administrators, traditionally, states maintain both the authority and the responsibility for local crime prevention, in this case, adolescent offending (Stolz, 2002).
1.1 Policy Implications

What does public policy have to do with the design of juvenile diversion programming? Schneider and Ingram’s discussion of policy design offers an explanation. Public policy design has implications for democracy because it impacts citizenship, democratic institutions, justice, corrections, and public policy problem solving (Schneider & Ingram, p. 82, 1997). Generally speaking, every public policy targets some specific population, has particular objectives and goals, problems that it purposes to solve. Policies also have rules, rationales and implementation tools (Schneider & Ingram, p. 82, 1997). For example, as a public policy, juvenile justice and diversion programming has as its main goal, the intention of deterring youth from further delinquent behavior. The main assumption underpinning of juvenile justice policy is that efforts will be made to control young offenders in such a way as to protect the public while at the same time offering some type of rehabilitative services for youth. The juvenile justice system also has the responsibility of punishing young offenders and assuring they are held responsible for their offenses. The determination of which goals a particular policy targets, and the problems that a policy seeks to address results in either an advantage or a disadvantage for the citizenry (Stolz, 2002).

Herein lies the policy link. Program design impacts the core purposes of democracy, that is, the distribution of justice, fairness, equality and equity (Schneider & Ingram, 1997). For example, the policy’s target population says something about who is important in society and in the community where the program is implemented; the policy
agents who design, create and deliver the program, be it juvenile court judges or program
administrators, make a statement about who they believe to be worthy of the program’s
benefits, how they believe scarce resources are to be distributed and who the most
important persons of that community are. For example, one community may have
rehabilitation as the main goal; another may target efforts toward punishing young
offenders. The tools of public policy (diversion program services and interventions) have
democratic implications because they reflect basic assumptions about how different
groups of people are treated (one community may provide a variety of services, while
another may provide few). The rules of the policy set the boundaries of who is allowed
to participate in the program. For example, in some cities juvenile diversion programs do
not give services to repeat offenders, although they may still be misdemeanor offenders,
they may not be allowed to re-enter a diversion program. In other cities, young, non-
violent offenders may be allowed to participate in diversion as long as they are juveniles
and as long as they don’t commit violent or drug related crimes. The difference is, one
group is given repeated opportunities to make positive changes while another group is
subjected to the stigma of involvement in the juvenile justice system. From a democratic
perspective, all of these issues say something about policy. Again, they say something
about the democratic principles of justice, fairness, equality and equity.
1.2 Purpose of the Study

This study is designed to test the extent to which evidence-based practice (EBP) exists in juvenile diversion programming in Ohio. In pursuit of this purpose, juvenile delinquency and juvenile diversion policy in the United States will be briefly examined. A succinct overview and history of the changing goals and assumptions underlying juvenile justice will also be presented. Through survey data, obtained from program providers, the author explores program components and design to see if programs are based on empirical evidence of what works to reduce juvenile delinquency. The main purpose of this research is a detailed examination of juvenile diversion programs currently being used in Ohio to determine:

- If they are based on what is known to work;
- What elements of juvenile diversion programs in Ohio resemble evidence-based strategies;
- How they are using the funds they receive from the state of Ohio;
- If programs are including activities that address the major institutions influencing young lives: families, schools, and communities (Sherman, Gottfredson, MacKenzie, Eck, Reuter, & Bushway, 1998);
- Whether current diversion services are being offered in Ohio cities to address the “core” areas of a young person’s life: family, peers, school and individual medical and health needs (Carney & Buttell, 2003);

The objective of this study exploring juvenile diversion programming in Ohio is to determine the degree to which each program employs evidence-based principles and theories, specifically, to see if programs in Ohio use comprehensive strategies, such as multi-systemic therapy (MST) and wraparound services. Comprehensive strategy involves the use a variety of services, treatment and interventions and it includes
purposeful collaboration and involvement of various agencies that serve adolescents (Heilbrun, Golstein & Redding, 2005).

1.3 Diversion Policy in Ohio

In Ohio, juvenile justice authorities have adopted the policy of using community-based programs whenever possible to reduce juvenile delinquency, juvenile crime, juvenile alcohol, tobacco and substance abuse, truancy and youth violence. Community-based juvenile diversion aims to provide troubled youth with life skills to discourage their involvement in criminal behavior. The general goals of delinquency prevention programs are usually the same, (to reduce, stall and discourage criminal and anti-social behavior); the activities used to accomplish these goals may differ from state and certainly from county to county. Programs used to divert juveniles from the Ohio juvenile justice system may differ in terms of program components, activities, length of treatment, frequency of treatment, and service delivery style. Some juvenile diversion programs target the individual juvenile, addressing the factors influencing delinquent behavior (such as having delinquent peers). Other diversion programs target the parents, addressing factors that diminish parenting ability (low parenting skills). Ultimately, regardless of program style, components, or mechanisms, the fundamental expectation of the program is to divert young people away from the juvenile justice system, reducing chances they will repeat (recidivate) criminal behavior. The idea is to use some
intervention, preferably at the onset of trouble, or, at any point of the youth’s encounter with the justice system to divert them from commitment to a juvenile facility or institution. There are many types of diversion. Even probation can be considered a type of diversion. For this research, county-level programs serving juveniles who are first time, non-violent, misdemeanor or status offenders in Ohio will be examined.

According to the Ohio Department of Youth Services, each of Ohio’s 88 counties receives some funding from the state of Ohio for juvenile corrections. All 88 county juvenile court offices were contacted to participate in this study. Demographic information was obtained from the Ohio Department of Development to assess the impact of various factors that may predict the absence or existence of evidence-based practice.

1.4 Evidence-Based Practice (EBP)

“Crime prevention should be rational and based on the best possible evidence” (Welsh & Farrington, 2006, p. 1). Evidence-based practice (EBP) refers to the process of bringing research and practice together, thus maximizing opportunities to help [juveniles] and avoid the stigma of the criminal justice system (Gray, 1997, 2001; Carney & Buttell, 2003; Pullmann, Kerbs, Koroloff, Veach-White, Gaylor, & Sieler, 2006; Schlonsky & Stern, 2007; Sackett, Straus, Richardson, Rosenberg, & Haynes, 2000). What EBP does is link the research evidence on the best ways to help juveniles to the actual application of programs in the real world.
Put into practice, EBP transports research findings on effective juvenile delinquency interventions to the everyday world of juvenile justice programming. There is an overwhelming body of research on juvenile delinquency that provides scientific evidence supporting the belief that young offenders are best served in their communities where they can receive treatment and services alongside those who impact them the most - their families (for a review, see Gottfredson, 2000; Henggeler, Schoenwald, Borduin, Rowland & Cunningham, 1998; Howell, 2003; Sims & Preston, 2006; Siegel & Welsh, 2008). To be sure, community-based juvenile diversion programming is one way to keep juveniles out of from the justice system. Empirically validated juvenile diversion programs are at the center of EBP.

1.5 Problem Statement

The challenge for juvenile justice corrections officials lies in the fact that a large number of adolescents come into the system with a myriad of problems. Today, youth lack social skills and emotional competencies, they have mental health issues, engage in dangerous behaviors that damage their health, such as alcohol and drug use and abuse, gang violence, criminal behavior, risky sexual behavior and other self-destructive behavior (Weissberg, Kumpfer & Seligman, 2003 in Weissberg & O’Brien, p. 87, 2004). According to the Uniform Crime Report (UCR), over 38,500 persons under age 18 were arrested in Ohio in 2006. The largest numbers of these underage arrests were for liquor
law infractions (6,336) and driving under the influence (4,581). In 2006, juveniles in Ohio were arrested for murder (4), rape (39), assault (207), running away (667), fraud (1,112), and theft (1,696), (UCR, 2006). Clearly, Ohio has a need for services targeting the reduction of juvenile offending.

In Ohio, the Department of Youth Services (DYS) is the state agency responsible for the management of juvenile offenders. The stated mission of the DYS is shown on their website:

-To encourage positive change in the lives of youthful offenders through collaborative partnerships and culturally relevant therapeutic and academic interventions that support safety and prepare youth to lead productive lives (DYS, 2007).

Each time an Ohio youth appears before a juvenile court judge, the judge makes the determination what type of delinquency prevention measure will be used in each child’s case. For first-time and non-violent offenders, community-based juvenile diversion programming is one option the courts use to reduce the number of juveniles being institutionalized and processed through the juvenile justice system. Again, the problem is juvenile diversion programs differ from state to state and county to county because there is no single juvenile justice system in America.

For this study, a sample of the juvenile diversion programs serving Ohio youths was explored to see if the programs are based on what the literature on delinquency cites as being most effective in reversing the trends of delinquency and juvenile criminal
behavior. The study concludes with implications for policy and recommendations for improving Ohio juvenile diversion programming.

In the United States, there are 51 separate juvenile justice systems, and juvenile diversion programs differ in each system (National Center of Juvenile Justice, 2008). The problem is there is currently no mechanism in place to monitor the specific program components of existing juvenile diversion programs in Ohio. How then, do we know which types of services are being provided for Ohio’s first-time, misdemeanor, status, and non-violent juvenile offenders? This study will help answer this question.

The federal government, through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) provides federal funds to help local governments to sustain community-based juvenile corrections programming. OJJDP also provides a database and guide of model programs (see chapter two of this study for a description) that have been evaluated, researched and empirically proven to be effective in reducing juvenile delinquency. The OJJDP model programs are based on research findings. Their activity and program component guides will be described in more detail in chapter two of this paper. Although OJJDP provides model guides, juvenile justice program creators and program providers are under no mandatory requirement to institute any particular type of program. This means juvenile delinquency prevention interventions, services, their design and application, may largely be dependent on the opinions, assumptions, goals and preferences of juvenile court judges and local program administrators. Decisions about
juvenile justice policy and the resulting program design may be influenced and driven by local political ideology or local preferences of policymakers (Stolz, 2002). The result may be a series of very different diversion programs across the state of Ohio. This paper aims to examine to what extent this is true by using scientific analysis to assess the program components of existing juvenile delinquency prevention programs in Ohio counties.

Across the nation, and in the state of Ohio, juvenile justice and diversion policy has historically been based on the American public’s endorsement of juvenile justice policies that focus on ways to help young offenders through rehabilitation and treatment, instead of imprisoning juveniles and young adults (Moon, Sundt, Cullen and Wright, 2000). One critical issue is developing programs that work to actually address the individual and specific needs of each child (Bonta, 1996). Again, the problem is, there is considerable variation in program design and program implementation across state funded juvenile diversion programs in Ohio because of the role local county juvenile court judges, program administrators and program staff play the design and delivery of diversion services. The grand question this research seeks to answer is whether existing juvenile diversion programs serving non-violent and first-time offenders in the state of Ohio are actually using interventions that scientific research suggests as being effective in reducing juvenile recidivism and deterring delinquent behavior – are they evidence-based, that is, are they addressing the real needs of juvenile offenders? The ultimate aim of this paper is to bridge the gap between research findings and juvenile justice policy and practice.
In pursuit of a contribution to bridge this gap, this research supports program methodologies that exemplify comprehensive strategy: multi-systemic therapy (MST) and wraparound services. MST involves application of various treatment and therapies that address the multidimensional causes of delinquency. Wraparound refers to the application of a variety of services that are aimed at addressing the entirety of issues that may impact a young person’s life, including his or her family, school, community, and peer influences. Both of these methods have been empirically proven to be effective in reducing juvenile delinquency.

Who endorses the MST and wraparound approaches as two of the best types of juvenile diversion programming? The U.S. Surgeon General and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention both endorse these approaches. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services – Substance Abuse and Mental health Services Administration (SAMSHA) includes MST in its model program guide list of science based prevention programs (SAMSHA, 2008). The literature is replete with examples of support for these juvenile service and treatment modalities. Describing the comprehensive model of corrective services for youth, (Northey, Primer and Christiensen (p. 14, 1997) maintain that wraparound strengthens the family because it recognizes and reinforces family values, including family members in the interventions while making positive changes in the family’s environment. A host of researchers point to the community-based wraparound and comprehensive multi-systemic approaches as being favorable ways to treat youth.
For example, Dore and Harnett (1995) argue the importance of corrections taking place in the community. Garbarino, Kostelny and Dubrow (1991) suggest that family intervention similar to that provided in the wraparound services model is important in helping young people avoid involvement in the juvenile system. Greene (1993) cites the importance of programs that include interventions that address various systems influencing youth and providing treatment that builds thinking skills. Listing best practices guidelines, authors, Hage, Romano, Conyne, Kenny, Matthews, Schwartz and Waldo (2007) cite programs that prevent delinquency by addressing the primary (dealing with problems before they occur); secondary (dealing with problems at their onset); and tertiary (here the police, the courts or other corrections authorities deal with problems that may have already occurred by reducing their impact) as being the best prevention practices. Hage, et. al., suggest that effective preventive programs go further than the mere reduction of risks, they should include activities that identify, support, and build individual adolescent strengths. Clark, Schaefer, Burchard, and Welkowitz (1992) noted improvements in behavior of youth served in community-based programs such as MST and wraparound. Kumpfer and Alvarado (2003) identified family-focused treatment as being effective. Heilbrun, Goldstein, Redding (2005) argue that the best corrections programs for juveniles are those which include activities for parents, such as anger management and parent training. Pearson, Lipton, Cleland and Yee (2002) support the community-based and comprehensive approach, including cognitive (thinking skills
development) therapy. Again, effective interventions for youth are community-based and family-focused (Lipsey & Wilson, 1998). Programs that unify and strengthen the family can possibly break the cycle of generational involvement in the criminal justice system and incarceration (Sims & Preston, 2006). Dryfoos (1990) describes 11 features of effective juvenile corrections programming that depicts wraparound and MST, including intensive and individualized treatment, collaboration with other agencies that serve juveniles, involvement of the child’s family, discussions surrounding the child’s peer influences and linking needs appropriate community and agency services to the child and their family. Gendreau (1996) states the most successful juvenile corrections programs are those that take the approach of teaching youth how to think in times of trouble, how to solve personal problems without violence, and how to react in stressful and compromising situations such as bullying, or being pressured to use tobacco or alcohol. These are the types of behaviors that lead to involvement in the criminal justice system. These are also the types of behaviors that the literature suggests can be successfully arrested through programs that model evidence-based practice (EBP) – programs that are comprehensive, including MST and wraparound services. These are just a few examples of research that supports comprehensive juvenile diversion programming.

Will anything else suffice in place of comprehensive diversion programs such as those that include MST and wraparound services? Lipsey (1992) and Peters, Thomas, & Zamberlan (1997) suggest that boot camps and shock incarceration may sound good because of their strict military style and structure, but research is not conclusive
that they actually work to reduce juvenile delinquency. Simply giving troubled youth summer jobs, intensive supervision, such as home detention and wilderness/survival programs have not proven to be overwhelmingly effective (Sherman, et. al., 1998, in Sims & Preston, 2006). Durlak, (1998); Gottfredson & Gottfredson (2000); and Howell (2003) describe strategies and programs that “simply do not work with juvenile offenders,” including, zero-tolerance policies, Scared Straight and boot camp. (p. 130). Howell argues that although programs such as these are used across the country and have large budgets with thousands of young people receiving lectures across the nation, there are at least 20 empirical evaluations that suggest these types of strategies are not effective (p. 130, 2003). One problem, Howell insists, is the lecture-based programs assume that children and young adults will be motivated to resist the temptations of adolescence if they hear a speech delivered by an authority figure such as a police officer. Why don’t these programs work? Howell (2003) goes on to suggest that these policies do not work because they are based on punishment as deterrence and punishment alone is not effective in reducing juvenile delinquency. However, there are interventions that do work to reduce juvenile delinquency. The literature suggests that what works are programs that provide treatment with very specific components, including cognitive-behavioral methods, self-esteem training, programs that provide multiple kinds of needs appropriate treatment and educational enhancement (MacKenzie, 2000). Programs that include MST and wraparound services are approaches that do seem to help some
juveniles. The central issue is whether or not diversion programs in Ohio are using these
types of services, programs that are based on scientific evidence of effectiveness.

1.6 The Policy Problem

Over time, the juvenile justice system has changed dramatically. During the era of the Progressives the juvenile system was once seen as a child social welfare agency. Today, the juvenile justice system is not only serious and formal; it’s increasingly a system where children are treated as adults. Feld (2000) suggests that the impetus for this transformation is based on two competing legal and cultural concepts. Originally, the culture of the law in America supported the belief that children are basically innocent, vulnerable and dependent, needing the protection of the state if their parents are not there to protect them. As the nation changed from an agricultural and rural society to a nation of highly populated, immigrant filled urban cities, the law changed to reflect society’s belief that children are responsible for their actions, similar to adults. This conflict over how young offenders should be handled Feld (2002) suggests, has allowed policymakers to manipulate society’s constructs and definitions of childhood in order to provide justification for a more punitive juvenile justice system. Bynum and Thompson (2007) argue that public opinion and how society looks at young offenders, how delinquency is defined and how the law depicts juveniles conjures up an image of the adolescent offender that is used to help society deal with troubled youth. Feld (2002) argues that
changes in the societal and legal manner in which children are viewed manifests in the form of reduced therapeutic and rehabilitative services for non-violent and less serious youthful offenders and it allows for increased numbers of youth to be waived to criminal court, transferred into the adult system. This makes the effectiveness of juvenile diversion programming all the more critical because young people may only be given minimal chances to avoid the juvenile and criminal justice system.

Although prompted by changes in public opinion about the nature of adolescent criminal culpability, juvenile justice policy and legislation can and should support programs that are based on scientific research. Scientific research should used to provide authoritative information for input into policy decisions concerning how to handle juveniles. Contemporary and historical social science research demonstrate that the most effective way to deter youth from delinquent behavior is to address the complexities of each youth’s individual life, family, mental health and learning abilities, etc. The problem is, little research exists to see whether or not local governments receiving funds from the state of Ohio are following evidence-based practice in designing and providing juvenile diversion programming services that are really tailored to meet the complex needs of today’s troubled youth.

To help local governments with the creation and delivery diversion services, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) has developed a comprehensive policy describing appropriate strategy for juveniles which focuses on
identifying and providing interventions for the juvenile population (Howell, 2003). At the crux of this strategy is the core tenet of making sure intense service is matched with each child’s individual’s needs and risks (Griffin & Torbet, 1998; Howell, 2003; Wiebush, McNulty, & Le, 2000). The question is whether or not local governments receiving funds from the state of Ohio are providing intense and individualized services or are they providing the bare bones minimum? The problem is, when it comes to criminal justice and juvenile justice policies, prevention methodologies may not be based on scientific evidence, but on some entrenched assumptions, customs, individual opinions, non-scientific theories or subjective impressions (Sherman, Farrington, Welsh and MacKenzie, 2003). The survey administered for this research examined characteristics of existing programs in Ohio to determine if they are indeed based on what scientific social science research suggests constitutes effective juvenile diversion.

1.7 Importance of the Study

There are several reasons for a study examining the specifics of juvenile diversion programming in Ohio. First, a study examining program effectiveness is important because diversion is a cost-saving mechanism. The monetary value of saving one high-risk youth is estimated at $1.7 to $2.3 million (Cohen, 1998). Second, a study exploring juvenile diversion is important because diversion intervention can also help decrease
disproportionate minority contact (DMC) and involvement in the juvenile justice system. The urban areas of counties in Ohio, similar to large cities across the nation, have substantial minority populations. According to Stevens (2002), to ignore the pressing need for services, treatment and interventions that help prepare minority adolescents for adulthood is “to court failure.” The problem is, too many minorities, particularly young black males, are becoming involved in the juvenile criminal justice system. Nationally, Black youths are at least four times more likely to be arrested compared to white juveniles (The Sentencing Project, 2004). Black juveniles, males in particular, are over five times as likely to be incarcerated (The Sentencing Project, 2004). Disproportionate minority contact (DMC) and involvement in the criminal justice system is such a national crisis that the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has outlined mandates for states to report on their progress in identifying proportions of DMC and developing remedies to address it. So, there is definitely a need for a study exploring the existence of evidence-based diversion strategies to serve this vulnerable population. A study examining program components is warranted to see if the needs of the most vulnerable populations are being addressed in existing juvenile diversion programs in Ohio. Third, there is a need to study the content and quality of juvenile diversion programming because criminal justice researchers agree that there is definitely a strong connection between adult and juvenile crime (Joseph, 1995; Bartollas, 2006; Benda, 2001). Juveniles who are arrested at an early age are more likely to be incarcerated as
adults, so there is an emergent need for an understanding of what works so youth receive early intervention. Fourth, as mentioned earlier, public policy and the resulting program design and implementation, speaks loudly as to whether or not the democratic principles on which this nation was founded are a reality for all citizens. So, a study examining the fidelity of juvenile diversion programming to see if it meets the parameters of providing justice, equality and equity for the people being served and the communities affected by juveniles is always timely and appropriate. A fifth reason this study is important relates to the need to communicate to stakeholders (parents, teachers, social workers, police officials) the importance of providing individualized services such as court directed diversion programs in order to deter youth from further criminal behavior. The hope is that the information provided in this study may be used to not only heighten awareness, but to create a dialogue with juvenile justice officials.

1.8 Assumptions, Goals of Juvenile Justice

In order to fulfill the purposes of this study, that is an examination of juvenile diversion programming in Ohio, a succinct discussion of juvenile justice and diversion policy in the U.S. is appropriate, specifically, the underlying assumptions should be mentioned as a basis for understanding why diversion is used today.

Over the years, the assumptions, goals, objectives and effectiveness of the juvenile justice system in America have vacillated back and forth between the discussions
of whether to punish young offenders (retribution) or to rehabilitate them, all the while making sure the public is protected. In early colonial America children were not viewed as being less responsible for their actions because of diminished reasoning capabilities, they were looked upon as being small adults (Agnew, 2005; Bartollas, 2006; Bynum, 2007). This meant children should be held responsible for their behavior. This view shifted after industrialization when the state began taking responsibility for troubled youth. As urbanization brought hordes of poor immigrant children who needed the help of the state, this prompted new theories and ideas for programs to reform and rehabilitate youth.

Between the 1960s and the 1990s, policies surrounding the treatment of juvenile offenders were still vacillating back and forth from support for punishment to belief in treatment, based on public opinion about reports of increasing juvenile crime. Today, the assumption of the juvenile justice system is the belief that adolescents are indeed vulnerable, however they are also responsible and that society must be protected from dangerous juveniles while at the same time providing needed interventions to deter troubled youth. The application of diversionary programs is one way to fulfill two of the federal government’s goals: reducing juvenile recidivism and protecting the public. A more detailed description of the progression of juvenile justice and the use of juvenile diversion in America will be provided in the literature review in chapter two of this study.
1.9 Rationale of the Study

What are the rationale, reason, basis, and argument for this study? There are two reasons the author is undertaking this research. First, the underlying reason for this study is the author’s belief that juvenile justice practice in Ohio should be a reflection of the democratic values of the Constitution, justice, fairness, equality and, equity. The author asserts that perhaps there is a connection between both the design and actual implementation of diversion services and the nation’s, systematic and institutionalized processes of racial oppression. Describing the problem of racism in America, Carter (2007) and Speight (2007) suggest that there are enormous injuries and consequences because of exposure to racism, that racism is pervasive, and that it is reproduced in the major cultural, economic, educational, and political institutions. Most importantly, racism constrains and diminishes both individual development and individual determination (Young, 1990 in Speight, 2007). Racism exploits, it marginalizes people, and leaves them powerless (Speight, 2007). And, although there has been much racial progress, as Cornel West argues in his 2001 text *Race Matters*, there is a legacy of white supremacy that appears in every American institution. This includes the juvenile justice system. What the author of this study seeks to explore is whether existing juvenile diversion programs in Ohio are indicative of democratic principles or something else. The implications of improperly designed and inappropriately delivered juvenile diversion services are immense. The author believes that a study exploring existing diversion programs will help us understand the need to make comprehensive approaches available
to juvenile populations in every county and jurisdiction. The data obtained through this study is expected to reveal whether juvenile diversion in Ohio exemplifies democracy or whether existing diversion programs contribute to the mechanisms of institutionalized racism.

The second reason the author elects to conduct this study lies in the rationale behind systems theory. Based on a lengthy review of juvenile delinquency literature and research, the author embraces the rationale of systems theory. The systems approach designs program activities around the needs of the child and the child’s family, integrating services by providing multi-agency access and community collaboration with different streams of care and a variety of flexible approaches to treatment that are related to the various systems influencing the child (Hamilton & Hamilton, 2004). The basis of the systems rationale rests on the application of the comprehensive and integrated theoretical model of delinquency prevention combining the multisystemic therapy (MST) diversion program model and wraparound services philosophy. MST is a systems approach that addresses the variety of impacts to a young person’s life (Borum, 2003). The wraparound concept is really a continuation of the systems system of care approach as it focuses mainly on integrating program components so youth and their families (parents and siblings) benefit. Taken together, these two methods can be used to provide a systems approach, which is, a comprehensive spectrum of services for juveniles and their families. Both MST and wraparound are concerned with providing numerous services via interagency collaboration in order to deliver a comprehensive
intervention program to juvenile offenders. Combined, these theoretical models provide an integrative rationale for delinquency prevention in the form of juvenile diversion for first-time, misdemeanor, status and non-violent juvenile offenders.

The literature describes three categories of delinquency prevention: primary, secondary and tertiary schema (Brantingham & Faust, 1976). Programs that provide MST and wraparound services such as those enumerated in the chapter two of this study address delinquency prevention from a secondary schema.

1. Primary prevention addresses the environmental conditions that are believed to influence delinquency;

2. Secondary prevention addresses early intervention, focusing on youth who are just beginning their offense careers;

3. Tertiary prevention is reactive and addresses rehabilitation and treatment efforts and program interventions. When a delinquent or criminal act is committed, the juvenile justice system is engaged. Police, court authorities, corrections authorities (community treatment and facility commitment), are the agents of tertiary prevention measures.

This study explores whether juvenile diversion programs in Ohio are integrating the comprehensive MST and wraparound approaches and combining all prevention schemas so that major risk factors in all domains believed to influence delinquency are being addressed for youth participating in diversion programs in Ohio. The purpose is to see if service components are tailored to resemble EBP.
The author believes that integrating a comprehensive strategy will provide a diversion services model that can provide intervention in the broadest sense, having the greatest effect to reduce juvenile delinquency in Ohio, thus, reducing the number of juveniles transferring to adult criminality, and reducing the number of minorities entering the juvenile justice system, keeping Ohio’s communities safe and strengthening Ohio’s children and their families. Using the systems theory as the rationale and framework for this study, the author intends to make an inquiry exploring the details of program components and services provided by contemporary juvenile diversion programs in Ohio. The first step in conducting this study involves a brief review of some of the history of juvenile delinquency and the use of juvenile diversion in America.

1.10 History and Major Shifts in Juvenile Justice

Historically, the goals of juvenile justice have been keeping the community safe, making youth accountable for their actions and providing rehabilitation services for young offenders (Siegel, Welsh, & Senna, 2003). Making the case that adolescents and young adults should not be subjected to the punishment of the adult justice system, the progressives pushed for a totally separate system of justice to serve juveniles, one that would have the goals of protecting and helping the child and protecting the community.
The beginnings of a separate justice system for juveniles occurred with the creation of the first juvenile court in Cook County, Illinois in 1899. The early courts were very informal. Many proceedings were held in the judge’s chambers. At the foundation of the new system of juvenile justice was the assumption that juveniles could be deterred from criminal behavior if they are provided with the skills they will need as adults.

The goals of the juvenile justice system experienced a number of changes as assumptions about children changed. A detailed account of how the focus, goals and effectiveness of juvenile justice have changed over time will be presented in chapter two of this paper. The milestone shift worth noting here is the passage of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) of 1974. The JJDP Act had as its main purpose the establishment of the requirement that youth that were status offenders (non-criminal offenses such as truancy, using tobacco, disobeying parents or running away from home) be automatically diverted from the criminal justice system. The Act was the beginning of a major philosophical shift in juvenile justice because it accomplished some important tasks. It brought with it a new definition of juvenile delinquency and it redirected three critical points in juvenile justice - its philosophy, its legal authority and its procedures (Burfeind & Bartusch, p. 43, 2006).

Originally, the formative underpinning of the juvenile court rested on the concept of rehabilitation. President Johnson’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration, the group responsible for the study and analysis that resulted in the
recommendations of the JJDP Act, felt children who commit status offenses should be turned over to the community (diversion), and services should be provided for youth and their families through community-based centers (Burfeind & Bartusch, p. 43, 2006). In other words, the focus of the JJDP Act was deinstitutionalization. The Act encouraged and increased the use of informal court processing and the use of community-based alternatives for status and non-violent offenders. It also provided funds for delinquency prevention activities. Its major purpose was the requirement that all juveniles be removed from adult facilities (Burfeind & Bartusch, 2006; Roberts, 2004).

After a series of violent school shootings and reported increases in juvenile crime, the American public has demanded the return of a harsher, more punitive and retributive juvenile justice system that focuses on incapacitation. Between 1988 and 1999 murders committed by juveniles increased 100 percent and students ages 12 through 18 were the victims of about 2.5 million crimes at school, over 186,000 of these were serious violent crimes (Siegel, Welsh, & Senna, p. 277, 2003). Another major shift in juvenile justice occurred at this point. Spawned by public opinion, policymakers took on a get-tough attitude and a law and order philosophy toward juvenile justice (Roberts, 2004). The result was an amendment to the 1974 JJDP Act with an accompanying change toward punishment. Contemporary juvenile justice has the goals of both punishment and rehabilitation. Most states have adopted tough juvenile laws, but practice also includes a variety of services, such as special courts, restorative justice, and the use of local diversion programs addressing a myriad of adolescent problems.
As far as differences in the theory, practice and effectiveness of juvenile justice and juvenile delinquency prevention in America, things have changed over the past 50 years as beliefs about the nature of juvenile delinquency changed. As mentioned earlier, the goals have fluctuated between whether or not we should punish young offenders, make attempts to repair the damage by restoring victims, or provide adolescents with interventions, treatment and rehabilitation. The changes in approach to practice have occurred depending on the theoretical explanation of juvenile delinquency. For example, embracing classical deterrence theory, practitioners assume juveniles are rational, exercising free will in determining to behave in a delinquent manner. This is the basis of the contemporary model of juvenile justice that calls for swift legal justice combined with actions of deterrence such as diversion programming (Sims & Preston, 2006).

Continuing the discussion of the history of juvenile delinquency prevention, there are two theories explaining juvenile delinquency that have traditionally influenced the practice of diversion: deterrence theory and labeling theory. These two concepts are important to understanding why diversion should be evidence-based.

Deterrence theory is born out of classical criminology. Classical criminology holds that the best deterrence occurs as a result of a combination of both prompt and proportionately appropriate punishment (Beccaria, 1764). Absorbing this classical notion in its’ definition, contemporary criminal and juvenile justice holds that punishment generally only deters when the possibility and costs of punishment outweigh the benefits of committing crime, the result is deterrence and a reduction in crime (Paternoster & Bachman, 2001).
The second theory that greatly influences juvenile diversion programming is labeling theory. Labeling theory is the intellectual basis and main theoretical rationale behind public policy supporting juvenile diversion. Frank Tannenbaum (1938), the man credited with creating the definition of labeling theory, argued that when children are labeled delinquents by authorities, including justice officials, parents or teachers, they fulfill this prophecy by acting out the label that has been assigned to them. Support for diversion is based on the belief that when juveniles commit minor offenses (status offenses), it is better to handle them in the community, with their family, thereby avoiding the labeling process, instead of subjecting them to the stigma that results from casting them off to an institution and processing them through the juvenile justice system (Sims & Preston, 2006). The literature review in chapter two of this research will provide more detail about the history and changes of juvenile justice.

1.11 Juvenile Justice in Ohio

How do Ohio’s juvenile justice policies fit into the broad context of juvenile justice in the U.S.? Ohio has followed suit with the rest of the nation becoming more punitive in dealing with recalcitrant youth while at the same time not relinquishing its support of rehabilitating children. Evidence of this can be seen in news articles and television reports of young people being waived over to adult court to serve adult time. At the same time, Ohio has increased efforts to help juveniles.
In 1993, Ohio’s juvenile facilities were overpopulated (2,600 occupied beds as compared to 1,700 in 2007) and experiencing constant daily intake increases. Rallying to address the problem, Ohio’s juvenile justice officials formed a partnership between the Ohio Department of Youth Services and the Ohio Association of Family and Juvenile Court Judges (DYS, 2007). Together, they created an initiative that would provide funding for the creation and implementation of local juvenile programs that would provide community-based treatment for minor juvenile offenders. The result was the RECLAIM Ohio initiative (Reasoned and Equitable Community and Local Alternatives to the Incarceration of Minors). In 2008 the state of Ohio disbursed millions of dollars in RECLAIM funds to Ohio counties. This study explores how this money is being spent to divert first-time juvenile offenders.

Through the RECLAIM program, the state provides financial incentives to encourage Ohio counties to develop community-based programs. The idea is to place state funds in the front of the juvenile justice system, equipping local juvenile judges with more options to be creative in providing community-based diversion for minor juvenile offenders with the ultimate purpose of diverting them from DYS facilities (Guarino-Ghezzi & Loughran, 2004). Ohio’s RECLAIM initiative is one example of a local juvenile justice system that seeks to salvage adolescent lives (Moon, Applegate and Latessa, 1997). RECLAIM will be discussed in further detail in chapter two of this study.
In addition to RECLAIM funds, Ohio counties also receive state funds from Ohio’s Youth Services Grants through Title IV. Funded through the Department of Education, Title IV funds may be used for a variety of services that reduce the risk factors believed to be associated with juvenile delinquency or to enhance existing juvenile justice services, including community-based diversion programs (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). In 2002, the Ohio General Assembly enacted House Bill 57, authorizing the transfer of funds to Ohio’s juvenile courts for the care and diversion of adjudicated (declared delinquent) children (State of Ohio, 2002). Ohio also receives federal monies through Titles II and V. Together, these initiatives provide monies to help local communities offer a variety of interventions to deter juveniles from the justice system. The question is how are juvenile social programs in Ohio using these funds? Specifically, in light of what is known in social science about individual child risks, family risks, peer group risks and school and community risks, the research question is whether or not the diversion strategies currently being used counties across the state of Ohio are appropriate, meaning they address the risk factors for the populations they serve. Are the programs evidence-based, that is, are they patterned after what has been demonstrated to be effective in reducing juvenile offending and addressing the factors associated with delinquency: individual difficulties; family disorders; peers; school and community characteristics (Henggeler et al., 1998)? For this study, Ohio’s diversion programs were explored in an in-depth analysis of survey data obtained for this research.
What will be examined are county-level diversion program design, activities, components, and implementation. The purpose is to contribute to the understanding of how juvenile justice policy and programming work together to divert troubled youth. To accomplish this, the study involves an analysis of self-reported data via an on-line questionnaire (and telephone or mail interview as requested) directed to diversion program administrators in all 88 counties of the state of Ohio. Since RECLAIM and Youth Service Grant funds are sent directly to each county’s juvenile court office, calls were made to each county’s juvenile court headquarters office. Initially, court administrators were contacted since they generally work directly with the juvenile court judges in determining diversion program design. Each program administrator was asked about services for first-time, misdemeanor and status juvenile offenders. Details of the survey questionnaire used to obtain this information are provided in the methodology section of chapter three in this study.

1.12 Components of Effective Juvenile Diversion

According to the model program guide of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), the most effective juvenile corrections programs are those, which include components that address juveniles’ social, family, and mental health needs. What specific policies appear to be most appropriate for decreasing juvenile delinquency? What programmatic components occur from appropriate policies on
reducing juvenile recidivism? Social science research suggests the most effective
diversion programs include:

1. Approaches where intervention is provided under the auspices of juvenile
court;
2. Counseling that involves the entire family;
3. Victim restitution;
4. Community service;
5. Programs that build character;
6. Drug treatment and drug testing (Moon, Sundt, Cullen & Wright, p. 52, 2000);
7. A multi-modal approach to intervention that includes items such as
   individual counseling, alcohol and drug treatment and education, personal
   skill building, and restoration to victims of crime (Cullen, Wright, Brown,
   Moon, Blankenship & Applegate, 1998);
8. Comprehensive strategies that integrate prevention activities and control
   mechanisms, providing a continuum of interventions and prevention
   services for the youth and his or her family (Howell, 2003);
9. Components addressing the five major risk domains for delinquent
   behavior: family, school, personal problems, peers and community
   (Howell, 1997);
10. Components that reinforce and help to sustain protective factors,
    strengthening factors such as having parents who are educated, having
    peers who are preparing for college (Burfeind & Bartusch, 2006);
11. Social skills building and cognitive skill building components (Agnew,
    2006);
12. Programs that are flexible enough to allow collaboration with other
    agencies that can offer services to help youth (Bynum & Thompson,
    2007);
13. Coordinated efforts to address juveniles’ multiple problems, including
    mental health assessments and interventions that address youth with
    emotional problems (Bynum & Thompson, 2007);
14. Academic interventions to help youth with problems in school
    performance (Hamilton & Hamilton, 2004).

These are some of the scientifically proven and common sense approaches to juvenile
delinquency prevention. Chapter 2 of this study continues with a more in-depth
description of evidence-based appropriate program components and services to reduce juvenile delinquency.

1.13 Research Issues of the Study

The research issue addressed in this study is whether existing juvenile diversion programs in Ohio are evidence-based. Evidence-based practices (EBP) are built on empirical research findings. This is the primary inquiry of this study.

What this study seeks to accomplish is an in-depth examination of Ohio diversion programs so that recommendations for policy can be shared with local juvenile justice policymakers. It’s implications for policy – informing stakeholders that diversion can and should be an opportunity for providing youthful offenders with future life chances.

1.14 Limitations of the Study

All survey program evaluations face limitations. There are several limitations in this study. First, confidentiality is a required safeguard for research involving youth. For this reason, access to records, caseworker notes, court records, etc., are often difficult or impossible to obtain. Sensitive and confidential information about juvenile offenders is protected to a large extent. This does not present a limitation for this study since study participants were not asked to provide any information that identifies juvenile clients in any way.
Also, agencies do not like to be embarrassed. Data describing how juveniles are treated in a particular diversion program may show some mismanagement of juvenile justice employees (Struckhoff, 2006). Some program administrators may be reluctant to cooperate because they may ask themselves what they have to gain from granting access to a researcher? Ordinarily, this may result in low response rates to the survey questionnaire. To offset this possible negative impact, the primary researcher of this study spoke with juvenile court judges and court officials via the telephone to ask for their county’s participation in providing access to information about details of diversion programs in their court’s jurisdiction. In spite of these limitations, survey research methodology, using a questionnaire as the research instrument, allowed the researcher to obtain information from a large population quickly.

Another limitation involves the fact that program administrators in Ohio cities examined in this study may not keep recidivism data and may not follow-up with youth who have exited the program. For this reason, program quality was not assessed using recidivism rates. Quality was explored by comparing evidence-based principles to existing program design and implementation. This is the key component of this study. In conclusion, the material presented in this study seeks to support the argument that juvenile justice policy must be formulated to assure that all youth in Ohio, whether they live in urban or suburban areas, be given full opportunity to benefit from what is known to work – individualized, precisely implemented, behavioral and cognitive oriented
programs and activities that focus on the identified needs of each young person.
(Heilbrun, Goldstein & Redding, 2005).

1.15 What we will learn

The study conducted for this dissertation extends contemporary research examining policies and practices of the juvenile justice system. The results of this study will provide descriptive information for juvenile justice stakeholders in the state of Ohio. This research can help policy makers determine if empirically tested program components are being used in diversion programs being supported by funds from the state of Ohio. Of particular interest to the author, the study will help us understand exactly what kinds of services the most vulnerable populations are receiving.

1.16 Format of the Study

Chapter one provided an introduction, citing the research problems surrounding the application of evidence-based juvenile diversion. Chapter two presents a succinct review of pertinent literature describing empirical social science research on the topic of juvenile diversion and an integrative review of the literature summarizing some of the accumulated knowledge concerning juvenile justice and it includes a historical perspective. Chapter three presents the research methodology, including a description of
data collections methods and a list of hypotheses posited. Chapter four describes results obtained from the original survey questionnaire and data analysis. Chapter five discusses the data findings, implications and recommendations for policy and conclusions.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Examining the topic of juvenile diversion practice in the state of Ohio, this chapter presents: (1) a discussion of the theoretical underpinnings of this study; (2) a succinct historical perspective of juvenile justice; (3) a description of what does and does not work in preventing juvenile delinquency; (4) a discussion of evidence-based practice and programming and; (5) a list of demographic variables believed to impact the existence or absence of evidence-based practice and; (6) a discussions of important policy and legislation related to juvenile diversion.

2.1 Theoretical Foundation/Rationale for the Study

Urban communities with high juvenile crime, and high crime in general, are most likely to be urban places where there is high unemployment (Joseph, 1995), where guns are readily available and drugs are easy to buy (Anderson, 1990), and juveniles are perhaps unsupervised (Agnew, 2005). These are the types of communities where evidence-based juvenile diversion is badly needed. Does evidence-based practice
exist in urban areas of Ohio meeting this description? This study explores existing juvenile diversion in Ohio counties in hopes of finding some answers to this question.

As mentioned in chapter one, two major concepts underscore the theoretical foundation of this study, systems theory and social equity as demonstrated through the democratic imperatives of justice, fairness, equality, and equity. Given America’s lengthy record of racial discrimination, a study examining what kind of program activities and components are being used to serve young offenders, especially juveniles of color, is appropriate. The primary theme underlying this study is that of how to best develop, discipline and control juveniles while maintaining democratic principles of equality. As Hawkins and Kempf-Leonard suggest,

*All of these supporting agencies [of the juvenile justice system] experience problems related to racial, ethnic and social class disparities within the clientele populations that they serve* (p. 16, 2005).

The extent to which these disparities exist in juvenile diversion programming in Ohio has only been minimally explored. The question the author seeks to explore is whether existing juvenile diversion programs employ evidence-based activities and program components and whether they display democratic imperatives. To this end, this study explores what juvenile diversion is like today in counties across Ohio.

The second concept at the theoretical foundation of this study is that of systems theory. Systems theory demands that program services address, involve and assist all of
the systems influencing a child’s life. Under the umbrella of the systems approach falls the concept of family systems theory. The theory posits that the family is the major socializing agent in our society, therefore, interventions must include the family if permanent and meaningful changes are to be made regarding the child’s value system, lifestyle, behavior or attitude (Roberts, 2004).

Two empirically supported treatment modalities that use the systems approach are multi-systemic therapy (MST) and wraparound. Both of these are systems approaches in that they address the various systems believed to impact or prompt delinquency. The premise here is the belief that juveniles may be prone to commit crimes based on their exposure to various systems of risks occurring at different phases of their development. Comprehensive strategies such as MST and wraparound service involve strengthening the family and addressing both risk and protective factors. The comprehensive approach is one of the best ways to help children who come in contact with the juvenile justice system because typically many children have a series of issues and problems that need to be addressed.

MST is effective as a juvenile diversion mechanism because it provides a variety, a system of intensive services and it involves the use of licensed youth workers (Lincoln, 1976). The MST approach is based on the belief that all members of a person’s family are connected and interdependent (Dembo & Pallone, 2001). Each member of the family responds to others in that family (Jang, 1999). MST will be discussed in further detail later in this chapter.
Wraparound theory is a service philosophy that involves wrapping the treatment around the individual needs of youth who are in trouble with the law. The key aspect of wraparound is it goes outside the existing diversion program to provide a systematic plan of activities to meet the needs of both the child or young adult and his or her family by using a variety of integrated services, provided by various agencies.

*Wraparound service planning refers to a process of organizing and coordinating service delivery for children and families with complex needs involved with multiple service providers. These services might include clinical therapy, substance use treatment, special education, medication, caregiver support, public assistance, employment, housing, medical health care, mentorship programs, transportation and coordination of services with other sectors such as juvenile justice and child welfare* (Pullman, Kerbs, Koroloff, Veach-White, Gaylor & Sieler, p. 378, 2006).

The wraparound service approach will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter. Drawing from these theoretical foundations, this study will examine Ohio’s existing diversion programs serving adjudicated, first time, misdemeanor and non-violent juvenile offenders to see if practices are evidence-based, employing what is known to work and representing the principles of democracy (justice, equality, equity and fairness).

Again, the rationale for the author undertaking this research has to do with the author’s belief that juvenile justice practice in Ohio may not be a reflection of the democratic values of the Constitution, that is, the social equity theory which encompasses justice, fairness, equality, and equity, if the most vulnerable populations are not receiving comprehensive diversion services.
2.2 Public Policy and Diversion

Public policy surrounding juvenile delinquency prevention has as its predominant goal the issue of deinstitutionalization and diversion. The major dilemma is how to devise public policies that fulfill the mission of protecting the public while providing the most effective services to treat and deter youth (Guarino-Ghezzi & Loughran, 2004). The idea behind public policy affording government support of diversion is that the state is expected to fund programs that replace formal and institutional processing by channeling juveniles away from the justice systems as early as possible (Brungardt, 1983). Again, the point to be made in this study is whether programs in the State of Ohio are offering the types of services that have been scientifically shown to eradicate youth crime, that is, comprehensive evidence-based services such as those provided by MST and wraparound service programs.

The main rationale behind public policy supporting juvenile diversion is the belief that when juveniles commit minor offenses (status offenses), it is better to handle them in the community, with their family, deterring them away from the justice system (deterrence theory), keeping them at home instead of shipping them off to an institution and processing them through the juvenile justice system (Sims & Preston, 2006).

*Diversion programs are intended to keep juvenile offenders out of the criminal justice system from the outset and thus reduce their interaction with other, possibly more serious, deviant groups. By keeping juveniles out of the system, the labeling impact of courts and judges will be reduced. Juveniles will also develop less of the secondary deviance patterns that result from being labeled by the system as delinquent* (Patrick & Marsh, p. 62, 2005).
As mentioned in chapter one, labeling theory forms the intellectual basis for diversion. Many believe that the act of the formal processing of status offenders and non-violent youthful offenders, the act of sending them through the justice system results in the attachment of the stigma of being “bad” and the impact of being assigned this label may act as an impetus, encouraging troubled children to act out the label they’ve been assigned, sort of a self-fulfilling prophecy ((Lemert, 1951; Becker, 1963; Sims & Preston, p. 86, 2006). The end result is juvenile delinquency, thus the whole purpose of the juvenile justice is as such made null and void (Agniew, 2001). Why conduct a study of juvenile diversion in the state of Ohio? The hope is that this study will benefit local juvenile justice policy makers by identifying what specific diversion program components are being used to help youth in Ohio so that the act of labeling young non-violent, status and even misdemeanor juvenile offenders can perhaps be avoided.

What this study seeks to accomplish is an-depth examination of Ohio juvenile diversion programs. It’s implications for policy – informing stakeholders that comprehensive and family-centered diversion programming can and should be used to provide youthful offenders with future life chances. This is what sets juvenile justice apart from the adult criminal system (Zimring, 2000).

2.3 Historical Perspectives - History of American Juvenile Justice

Traditionally, the central premise of the American juvenile justice system is that children are not as responsible as adults because of their developmental immaturity, thus,
their motives, thinking abilities, and decisions are different from adults (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Guarino-Ghezzi & Loughran, 2004).

No child under 16 years of age shall be considered or be treated as a criminal; a child under age shall not be arrested, indicted, convicted, imprisoned or punished as a criminal (Tuthill, 1904 in Hawkins and Kempf-Leonard, p. 107, 2005).

This was the original rationale of diversionary programming, as expressed by the first judge of the Cook County, Illinois Juvenile Court. This was also the original and basic principle of the juvenile justice system. The public’s feelings about this premise and the corresponding changes in juvenile policy have vacillated back and forth. How did the contemporary juvenile justice system become what it is today? On the following pages is a discussion of the history of juvenile justice in the U.S., depicting how the juvenile justice system, its assumptions, goals and policies have transformed with time. Interspersed are dates of changes in Ohio juvenile justice.

Although time and space prohibit a complete history of the development and changes in the society’s responses and the goals, functions, philosophies and assumptions of juvenile justice and juvenile diversion, somewhat of a lengthy discussion is required here in order to provide an understanding and overview of events that led up to the design
of the juvenile justice and juvenile diversion systems we see today. Describing the history of the juvenile justice system, Guarino-Ghezzi & Loughran (2004), suggest that changes in the goals and perspectives on how to handle juveniles have been shaped by various and competing political factions.

In the humanitarian movement of the early reformers, the Progressives viewed children as being in need of the protection of the state (Aumann, 1931). Reformer Charles Brace, pioneered alternative strategies for preventing juvenile delinquency as early as 1853, emphasizing the “non-institutionalization” of young offenders, creating the “farmer’s home.” This was the beginning of the use of government institutions to educate, correct and even socialize juveniles (Mennel, p. 199, 1983). In 1857, authorities in Ohio created the Ohio Reform Farm for boys based on Charles Brace’s ideas. Program components included literacy, dramatics, singing and general education. “Elder brothers” delivered intervention services. There were no trained staffers (Mennel, p. 203, 1983). By 1899, progressive reformers, lead by Jane Adams and groups of socialite and aristocrat women in Chicago, had pushed support for the first juvenile court. Adams is famous for opening Hull House in Chicago, where she provided a social setting to help young immigrants escape poverty. With the creation of the first facility for juveniles in Massachusetts in 1848 and the first separate juvenile court in Cook County, Illinois in 1899, the juvenile system now had its “first legal institution to provide children with separate proceedings and hearings, separate confinement facilities, and probation and informal court procedures” (Hurley, 1977). The new juvenile justice system also began
to take on the mandate of providing more flexible procedures and opportunities for
diversion. The new system had its own laws and definitions created just for juveniles
(Guarino-Ghezzi & Loughran, 2004). One interesting thing to note here is the fact that
during the early days of the juvenile system, probation officers delivered most of the
juvenile services and treatment. Today’s juvenile justice system also relies heavily on
probation officers.

At its inception, the legal presupposition of the early juvenile court and justice
system was based on the English philosophy of *parens patriae*, the state as parent. This
meant the state is expected to act as parent, when necessary, providing for the protection,
education and even the rehabilitation of needy children (Bartollas & Miller, 2008;
Burfeind & Bartusch, 2006; Bynum & Thompson, 1996). Describing the early juvenile
justice system, Getis (2000), suggests that the underpinnings of the new juvenile justice
system rested on the philosophies of social work. The result - the use of social workers to
deliver juvenile services became routine practice. The Progressives had based their
argument for helping poor children on the belief that juvenile delinquency was caused by
social problems (poverty and crime), not heredity. The Progressives had pushed for a
humanitarian juvenile system, one that would address the environmental issues of
delinquency; one that would allow the application of scientific methods (observation and
classification of facts), and one that would value the use of professionals, experts who are
trained to help adolescents (Getis, 2000). The goal of the system: (1) to protect the
public; (2) to act as an agent of social welfare; (3) to rehabilitate children by giving them
the skills they would need for a successful and pro-social life; (4) to act as a legal institution, holding children responsible for their actions. The assumption of the system: that the rehabilitation of children is always appropriate. It’s focus: on the child, not on the offense (Feld, 2000). The new court created the legal “status offense” category (truancy, smoking, alcohol use, loitering) and established many of the differences between juvenile and adult court that we see today - juvenile court proceedings, individual records were not public; a judge would declare the youth to be adjudicated delinquent or he would be found not guilty of charges (Getis, 2000).

Ohio established its first juvenile court in Cuyahoga County 1902. By 1931, Ohio had 63 counties with juvenile organizations for the care of dependent children (Aumann, 1931). At least 53 counties now had juvenile reform facilities, referred to as the County Children’s Home (Aumann, 1931). It was also during this time that the state of Ohio created the State Department of Welfare. This agency had the responsibility of spearheading studies on juvenile delinquency. Similar to new juvenile courts in other states, the Cuyahoga Juvenile Court processes were also very informal with proceedings usually taking place in the judge’s chambers and probation was the primary mechanism as intake and assessment were done by probation officers. Probation was believed to be effective and it was widely used. By 1909, at least 30 states had totally separate courts for juveniles.

Around this time, experts in the field of sociology, led by academics at the University of Chicago, began a movement to study the development of children, based on
the belief that children’s behavior changes as they go through the stages of developing into adulthood. Scholars began to lead the work being done at the Chicago School of Sociology. It was here that academic and social science researcher, Dr. William Healy, started the Juvenile Psychopathic Institute, the world’s first guidance clinic, in 1909. In 1913 Healy posited the theory that there is “no simple causation of delinquency” because it is the result of a variety of sources of influences, such as “mental defects and habits or conflicts, outer influences, impulsions, worries, suggestibility” (Getis, p. 75, 2000). Later, in his seminal text of 1915, *The Individual Delinquent*, Healy marked the beginning of the use of the scientific approach to studying juvenile delinquency and its prevention. This was also the beginning of recognition of the powerful influence of family on juvenile delinquency (see Burt, 1925; Mennel, 1983). Healy’s work included testing youth to determine if delinquency was hereditary or the result of psychological defects. It was during these studies that Healy began to conduct psychological testing of delinquents across the nation.

By 1912, the federal government had established the U.S. Children’s Bureau to collect statistics on juvenile crime (Guarino-Ghezzi & Loughran, 2004). Between 1934-1960, the concept of linking delinquency to impoverished city living became even more popular as a result of Clifford Shaw’s 1934 Chicago Area Project. Shaw insisted there was a need for government intervention. His argument was based on the belief that delinquency prevention could only be accomplished through interplay between community organizations and government action (Burfeind & Bartusch, 2006).
Throughout the sixties, the goals of the juvenile justice system continued to vacillate between punishment and rehabilitation. Many of the large, obsolete juvenile institutions were closed. These early juvenile facilities had a history of abuse and neglect. This is what spawned the creation of community facilities and halfway houses such as those we see today. Opinions about what to do with troubled children continued to waiver. Many were feeling that nothing works, that the juvenile system too lenient and there was a need for harsher punishment (Junger-Tas, 2002). Probation, although widely used, was seen as being much too lenient. Meanwhile, the public, frightened by media reports of rising juvenile crime, demanded harsher punishment of juveniles (Marrus & Rosenberg, 2007). Some saw the informal and flexible process of juvenile courts as a disregard for the constitutional requirements that adults were afforded and they challenged the informality of juvenile courts. The legislative response was in the form of several landmark Supreme Court cases that must be mentioned because they challenged due process protections for juvenile offenders. The struggle was an argument over whether juvenile court proceedings should continue to be informal with the goal of finding the best ways to provide needs appropriate and effective services to help youth, or formal court processing, complete with the usual legalities of evidence-laden proceedings similar to those of adult criminal courts. Several cases stand out.

First, in 1966, *Kent v. United States* – Here the court established that juveniles who are in a position where they may be subject to being waived to adult court are in fact entitled to adult due process. A second case in 1967, the *In re Gault* case, made it clear
that juveniles, similar to adults, are also entitled to the protections of both the 14th Amendment and the Bill of Rights. The keys issue is prior to these cases, the court was juxtapositioned in a more humanitarian role. These cases changed the Progressive reformers’ view of juvenile court from a flexible, informal, highly discretionary social welfare agency whose main purpose was to help the child, into a stricter, more formal court, replete with mechanisms afforded adult offenders, including due process safeguards, individualized treatment and graduated sentencing (Feld, in Sanders and Hamilton, p. 155, 2001).

Two more cases are worth mentioning to complete a succinct review of how the juvenile court system we see today came into existence. In 1970 *In re Winship* – the court established that the higher standard of burden of proof – beyond a reasonable doubt – is applicable in all criminal cases, regardless of the age of the defendant. Then, in 1975, *Breed v. Jones* – The court extended double jeopardy rights to juveniles. The most important thing to note here is that the court’s findings in these cases catapulted major shifts not only in the philosophy of juvenile court, but also in the assumptions about how to handle juvenile delinquents.

Up until this time, the prevailing assumption generally accepted by society was the belief that young offenders were actually victims. They were the victims of societal problems, and they were not criminals (U.S. President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967). Embracing this assumption, the federal government created a comprehensive policy agenda for the juvenile justice
system (Guarino-Ghezzi & Loughran, 2004). This was the first large-scale juvenile delinquency prevention program in the U.S. (Guarino-Ghezzi & Loughran, 2004). It was during President Johnson’s tenure in office (1963-1969) that the Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice was formed. This agency was responsible for creating the federal policy outlining a comprehensive plan for juvenile diversion aimed at the deinstitutionalization and diversion of juvenile offenders.

In 1974, Congress passed the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act as a result of a series of lawsuits and complaints about abuse, mistreatment and violence in the nation’s oldest juvenile facilities (Swartz, 1989). The Act accomplished several things. First, it allowed the transfer of status offenders to family court, instead of juvenile court. Second, it mandated that separate housing be provided for juveniles who were being held in facilities and institutions where there were adult offenders. Third, the JJDP Act mandated the removal of over 100,000 juveniles who were locked up in adult institutions (Guarino-Ghezzi & Loughran, 2004). Fourth, the JJDP Act created the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Today, the OJJDP oversees the administration of delinquency policy at the federal level and it provides assistance for state and local juvenile justice systems. As a result of the 1974 JJDP Act and the creation of the OJJDP, the federal government began to provide financial incentives to local governments as encouragement for special programming for first-time and non-violent juvenile offenders. These changes were based on the belief that juveniles who were incarcerated, jailed, or institutionalized not only suffered from being labeled,
their life chances are often diminished and quite often they are exposed to more serious offenders, so less restrictive measures are more desirable. Keeping youth out of the system is overall more effective in reducing juvenile recidivism.

Although there were some positive changes at the federal level in the 70’s, the assumptions about juveniles having diminished capacity were changing toward the belief that youth who commit adult crimes (using guns and selling drugs) should do adult time. It was this get-tough attitude that facilitated the increase in waiving juveniles to criminal court to receive adult sentences. By 1975, the goals of the juvenile system were strongly positioned between the need to punish and the hope for rehabilitation and deinstitutionalization. The problem was, Supreme Court decisions such as Kent, Gault, and Winship actually had an adverse effect on how the public viewed juveniles. These cases did apply the protections of the constitution to the auspices of juvenile justice. However, the public now expected youthful offenders who were receiving the same constitutional protections as adults to be held responsible for their actions, similar to adults. The result was a juvenile justice system that was beginning to resemble the adult criminal system where the focus was on punishment. A new consensus had emerged – that juveniles are responsible, regardless of their environment, regardless of the social conditions that impact their lives, and they should be punished. Rehabilitation was secondary. Recidivism became the major measure of success in juvenile corrections. The early goal of government acting as a social welfare agent, providing youth with life skills to prepare them for adulthood was rapidly being set aside. The nation’s new
attitudes embracing punishment resulted in an increase in the numbers of juveniles in court system, particularly minority populations and black males in particular. The growth of the juvenile justice population also created a need for all kinds of new services and programs to address juvenile crime.

In the 1980s, as drug trafficking and gun violence increased in urban areas the juvenile justice system continued to get tough on punishing young offenders. Virtually every state in the U.S. began to enact tougher laws, subjecting juveniles to harsher punishment (Feld in Hawkins & Kempf-Leonard, 2005). Probation was still the primary mechanism of juvenile courts. It was during this time that intensive supervision was created using a team of probation officers. It was also during the 1980s that diversion and restorative justice programs began to appear. Specialty courts, such as teen courts, appeared. Judges began to use juvenile drug courts for non-violent and first-time youthful offenders.

In 1992, the OJJDP’s new Title V initiative following the 1974 Act was amended (42 U.S.C. 5601 et. seq.). Title V established the Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency, also known as the Community Prevention Grants program. This program centers on identifying and decreasing risk factors and reinforcing protective factors for juveniles who come into contact with the local Department of Youth Services (OJJDP, 2008). As a funding incentive for states such as Ohio where home rule allows program administrators to dictate the types of services juveniles receive, Title V is in place to prompt local justice officials and policy leaders to create comprehensive community-
based techniques to help adolescents. The OJJDP also provides training for local leaders who sponsor comprehensive juvenile programming and access to a model programs guide (MPG) via the agency’s website. The MPG will be discussed further later in this study.

During the 1990s there were also some major policy changes that reflected the harsher, more retributive juvenile justice system including: (1) the increased use of judicial waiver of juveniles to adult court; (2) prosecutors increased the use of concurrent jurisdiction (allowing cases to be filed in adult or juvenile court) and (3); state statutes changed mandating certain offenses to be automatically excluded from juvenile court (Griffin, Torbet, & Szymanski, 1998). Ohio followed suit and legislated mandatory waivers to adult court for juveniles convicted of certain violent crimes. At the same time, Ohio also began to focus on community alternatives for non-violent youthful offenders. In 1994, former Ohio governor George Voinovich spearheaded the implementation of the RECLAIM Ohio program in 88 counties as the state of Ohio focused on providing community-based programming for juveniles, including day treatment, electronic monitoring, residential treatment, and intensive supervision (DYS, 2005). Summit County was one of the pilot sites testing the RECLAIM initiative in 1993.

Between 1998 and 1999, there were 47 school-associated shootings in the U.S. (Siegel, Welsh & Senna, p. 277, 2005). As a result of the incidents of school shootings and other youth violence, an amended Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act was passed including language that literally calls for the treatment of children as
miniature adults. The juvenile justice system had now relegated to the early colonial suppositions about children being small adults. States swiftly followed, each with their own legislation creating harsher juvenile penalties. For example, in 1999, Ohio legislators passed Senate Bill 179, broadening the scope of options available to juvenile courts to punish and incapacitate juveniles. The key reforms of the bill are disturbing and retributive, allowing the commitment of 10 and 11 year-olds for violent crimes; triggering adult sentences if juveniles commit a felony while under supervision and; allowing courts to impose adult sentences through the mechanism of the blended sentence (DYS, 2005). The problem is, these changes disproportionately impact minority youth. The sad truth that has not come to the fore of the public agenda is the fact that “minority youths are incarcerated at a rate two to five times that of white youths” (Siegel & Welsh, 2005, p. 353). In Ohio, “for every 212 white youths in custody over 1,038 African Americans are in custody” (Siegel & Welsh, 2005, p. 354). This is what is referred to as disproportionate minority contact (DMC).

Today, the goal of the juvenile system is whatever is in the best interest of society (Sims & Preston, 2006). Frequently, newspapers and television report the incidents of increased blended sentences permitting the commitment of juveniles to serve adult sentences upon transfer to adult facilities after reaching age 21, and judges are now making decision to waive hearings based on seriousness of the offense, instead of basing the crux of their decisions on the maturity of the youth or their ability to receive treatment or be rehabilitated (Burfeind & Bartusch, 2006).
As shown in the historical description above, over time, attitudes toward juvenile offenders have shifted back and forth between the position of whether juveniles should be punished or rehabilitated and juvenile justice policies and programs have responded. The result is the contemporary juvenile justice system, one that has gradually moved away from rehabilitation, toward punishment (Howell, 2003; Sims & Preston, 2006).

2.4 Ohio RECLAIMs Juveniles

Turning specifically to the state of Ohio, the history of juvenile justice policy in Ohio has been shaped by the fluctuation in national juvenile justice policies. As compared to national policy, Ohio has kept pace with vacillating public opinion and policy changes in juvenile justice. One example of how national juvenile policy influenced Ohio juvenile justice involves Ohio’s response to the In re Gault decision. As a result of the Gault decision, the Ohio legislature changed the Ohio Juvenile Code in 1968 and adopted the Modern Courts Amendment to the Ohio Constitution, creating the Rules of Juvenile Procedure.

In the 1970s, 80s and 90s, most states, including Ohio, adopted more punitive ways to handle juveniles, allowing the prosecution of youth in adult criminal courts. In the 1990s, Ohio began mandatory waiver to adult court for juveniles convicted of certain violent crimes (OJJDP, 2007). Changes in national juvenile justice policy do affect youth in Ohio.
Most recently, Ohio has been at the forefront of establishing alliances to address contemporary problems of how to deal with juvenile delinquents. An example is the collaboration between four state agencies – the Ohio Departments of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services, Mental Health, Rehabilitation and Correction, and Youth Services – forming the Linkages Project. The purpose of the project is to create a labyrinth of agencies to provide mental health and substance abuse services for juveniles in Ohio (Cocozza & Skowyra, 2000).

In the midst of increasing juvenile homicides, school shootings and juvenile gang violence, critics of the juvenile justice system argue that money should be spent to punish juveniles instead of trying to rehabilitate them. The tide of public opinion and the pendulum of public policy seem to be swinging toward the abolishment of a separate justice system for juvenile offenders.

2.4.1 Funding of Diversion in Ohio

In May 1992, juvenile correctional facilities were overpopulated with over 2,600 youth committed to Department of Youth Service (DYS) facilities (OJJDP, 2006). Governor George Voinovich initiated a dialogue between DYS officials and juvenile court administrators to develop a collaborative approach to the care, treatment, and corrective sanctioning of delinquents. What resulted was RECLAIM Ohio, created to encourage juvenile court judges to design and use community-based options and to give
juvenile offenders more opportunities to be diverted away from the justice system into local programming. The RECLAIM program places a policy and funding emphasis on delinquency prevention and early intervention activities (OJJDP, 2006).

In 1993, the Ohio legislature passed a House Bill that officially created the Reasoned and Equitable Community and Local Alternatives to the Incarceration of Minors (RECLAIM Ohio) program. The state uses funds from this initiative to encourage juvenile courts throughout Ohio to use diversion programming. The goal of RECLAIM is to divert non-violent and status offenders away from incarceration toward community-based interventions. Statewide, thousands of youth are served annually by community-based programs operating with the approval of local juvenile courts and funded with RECLAIM Ohio appropriations (OJJDP, 2006). Counties throughout Ohio receive partial support for juvenile diversion programs from RECLAIM Ohio funds.

In 2006, Ohio had a state juvenile correctional agency budget of $282,000,000, serving a caseload of 4,247 juveniles, with a budget of $62,000 per case (compare this to a state such as Georgia where the budget is $38,000,000, serving 27,855 cases at a cost of $12,000 per case). In 2007, the State of Ohio spent $50 million on juvenile diversion programming (DYS, 2008). These figures are evidence of Ohio’s commitment to serving the needs of juveniles. RECLAIM is part of Ohio’s effort to serve and divert juveniles. The Ohio RECLAIM program gives juvenile court judges the ability to respond to juvenile delinquency in a way that diverts youth from the system by creating local
community-based programs that allow diversion practitioners to contract and interact with other community agencies that provide services for juveniles. According to officials at the DYS (2007), RECLAIM is specifically designed to invoke a community-based response to juvenile crime.

The theory of RECLAIM Ohio is to provide local autonomy in the administration and practice of juvenile justice (DYS, 2007). The program goals are twofold: to empower local judges with more sentencing options and disposition alternatives for the juvenile offender and to improve the Department of Youth Services’ ability to treat and rehabilitate youthful offenders whose offenses may not warrant commitment to a juvenile facility (OJJDP, 2006). Overall, RECLAIM Ohio allows local juvenile courts to create a series of needs appropriate services and sanctions that address the individual problems of juvenile offenders who come before them (OJJDP, 2006).

Initially, RECLAIM was piloted in several counties first in 1994 (Clermont, Galitia, Mercer, Delaware, Hocking, Summit, Erie, Licking, and Van Wert). RECLAIM Ohio funding became available to all 88 of Ohio’s counties in January 1995 (OJJDP, 2006). Ohio counties participating in RECLAIM Ohio each receive a funding allocation that is based on the number of youth adjudicated - an adjudication hearing is the juvenile court version of an adult trial for acts that would have been felonies if committed by adults (OJJDP, 2006). Then, each month, the county’s allocation is charged 75 percent of whatever the daily costs are for youth housed in secure Department of Youth Services facilities (DYS, 2008) institutions and 50 percent of the daily costs for youth placed in
DYS community corrections facilities. Community corrections facilities (CCF) are funded by the state of Ohio, locally operated, alternatives for serious juvenile offenders who are in need of treatment and services that could be provided in a residential facility but whose offenses do not warrant a long-term commitment to a more secure DYS facility (DYS, 2008). Every month, the DYS gives each county a rebate for whatever allocation that remains. The counties then take these funds to create local programs such as diversion. If RECLAIM were not in place, most adjudicated youth would automatically be placed in a secure facility. According to officials at the DYS, there are approximately 279 RECLAIM Ohio funded programs currently in existence throughout Ohio.

Today, Ohio’s Department of Youth Services disburses $50 million dollars (using RECLAIM and Youth Service Grant monies) to Ohio juvenile court jurisdictions for community-based programs. Since RECLAIM Ohio funds are distributed based on the number of adjudicated youth in each county, some counties may not receive monies from this fund. In 2008, 79 counties received RECLAIM funds (DYS, 2008). Additional funding for Ohio counties come out of the $20 million distributed through Youth Services Grants (DYS, 2008).

In addition to RECLAIM Ohio funds, juvenile diversion programs throughout Ohio also receive funding from the state’s Youth Services Grants through the DYS Office of Subsidies and Grants. Through these grants, over 600 juvenile programs are funded, including diversion, serving over 100,000 youth throughout the state.
(DYS, 2007). Every Ohio County receives a minimum base of $50,000 in Youth Services Grant monies. Additional grant allocations are later dispersed based on county population (DYS, 2008).

In terms of how counties use these funds, RECLAIM funds must be used in programs serving youth who have come before local juvenile court judges. Funds cannot be used to build, renovate or repair facilities (OJJDP, 2006). While funds from RECLAIM may only be used for youth already seen in juvenile courts, Youth Services Grant awards may be used to divert youth at any place during the juvenile justice process (DYS, 2007). Each city has a different program.

At the federal level, Ohio receives funding from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) for three grant programs: Title V Incentive Grant for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs; Title II Formula Grants provide funds through a competitive grant process and; the Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG) funds services for youth already in the juvenile justice system (DYS, 2007).

2.5 Recidivism - A Gap in the Research

Generally, one accepted assumption supporting the use of diversion is the belief that diversion activities may reduce the repetition of juvenile crime (recidivism) and anti-social behavior that results in a court appearance. In order to determine effective juvenile
diversion programming, some of the explanations about how youth decide to recidivate (the repetition of criminal behavior) should be examined. The literature suggests there is a gap in the research here. According to Corrado, Cohen, Glackman and Odgers (2003), very little is actually understood about how juveniles make the decision to recidivate. One assumption, the deterrence model, suggests that youth may recidivate based on their understanding of how severe, certain and swift punishment will occur (Paternoster, 1989). After testing this theory, Paternoster (1989), concluded that most first-time offenders often do not consider these issues before committing their initial crime. However, Paternoster did find a statistical difference when he examined the influence of gender and having parents who were active and effective in supervising youth. These two things, Paternoster (1989) suggested, make a difference in incidences of youth recidivating for specific behaviors such as drinking, petty theft, vandalizing property or using marijuana. Paternoster’s findings suggest that the most effective juvenile diversion programming serving first-time offenders, especially boys, should include activities that help parents maintain effective supervision. (i.e., parent training classes). This decreases chances that youth will repeat criminal or anti-social behavior.

According to Hamilton and Hamilton (2004, p. 84), recidivism rates of juvenile correctional programs are “notoriously high, with practice wisdom suggesting that anything better than 50% is good.” For example, based on their findings in a three-year experimental study examining juvenile diversion, researchers Steven Patrick and Robert
Marsh (2005), suggest that first-time status offenders do not readily respond to treatment. This group, they argue, usually recidivates for the same offenses for which they were initially arrested, for example, smoking or truancy. Based on the longitudinal evidence of their study, Patrick and Marsh conclude that: (1) most non-violent or status juvenile offenders do not become career criminals; and (2) diversion programs do not reduce juvenile recidivism in first-time offenders, at least not for those committing alcohol and tobacco offenses. They insist that diversion programming does not significantly reduce recidivism rates. If diversion programs do not work, what good are they, the researchers asked. Besides attempting to reduce juvenile recidivism, diversion, they say, does have other functions such as: keeping youth out of the criminal justice system, reducing the strain on the legal system, saving court costs, and enabling the courts and juvenile justice to provide more services to a larger number of youth. And, if nothing else, diversion satisfies the public’s demand for holding young offenders accountable for their actions (Patrick & Marsh, 2005).

As far as the predictors of juvenile recidivism, Benda, Corwyn and Toombs (2001), argue there are four strong predictors: previous incarceration, gender (boys are more likely to be delinquent), age at the onset of delinquency and age at the onset of alcohol or drug use. Comprehensive strategies such as MST and wraparound can provide the types of services needed to address these predictors, keeping youth out of juvenile justice facilities, providing pro-social activities for precocious boys and discouraging the use of alcohol and drugs at the early ages of juvenile development.
2.6 What Works to Reduce Juvenile Delinquency

What correctional treatment works to reduce juvenile recidivism and juvenile delinquency? As mentioned in chapter one, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention provides a CD, the model program guide (MPG) that is available to anyone upon request.

According to the OJJDP MPG, the most effective delinquency prevention programs include the following components and activities:

1. Multi-leveled and family-centered therapy and education, addressing both family and adolescent problem behaviors;
2. Psychotherapeutic interventions that work to reduce aggressive behavior;
3. Curriculums that include alcohol, tobacco and substance misuse prevention for the adolescent and the entire family;
4. Culturally tailored curriculums that address the values and norms of the particular ethnic or racial group being served;
5. Character building or leadership skills from experiences working or volunteering in the community;
6. Training that reduces victimization and violence among family and peers;
7. Programs that foster and increase academic success;
8. Pro-social activities that reduce gang involvement;
9. Family support services for crisis situations;
10. Wraparound services that provide highly structured, integrated services (OJJDP MPG, 2006).

Overall, the OJJDP recommends wraparound services, multi-dimensional family-centered therapies and treatment of risk factors (OJJDP MGG, 2006).

In addition to recommendations from the OJJDP MPG, a review of the literature also reveals what is known about what works to reduce juvenile recidivism. Regarding program services, empirical research suggests the following:
• Age-appropriate services - The developmental model is the most effective way to prevent juvenile delinquency because it employs a continuum of age-appropriate services to address multiple problems. For example, for youth ages 6-12 programs that include parent training, academic tutoring, and violence prevention classes are important. For those ages 13-17, community-based strategies, mentoring and violence prevention classes help prevent delinquency. Crisis intervention is also important for this age group (Howell, 2003; Tonry & Farrington, 1995; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1999, pp. 178-79).

• Cognitive therapy – Interventions that include cognitive components are twice as effective in reducing recidivism (Izzo and Ross, 1990; Pearson, Lipton, Cleland, & Yee, 2002). Activities that develop interpersonal skills communication training help diminish delinquency (Lipsey & Wilson, 1998). With cognitive therapy, young people are prompted to recognize and to change maladaptive thinking patterns. Cognitive therapy is a way to gain control over thoughts that trigger problem behavior (Beck, 1995). Cognitive therapy concentrates on thoughts, assumptions, and beliefs that make youth prone to delinquent or criminal behavior. With cognitive therapy, people are encouraged to recognize and to change faulty thinking patterns. Cognitive therapy is a way to gain control over inappropriate repetitive thoughts that often feed or triggers various behavior problems (Beck, 1995).

• Effective diversion programs are founded on a life-course perspective, that is, they focus on addressing juvenile offender trajectories (long-term patterns that result in the development of delinquency) such as the breakup of a family because of divorce or poor academic performance and dropping out of school (Campbell & Retzlaff, 2000).

• Involvement in conventional activities (i.e., after school athletics, supervised events) may reduce juveniles’ propensity to offend (Sampson & Laub, 1993).

• Intensive supervision programs (ISP) that include strong treatment services in conjunction with parole/probation services have been shown to be statistically significant in reducing juvenile recidivism (Lipsey, 1992, 1998).
• Some juveniles are what Moffitt (1993) refers to as adolescence-limited offenders. Their offending behavior wanes as they approach 18. For this reason, assessment is important so juvenile justice officials and program administrators can identify this group, target intensive interventions and stall offending during adolescence (Howell, 2003). Appropriate assessment instruments must be used upon entry into the program. Assessment must be ongoing and frequent. After initial assessment occurs, diversion services must be intensely applied to youth fitting the high-risk category (Andrews, et al., 1990).

• In his stepping-stones model, Farrington (1986) suggests that at different stages of adolescence, various predictors influence youth: having criminal parents, failure in school, and poverty. Under the pressure of such influences, problem behavior begins to escalate, complicating existing problems. Successful programs must address these indicators.

• Parenting training helps youth with troubled families. Studies examining the bi-directional relationship between parents and juveniles found delinquents are often caught in a cycle of negative interaction as a result of ineffective parenting practices (Barber & Rollins, 1990). This leads to recidivism (Conger & Simons, 1997).

• Aftercare that is coupled with intensive supervision and case management and is based on behavior modification that helps youth increase social skills and reduce their need for alcohol and drugs is effective in delinquency prevention (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994).

• A systems/systemic approach – using interventions that target all members of the juvenile’s family because when a child has problems, the entire family has a problem (Dembo & Pallone, 2001; Hoffman, 1981). The implication is that the juvenile’s problem is actually an indication of a larger family problem.

• Service intensity must match risks and needs (Griffin & Torbet, 2002; Wiebush, McNulty, & Le, 2000). Effective diversion must be targeted toward specific needs. A small group of high-risk youth commit 75% of juvenile crime. These high-risk offenders require more intensive and sustained intervention and treatment. (Altschuler & Armstrong, 1994; Schumacher & Kurz, 2000).
2.6.1 Risks and Protective Factors

Empirical research suggests that identifying risk factors (indicators that youth are headed for trouble) and protective factors (influences that encourage positive behavior) can help policy makers, program creators and administrators design interventions that really work to address targeted needs. Again, the overarching challenge for diversion service providers is how to address the multiple problems that juveniles come into the system with. More and more young people are coming into the juvenile justice system with serious educational, physical, psychological, psychiatric, family, personal and, emotional problems. And, to further complicate matters, these risks occur at different levels and often simultaneously.

Bronfenbrenner (1979) provided a framework for understanding the different levels of risks influencing delinquency. Risks often occur in at least one or more of five spheres or levels: individual, family, school, among peers, and in the community (Howell, 2003). Criminogenic risk factors include such issues as lack of family supervision, lack of parental affection, lack of self-control, low academic achievement, anti-social attitudes, having criminal parents, having criminal or delinquent peers. Risks also include: having parents and friends who use alcohol and drugs, being exposed to violence at home or in the community, having access to firearms, witnessing criminal behavior, and having parents who are not educated. How can diversion programming
address risk factors? Empirical research suggests the best way to help juvenile delinquents is to address the most consistently reported problems. Programs that work employ:

- Treatment targeting problems of physical abuse (Dembo, Williams & Schmeidler, 1998) sexual victimization (Dembo et al., 2000);

- Mental health treatment – more and more youth come into the criminal justice system with mental health issues (Greenwald, 2002). Counseling that addresses poor emotional functioning and psychological problems can help diminish delinquency (Dembo et al., 1998);

- Services to address poor academic functioning and achievement (Farrington, 1989; Farrington, 2007). Treatment should include techniques that help youth with their studies, such as academic tutoring.

At the other end of the spectrum of issues that indicate a child may be on the pathway to further delinquency lies the issue of protective factors. Protective factors are forces that counter negative risks and help children resist delinquent or criminal behavior. Protective factors, similar to risk factors, should also be identified at initial assessment so program providers can design treatment and services that complement the positive dynamics of each client’s family. There is a gap in the literature here.

Few studies examine the influence of protective factors in reducing juvenile delinquency (McCord, Widom, & Crowell, 2001). Protective factors include things such as: having positive relationships with parents and siblings; high parental supervision, having pro-social community involvement such as volunteering or playing softball in a neighborhood league, having clearly delineated guidelines for appropriate behavior,
Such as having a required curfew, having friends who are preparing for college, and having pro-social peers, (Durlak, 1998; Howell, 2003; Wyrick, 2000). Diversion services that stabilize protective factors provide a type of insulation that can keep youth from becoming delinquent or continuing delinquent behavior. Specific diversion services that can be provided to reinforce protective factors include:

- Overall, the family must be included in program interventions since the family is the primary socializing mechanism in American society (Catalano & Hawkins, 1996).

- Showing parents how to supervise and build closeness with their children, communicate with them, help them do well in school, groom and encourage youth to prepare for college;

- Services that educate youth and their families about risky behavior such as tobacco, drug and alcohol use.

- Initial assessment must be done to identify high risk/need cases so intensive services can be targeted to this group (Borum, 2003).

Finally, services targeting both risk and protective factors must be age-appropriate (Catalano & Hawkins, 1996). Assessment should be used to identify the need for age-appropriate services such as alcohol and substance abuse treatment since these are major risk factors for delinquency, (Huizinga, Loeber, Thornberry, & Cothern, (2000); Dembo et al., 1995). What is known is this. Juvenile treatment and interventions must be targeted and intensive since juvenile delinquency is concentrated in a small part of the youth population (Schumacher & Kurz, 2000). The same youth get into trouble over and over again. Recidivism is an issue for this group of chronic offenders.
Enormous amounts of juvenile justice system resources are wasted on the very large proportion of all juvenile offenders who never become serious, violent and chronic offenders. Given the system’s limited resources, juvenile justice officials and policy makers should target chronic offenders who repeatedly commit serious and violent offenses with sanctions and intensive interventions instead of confinement in facilities without rehabilitation programs or transfer to the criminal justice system (Howell, 2003, p. 71).

What works are programs that include a combination of interventions, applied simultaneously, using coordinating services from various community organizations, targeting the issues of importance to each individual juvenile. This is evidence-based practice of juvenile diversion at its best. What works are programs that address risks and protective factors in the community, family, school, peer and individual sectors of each young person’s life. Comprehensive MST and wraparound services meet this description. These approaches strengthen the core social institution, the family, while providing guidance and control of youth.

2.6.2 Specific Populations - Gender and Race

When it comes to gender differences and identifying the causes of delinquency, research suggests boys and girls are not the same for various reasons. In order to create effective programming, these differences should be taken into consideration. Boys and girls do not undergo the same growth processes developmentally (Kelley, Huizinga,
Boys and girls seem to have different things that influence their path to delinquent behavior. The risks that impact delinquent behavior may not be the same for boys and girls (Obeidallah & Earls, 1999; Romano, Tremblay, Vitaro, Zoccolillo, & Pagani, 2001). Boys may be more prone to become involved in violent behavior, while girls are more prone to come into the justice system because of anger related to physical or sexual abuse. Thus, treatment services should not be the same. Researchers also suggest the neurological differences in gender that may impact behavior. Girls are left-brain oriented. Boys use the right side of their brain, a spatial orientation. What this means in lay terms is not only are boys and girls socialized and acculturated, differently, their behavior and reactions to the impact of society, family and friends may be different because of the biological differences in the way each group develops. These things should be considered (Siegel, Welsh & Senna, 2005). Diversion programs should be tailored to meet the needs of specific populations of delinquent girls or boys, including activities such as gender-specific counseling.

Girls make up a smaller population of youth requiring services in the Department of Youth Services and they have different needs. Research suggests that girls are less likely to be recidivists and they seem to end their offending careers earlier, as compared to boys. There is also evidence that girls who persist in criminal and antisocial behavior may have more psychological concerns than boys. As mentioned earlier, girls are more likely to be exposed to physical and sexual abuse and mistreatment (Pajer, 1998). Agencies serving female delinquents must take these issues into consideration, applying
appropriate assessment techniques so that the intervention matches the youth’s individual needs. Artz (1998) asserts that girls are prone to delinquency because of low self-esteem generated by experiences of abuse, gang involvement and feelings of inferiority. With these issues in mind, early intervention, program intensity, psychotherapy, comprehensive counseling and provision of mental health services are important in diversion programs serving female delinquents (Pajer, 1998; Artz (1998).

Male juveniles make up the largest proportion of youth requiring services in the juvenile justice system and in the Ohio Department of Youth Services [92 percent] (DYS, 2006). For boys in general, regardless of their race, effective diversion programming should include components that help them build relationships, such as mentoring activities since boys tend to be relationship-resistant (McCluskey, Noller, Lamoureux and McCluskey, 2004). Programs that provide boys with early employment opportunities for work experiences are also effective in discouraging delinquency (Staff & Uggen, 2003).

When it comes to delinquency, diversion and the issues of race, the dilemma of how to help African Americans, both boys and girls, presents a particular problem because of the contemporary issue of disproportionate minority contact (DMC) and involvement in the overall criminal justice system. There is a continuing need for research studying disproportionate minority involvement in the juvenile justice system and particularly as it relates to African American males (McDonald & Lind, 2001).
Minority youth are bearing the brunt of the punitive juvenile justice system and reforms that panic over juvenile crime. They suffer the largest increase in arrest rates, court referrals, and rate of detention, incarceration and transfer to the criminal justice system (Howell, 2003, p. 40).

Here’s the problem. In their book, “Our Children, Their Children, Confronting Racial and Ethnic Differences in American Juvenile Justice,” authors Hawkins and Kempf-Leonard (2005) note that the policy shifts of the 1980s that were intended to toughen penalties for violent juvenile offenders actually resulted in an enormous disparity in incarceration rates of children of color. Citing data from the Uniform Crime Report (UCR), Hawkins and Kempf-Leonard (2005), found that African Americans make up 15 percent of the juvenile population, yet they account for over 25 percent of the arrests. They are 2.1 times more likely to be referred to juvenile court as whites. They are also more likely to be detained because of drug offenses, more often referred for formal charges, more often adjudicated delinquent, more often arrested and processed through the juvenile justice system. Police detains them more often, as compared to white youth, and they are the population that is most likely to be placed in a juvenile corrections facility (Hawkins and Kempf-Leonard, p. 32-45, 2005).

The African American male in particular has a serious “multiplicity of problems” confronting him, such as “society’s distorted stereotypes and negative perceptions of them, alcohol and substance abuse, lack of education and poor academic achievement, high rates of absent fathers in the home, low self-esteem, poor interactions with family”
and the wider society (Blake & Darling, 1994, p. 402-415). For the young black male, his dilemma is “personal, cultural and societal” (Blake & Darling, 1994). For this population, effective diversion treatment should include cognitive therapy and counseling to disarm destructive behavior so young African Americans can address negative feelings about themselves (Granello & Hanna, 2003). Culturally sensitive programs, such as a program in Ohio where young black males play African drums while sharing their stories and feelings about the struggles of growing up, where they can discuss the problems they are having with siblings, parents and friends, and their failure or success in school are needed. Unfortunately, diversion programs that are culturally sensitive and designed to serve this special population are rare (Morris, 1993 in King, Homes, Henderson and Latessa, 2001).

As far as identifying which program components of diversion are necessary to effectively divert African American males and females, three of the major predictors of delinquency for this population are poor academic performance, dropping out of school and low reading levels (Voelkl, Welte, & Wieczorek, 1999). The problem is, school, similar to the family, is one of the primary socializing institutions where individuals receive instruction regarding appropriate pro-social behavior. Diversion programs that help youth feel better about their ability to perform academically lessens the chances they will drop out or fail in school. This reduces the chances they will become involved in criminal behavior. The most important thing is diversion programs that provide activities to increase academic performance have the ability to deter African American youth from
the justice system, thus reducing disproportionate minority contact. Overall, regardless of the population being served, the optimum goal of juvenile diversion programming should be to help youth as they develop into adults. According to Hamilton and Hamilton (2004), race does make a difference and corrections services for juveniles must take this into consideration.

2.6.3 What Does Not Work?

The literature suggests there are juvenile diversion programs that are ineffective in preventing delinquency. Examples of ineffective juvenile diversion program activities that have not been empirically proven to reduce juvenile recidivism include:

1. Zero-tolerance methodologies (applied to youth who may violate program rules) are ineffective because of the inconsistency of application. There’s just no way to apply punishment in all cases, so some violations may go unpunished. The result is a loss of the credibility of authorities, diminishing juvenile’s likelihood of obeying rules (Howell, 2003).

2. Alcohol and substance abuse treatment services may be ineffective unless problems at home, school and the community are addressed. Treatment must include the family. It must address the multiple causes and influences that may trigger substance use and resulting delinquency (Henggeler, et. al., 1998).


4. Punishment techniques, such as intensive surveillance, home confinement, random drug testing (Gendreau & Andrews, 1996).
5. Balanced and restorative justice (BARJ) – The basic foundation of restorative justice rests on the belief that criminal behavior damages the individual more than it hurts society. The purpose is to focus on the young offender’s future while at the same time repairing whatever harm has been done by the crime (Zehr, 2002, pp. 19-20). Restorative justice activities include such as offender mediation, community sentencing, family conferencing and community victim impact panels, all with the aim of prompting the offender to feel some emotion and accept responsibility for his or her crime. The problem with BARJ is “there is no sound empirical evidence to date of the effectiveness of such approaches in reducing recidivism” (Howell, p. 146, 2003).

These are some of the practices that the literature suggests are ineffective in treating and reducing juvenile delinquency. The literature suggests what works is evidence-based programming.

2.7 Evidence-Based Programming

What is evidence-based practice (EBP)? “Evidence-based practice has been defined as the conscientious, explicit, and judicious use of the best available scientific evidence in professional decision making” (Sackett, Richardson, Rosenberg, & Haynes, 1997, in Roberts, 2004, p. 5). Evidence-based practice in juvenile diversion simply means programs are using what is known to work. It means using science-based prevention program components. When practitioners select and use interventions that are based on empirically demonstrated programs, this is evidence-based practice (Rosen & Proctor, 2002, in Roberts, 2004, p. 366). The originators of the philosophy of evidence-
Based practice (Sackett, Richardson, Rosenberg, & Gray, 1997) describe EBP as a process, a philosophy, an alternative to making policy and practice decisions based on local or individual preferences, instead focusing professional judgment on empirical and evidentiary knowledge. Evidence-based practice is about the application of programs and activities that have stood up under the scientific rigor of social science research, emerging as replicable examples of effective prevention mechanisms. Effective juvenile delinquency prevention programming is based on evidence. Multi-systemic therapy and wraparound services have been proven to meet these standards (Borum, 2003).

2.7.1 Effective Programmatic Elements

There are programs that have proven to be effective in reducing juvenile recidivism. Before presenting the specific types of diversion programs necessary for effective reductions in juvenile recidivism, the classification of delinquency prevention programs should be examined. Juvenile delinquency prevention programs are usually classified in one of these categories:

1. Classifying programs in terms of the intention of services: Primary programs target the environment and/or conditions that may be contributing to delinquency; Here activities include things such as mental and health care services, prenatal care, physical changes in the environment, such as repairing broken windows. Agents delivering the services include schools, day care, and local government agents and programs. Secondary or early intervention programs are concerned with reaching youth in the early stages of their offender careers. Here, activities include after-school activities and programs, mentoring.
programs, job skills training, community programs provided through agents such as volunteers or staff at the YWCA or YMCA or Boys and Girls Clubs of America and; Tertiary programs (involving the police, the courts and/or corrections) provide interventions such as rehabilitation and treatment, with the specific intention of reducing the chances of recidivism (Brantingham & Faust, 1976; Siegel, Welsh & Senna, 2005; Siegel & Welsh, 2008). Diversion program components will fit into one of these categories.

2. Classifying programs in terms of population to whom services are targeted: Universal programs serve all juveniles; Selected programs serve certain populations, for instance, high risk youth or some programs are dedicated to serving juveniles who are in crisis (Tolan & Guerra, 1994).

3. Classifying programs in terms of risk factor domains: whether the services target school, family, peer or individual risks and/or protective factors (Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 2000; Tremblay & LeMarquand, 2001).

In order to reduce the chances of recidivism, diversion services must include evidence-based program components (EBP) and be comprehensive in scope. Again, evidence-based simply means using what academic and empirical research has shown to be effective - applying social science research findings to specific juvenile delinquency prevention practice.

In order to be effective in reducing juvenile delinquency, program component elements should include the following distinctive services:

1. Systematic and repeated assessment using professional and reliable risk assessment instruments (RAI), to identify the risk factors impacting each client; to identify the needs of each client. This is the foundation for effective delinquency prevention (Borum, 2003; Howell, 1997; Lipsey & Wilson, 1998). The RAI can be used to examine a variety of important domains: for example, previous criminal offenses; family/parent problems; criminal and deviant peers; alcohol and substance abuse;
sexual activity; mental health problems; positive community activities or athletic involvement; academic progress; psychological or psychiatric issues and risks (Gavazzi, Yarcheck and Chesney-Lind, 2006).

2 Social skills building components - Opportunities for social building experiences, such as supervised after school activities and special events.

3 Parent training - Researchers strongly suggest that diminished parenting is a major influence in delinquency (Sampson & Laub, 1993; Lytton, 1990; Jang and Smith, 1997; Patterson et al., 1992; Thornberry, 1987). Parent training must be part of diversion programming since parents have a lot to do with how juveniles behave. Parent mismanagement must be addressed as a major link (Baker & Rollins 1990; Patterson, Reid & Dishion, 1992; Conger & Simons, 1997; Stewart, Simons, Conger & Scaramella, 2002). Programs should include parent training, parent anger management, etc.

4 Mentoring - MST programs should include mentoring to provide structured and positive relationships for youth.

5 Thinking skills - Programs should include cognitive modalities such as problem-solving, behavior skills, behavior modification, interpersonal skills training, rational therapy and role playing to help modify delinquent and criminal behavior to help change errors in thinking patterns (Izzo & Ross, 1990; Yochelson & Samenow, 1977; Akers, 1988; Pearson, Lipton, Cleland, & Yee, 2002). Effective treatment must include components that address thinking and behavior, including problem-solving skills (Lipsey, 1992; Garrett, 1985).

6 Cognitive behavior therapy provided in MST must focus on not only developing, but also teaching youth how to maintain appropriate patterns of pro-social behavior (Bandura, 1969; Skinner, 1953; Pearson, Lipton, Cleland, & Yee, 2002).

7 Programs should also include family crisis intervention services and opportunities for community service and supervised pro-social activities, such as chaperoned out-of-school programs and special events.

8 Tobacco and alcohol/substance use/abuse training and education help reduce delinquent behavior (Penn, Greene & Gibbadon, 2006; Struckhoff, 2006; Joseph, 1995; Burfeind & Bartusch, 2006; Agnew, 2005; Sims & Preston, 2006).
9 Services that increase academic performance (tutoring) and social competence training and involvement (Weiss, Little, Bouffard, 2005; Ferrer-Wreder, Stattin, Lorente, Tubman & Adamson, 2004).

10 Behavior modification and management methods – helping youth manage aggressive and disruptive behavior (Catalano et al., 1998).

11 Violence prevention curricula – lessons that teach skills such as anger management, managing depression, controlling one’s impulses and empathy, respect for others and their property, promoting pro-social behavior with friends, family, in school (Herrenkohl, Hawkins, et al., 2001).

12 Case management – programs that employ staff who are licensed and trained to handle troubled adolescents; programs who collaborate with the community to provide access to individualized and needs appropriate services addressing risk factors (MacKenzie, 2000).

The best configuration of an effective model of juvenile diversion programming should be organized around a myriad of services that consist of curriculum models that are delivered intensively, to individuals and small groups of youth, coupled with initial and on-going assessment and case management. Effective evidence-based juvenile diversion services must be aimed at the highest risk cases, targeted to meet identified key risk factors, individualized, continuously assessed and reassessed and modified along the way to address individualized needs and risks (Borum, 2003; Griffin & Torbet, 2002; Hoge, 2001).
2.7.2 Comprehensive Strategy - The Framework

Every jurisdiction should employ the comprehensive strategy approach to delinquency prevention because it provides a continuum of treatment, prevention and rehabilitation services for youth. It involves an integration of the entire juvenile justice system, juvenile service providers, parents, and the educational component. It allows diversion service providers to link services, strengthening treatment, ensuring that youth’s multiple problems will be addressed.

When the Clinton Administration, through the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) issued its Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent and Chronic Juvenile Offenders in 1993, it outlined the principles for managing juvenile offenders (OJJDP, Annual Report, 1998). They include: risk assessment, needs assessment, individualized treatment, and aftercare. The philosophy of comprehensive strategy in juvenile delinquency prevention is based on the principles of:

1. Strengthening the family;
2. Supporting all of the core institutions that influence youth (family, school, church, and community);
3. Providing prevention that is cost-effective by enlisting the help of community agencies and all stakeholders;
4. Early prevention and early intervention - Intervening quickly and effectively to deter, discourage, diminish and reduce delinquent behavior; that is, quickly identify and provide services to youth at risk for delinquency (Howell, 2003, pp. 175-304).
Altogether, the comprehensive strategy approach to delinquency prevention provides a framework for local governments to form a multi-agency response to delinquency, bringing program services together with healthcare, social welfare, school systems and justice officials to address the myriad of problems today’s youth experience. The comprehensive strategy is a holistic way of providing and delivering needs-based juvenile services for minor offenders. Comprehensive strategy involves the entire circumference of systems that research indicates are related to the development and care of juveniles and the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

2.7.3 MST and Wraparound Services

MST and wraparound services are evidence-based means of reducing juvenile recidivism. Developed by University of South Carolina psychologist Scott Henggeler, MST is a clinical, home-based treatment. The main aim of MST is preserving and stabilizing child’s family. MST reduces juvenile recidivism (Mihalic, & Irwin, 2003; Henggeler, Schoenwald, Borduin, Rowland and Cunningham, 1998). MST welcomes the engagement of the youth’s entire family based on the belief that most adolescents’ problems can be traced back to some problem in the family (Mendel, 2001). The therapist meets with the youth’s family and together, they come up with strategies to address whatever problems the juvenile may have. Therapists also provide coaching for
the parents and when appropriate, referrals to necessary services, in general, whatever is needed to help the child. According to Mendel (2001), MST has proven to be effective in reducing juvenile recidivism in over eight scientific trials and costs around $4-6,000 per juvenile, which is less than the cost ($35-70,000 per year) of incarcerating a juvenile he argues. It’s effective, he continues, and provides opportunities for multi-dimensional treatment for troubled youth. The key difference in MST and other programs is its specificity in being goal oriented and its emphasis on reinforcing, stabilizing and developing the strengths of families. Most importantly, MST places family empowerment as the main target.

Wraparound Services refers to a special type of service delivery. Wraparound is a local level service and comprehensive approach involving collaboration between juvenile justice personnel and treatment and intervention personnel (Sims & Preston, 2006). The comprehensive strategy embraces the wraparound services model because it allows for the integration of service activities and various service providing components of the community. Similar to MST, wraparound involves the parents and the child. It allows for individualized services, varied delivery systems, community-based interventions, all conducted in an environment that is familiar to the child - his or her own community (Howell, 2003). There is a gap in the literature pertaining to studies examining programs treating juveniles using wraparound in the American juvenile justice system (Pullmann, Kerbs, Koroloff, Veach-White, Gaylor and Sieler, (2006). Research being done for this study will extend our knowledge about exactly what types of programs exist in Ohio.
Following is a table depicting how MST and wraparound services differ. Wraparound is similar to MST, but it differs in the following ways:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MST</th>
<th>Wraparound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is a type of treatment</td>
<td>Is a way to deliver treatment services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main goal: keeping youth in the community</td>
<td>Main goal: Keeping youth in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary goal: family empowerment;</td>
<td>Secondary goal: Identifying key family members, involving them in the treatment interventions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept prompted by failure of large juvenile institutions;</td>
<td>Concept prompted by desire to reduce fragmentation of services for juveniles;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention occurs at the family level;</td>
<td>Intervention occurs at community level;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus: Changing how the youth functions with their family and in larger society;</td>
<td>Focus: Changing the community to improve how the child and his/her family functions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivers direct treatment via ancillary services as they are required to meet immediate needs, address immediate issues of youth;</td>
<td>Wraparound is all about coordinating community support for juveniles;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team: trained clinicians and their supervisor provide case management. Together, they develop a treatment plan for each youth. A clinicians delivers treatment, working with parents;</td>
<td>Team: large, made up of professionals from various community agencies, create a treatment plan together. Services are delivered by a therapist;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target: targeting risk factors, altering youth’s behavior and his/her interactions between the various systems influencing their lives (school, family, peers, individual issues);</td>
<td>Target: integration of services targeting youth or family’s mental health problems, parenting issues;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Comparing MST and Wraparound (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MST</th>
<th>Wraparound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team identifies youth’s problems using risk assessment instrument (RAI);</td>
<td>Services are all about collaboration between agencies in the community;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents receive services, teaching them how to intervene to meet goals set for child’s comprehensive treatment plan.</td>
<td>Entire family receives services through participating agencies. Siblings receive services as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST functions through the incorporation of 9 principles of treatment: (1) Assessment; (2) Therapy emphasizing strengths; (3) Therapy builds responsible behavior, reduces recidivism; (4) Therapy targets problems and goals; (5) Multiple systems of delinquency influences addressed; (6) Therapy intervenes according to youth’s age development; (7) Family members included in activities regularly; (8) Continuous evaluation and frequent assessment and reassessment; (9) Therapy aimed at long-term changes through empowerment to entire family of juvenile (Howell, p. 235, 2003).</td>
<td>Relies on 13 core tasks: 1) Identifying significant others in child’s life; 2) Encourages a strong non-judgmental approach that centers on the family; 3) Wraparound team meetings to create the service plan; 4) Team identifies which services are needed for the child and the family; 5) Identify cost of services and expected outcomes; 6) Prepare for training of team to deliver services; 7) Create crisis intervention plan; 8) Arrange services that may not exist; 9) Work with fiscal staff to fund services; 10) Delivery of services; 11) Evaluates delivery of services; 12) Create transition plan and long-term follow-up plans for youth and family; 13) Gather and summarize outcome data for use in program evaluation (Carney &amp; Buttell, p. 558, 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy lasts 3-5 months</td>
<td>Therapy lasts indefinitely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Empirical research of programs employing these two diversion methods shows effectiveness in reducing juvenile recidivism and discouraging delinquent behavior (Aos, Barnoski & Lieb, 2001).
2. 7.4 Predicting the Use of Evidence-Based Practice

What predicts the adoption of programs exemplifying the components and design of evidence-based juvenile diversion? Why would some Ohio counties elect to use juvenile diversion programs that include comprehensive and evidence-based strategies while other counties do not? What are the urban theories and organizational theories that could explain why some counties elect to adopt or reject comprehensive strategies and evidence-based practice in juvenile diversion? What are some of the demographic variables impacting program decisions? The following literature review provides some insight into the answers to these questions.

Some of the reasons behind the choices local governments make in how they will handle recalcitrant youth can be traced back to an earlier discussion about society’s struggle with how to handle juvenile offenders. As stated earlier, the approaches to juvenile justice have continuously shifted back and forth between society’s desire to rehabilitate and reform or to incarcerate and punish. Behind this constantly swinging pendulum lies a “paradox of perverse rewards” (Greenwood, 2006, p. 168).

Any program that produces concrete benefits for youthful offenders must face the problem of appearing to reward the undeserving. Effective delinquency prevention programs may benefit participating youth and other members of their family, as well as potential crime victims by increasing their educational and vocational skills, income, or quality of life. These often unmeasured benefits may create, at least in the minds of some, perverse incentives or rewards for youth who are the most delinquent.
When these programs achieve their goals, the largest rewards are reaped by the youth that are most at risk. This perverse incentive feature, in which prevention programs appear to bestow the greatest benefits on those who are not only the most at risk but also the most troublesome, may be another factor that makes prevention such a hard sell to some audiences (Greenwood, 2006, p. 169).

There are several urban theories that can be applied to explain the dilemma of why some areas embrace EBP in programming, while others do not. In their book, “Theories of Urban Politics,” authors David Judge, Gerry Stoker and Harold Wolman (1998) discuss some of these theories. First, they describe America as pluralistic, where power is fragmented, decentralized and dispersed unequally. Within the unequal systems of political actors are the street level bureaucrats who deliver public policy through everyday serves to the public. It is at this point that the allocation of resources (for example, funds to support juvenile diversion programming) is determined. A second urban theory suggests that the underpinning of the delivery of public policy in the form of services rests of on a hierarchical concept of American society (elite theory) and works to maintain inequality at every sector of American life. A third urban theory worth considering as a possible explanation for why certain local governments adopt or reject comprehensive strategy is that of the critical elite theory. This is the theory most applied to urban studies (Judge, Stoker, & Wolman, 1998). The power elite is a small group of leaders who influence and monopolize the allocation of scarce government resources. A fourth urban theory explicating the discussion of how local governments decides the
depth of services available to divert juveniles is that of regime theory. What makes regime theory so powerful in determining the delivery of public policy and services is the belief that underneath the surfaces of American society are systemic power bases where individuals who are in strategic positions exercise their influence on the investment or the disinvestments or the urban system (Judge, Stoker, & Wolman, 1998).

In his book, “Independent Cities Rethinking U.S. Urban Policy,” Robert Waste (1998) describes what he refers to as “the permanent crisis and the invisibility problem of American cities” (p. vii). Waste argues that there are “built in difficulties” in solving the problems of urban policy because public perception [of juvenile crime] and bipartisan politics are associated with program decisions and the delivery and allocation of services. Waste suggests urban Americans are the “other America” and they are politically invisible. If this were true, then it would explain why communities where there is high crime, poverty, a large minority population and high risks for juvenile delinquency would not do everything possible to provide comprehensive and evidence-based diversion for juveniles. Waste continues saying if local policymakers maintain status quo programs instead of adopting radical policy responses, crises such as the problem of disproportionate minority contact will continue.

There are other possible explanations why particular counties may or may not adopt comprehensive diversion strategies?

In spite of their apparent support for the ideal of racial integration in schools [and American society], the vast majority of Americans apparently disapprove of the main public policy that is meant to achieve it (Glynn, Herbst, O’Keefe & Shapiro, 1999, p. 344).
This undertone of public attitudes concerning race plays out in the delivery of services in every sector of America’s institutions, including the juvenile justice system (West, 2001; Hooks, 1995; Reiman, 2001). These are a few urban theories that may be used to try to explain why some counties elect to reject or adopt EBP and comprehensive diversion strategy.

The organizational theory explanation of why some cities may adopt juvenile diversion programming is no simple matter. No doubt there are institutional structures in local government. There are many organizational theories that could be used to explain the absence or existence of evidence-based practice in juvenile diversion programs in Ohio. However, three organizational theories might apply to this discussion: leadership, community influence, and contextual dimensions. Katz and Kahn (1966) describe organizations and the system concept in an article in the textbook, “Classics of Public Administration (Shafritz, Hyde & Parkes, 2004).

In summation, they suggest that human organizations are social systems, replete with boundaries and behaviors and they are the “epitome of the purposes of the designer, its leaders or its key members” (p. 206). “Human purpose is deliberately built into organizations” and the very “social compact” under which they operate is a very deliberate device (Shafritz, Hyde & Parkes, 2004, p. 206). Katz and Kahn (1966) suggest that an organization is “purposive” by design and that it is a “social device” for succinctly and efficiently delivering group intentions for some stated [or unstated] purpose and it has a “practical objective.” They also suggest that the design of an organization
may include “latent functions that might be the result of the intricacies” of the program designer’s thoughts and intentions. At the county-level, local juvenile court judges (policy leaders) are usually the sole catalysts for creation, design, and funding of diversionary programs in their county. Ultimately, public organizations and public officials respond to their constituents. The programs that are created, which continue to exist and the selection of persons who will be allowed to participate in those programs are indicative of the core values and culture of those guiding the organizations.

Regarding the theory of community influence, the community in which juvenile justice program exist also influences the organization. Juvenile courts and juvenile programs are organizations with very dynamic structures with distinct intellectual traditions and diverse ways of processing and delivering services and activity (Nicolini, Gherardi, & Yanow, 2003). Each community influences its organizations differently. Organizations align themselves behind the options which each community, prompted by its leadership, supports, whether actively or passively. The juvenile justice system, at its micro-level form [the juvenile court and local diversion programs] is ultimately illustrative of the local political landscape and program design is seldom contested or negotiated unless some interest group or stakeholders bring the issue to the fore of the local political agenda. The result – diversion program design is a direct reflection of the values of the program creators. The way our nation and our
communities control juvenile crime and crime in general reflects the basic ideals and values we subscribe to (Cole, Gertz, & Bunger, 2002).

A third organizational theory possibly explaining the rejection or adoption of EBP in local juvenile diversion practice is that of the contextual dimensions of juvenile organizations [courts and juvenile programs]. Context determines the size, environment, goals, strategy, purpose, plans, and allocation of resources. In smaller counties, where funds may be limited, organizations [juvenile programs] may operate as open systems allowing them to interact with the local environment, using local resources and experts in order to survive. In the larger urban areas, organizations [juvenile programs] are more likely to operate as closed systems, not depending on the community for resources and experts. All of these aforementioned issues might potentially influence whether a county or city selects to adopt the more comprehensive version of juvenile diversion that is evidence-based.

Finally, government provides the foundation for the creation and support of organizations that provide juvenile diversion services. However, local political actors and street-level bureaucrats delivering the services and implementing program delivery, ultimately influence program design and content. The democratic values of social justice and social equality are either delivered or withheld in the process. This brief discourse proposing some suggestions about how we can explain or predict the existence or absence of evidence-based practice in juvenile diversion programs in Ohio counties brings us to the matter of formulating research questions and hypotheses statements which will be presented in chapter three.
Keeping in mind the discussion about society’s beliefs about who deserves to receive services and the discussion of organizational and urban theories as they might relate to explanations predicting the existence of absence of EBP in juvenile diversion, a specific discussion of indicators of demographic issues that may influence the existence or absence of comprehensive and evidence-based juvenile diversion programming is now appropriate. These statements are formulated into hypotheses in chapter three. Results of statistical testing are presented in chapter four.

1. The crime rate in a county may predict the existence or absence of comprehensive juvenile diversion strategy and EBP. Research suggests that communities with high crime rates persist in acts of juvenile delinquency (Hawkins & Kemp-Leonard, 2005). As mentioned earlier in the literature review describing the risks that predict juvenile delinquency, youth who are subjected to neighborhoods with high crime are more likely to become engaged in criminal behavior. Hawkins and Kemp-Leonard’s text, “Our Children, Their Children” includes discussions from a large body of research suggesting that neighborhoods with high crime rates are also places with a myriad of other problems, poverty, single-parent households, social isolation, low academic achievement. In a nutshell, high crime rates are indicative of multi-level problems Hawkins and Kemp-Leonard argue. Therefore, communities with high crime rates are expected to offer evidence-based juvenile diversion services.

2. The high school graduate rate of a county may predict the existence or absence of comprehensive juvenile diversion strategy and EBP. “Public education is probably the most important service that local governments provide,” each school district produces different educational outcomes and drop out rates are higher for the urban poor. (Dreier and Mollenkopf and Swanstrom, 2001, p. 143). Throughout the literature, the role of education is clearly important in preventing and discouraging juvenile delinquency. Education is a valuable public commodity. Therefore, if graduation rates are high, perhaps officials recognize the importance of education and the county will be more likely to adopt practices that are scientifically proven to be effective in juvenile diversion.
3. The total minority population of a county may predict the existence or absence of comprehensive juvenile diversion strategy and EBP. “The racial or ethnicity of a juvenile suspect appears to play a major role in police discretion and disposition of a delinquent case” (Blumstein, 1995; Flowers, 1988; Hawkins, Laub & Cothern, 2000; Rodriguez, 1988; Snyder, 1999; in Flowers, 2002, p. 145). Flowers (2002) cites a Philadelphia cohort study that suggests that the most important factor police consider when deciding whether or not charge a juvenile offender is his or her race or ethnicity (Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin, 1972). Cornel West (2001) suggests that race matters in daily decisions that determine who gets what and more often minority groups, particularly African Americans, may not be seen as being deserving of the kinds of services typical of comprehensive and evidence-based strategies. Urban areas with large “underclass” minority groups are often marginalized in the eyes of the public as their behavior is seen as “pathological” (O’Connor, 2001, p. 8). The problem is, Reiman (2001) argues that society, using the lens of a slanted media, predetermines the image of criminals to more than often be young, male, Black or Hispanic. These juveniles are not seen as being worthy of services, but of punishment. Another problem that the literature overwhelmingly documents is the problem of disproportionate minority contact (DMC) in the criminal and juvenile justice systems. In an attempt to confront the problem of DMC, the federal government has responded by requiring states receiving federal funds to create and report on strategies to reduce the number of minority juveniles represented in the justice system. Much of the literature implies that there are biases that occur along racial lines at every sector of the criminal justice system. Because of these core beliefs, communities with high minority populations may be more unlikely to adopt comprehensive juvenile diversion strategies. Counties with substantial minority populations may not use EBP components in juvenile diversion.

4. Finances are important for the maintenance and creation of juvenile programs. Some counties may not have the funds to provide the services young people need. Counties that receive RECLAIM Ohio funds for juvenile programming should be more likely to have diversion that resembles EBP.
These demographic variables are formulated into hypotheses (see chapter three) and tested using statistical analysis to determine if they predict the existence or absence of juvenile diversion programming that includes comprehensive strategy and evidence-based practice.

2.8 Research Questions

Based on the premises of empirical social science literature on effective juvenile diversion programming, the questions to be addressed in this study are:

2. Do Ohio’s existing diversion programs use evidence-based interventions that are matched to youth’s needs with programs that are properly designed and are being implemented based on what is known to work to deter youth from criminal behavior, including providing individualized and different levels of intervention?

3. Do existing Ohio diversion programs use proven and valid professional assessment instruments to identify the risks and needs of youth? And, is assessment being done repeatedly?

4. Do existing programs in Ohio address both risk and protective factors and how do they serve juvenile substance abusers and youth with mental health issues?

5. Do Ohio’s programs use comprehensive strategies such as multi-systemic therapy (MST) or wraparound services?

6. Do Ohio’s diversion programs exemplify democratic principles of justice, fairness, equality and equity as evidenced by the comprehensiveness of program design and service delivery?

These questions will be addressed in this study examining existing juvenile diversion programs serving youth in the 88 counties of Ohio.
3.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the research methodology of this study exploring the existence of evidence-based practice and programmatic components in juvenile diversion programs across the state of Ohio. Effective diversion programming, as can be seen from the literature review in chapter two, should include components that address a myriad of factors, which influence delinquent behavior. In this study, evidence-based diversion practice is defined as programmatic activities that are coherent with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) comprehensive strategy. The comprehensive strategy provides an evidence-based framework of treatment and activities consisting of two main components: (1) intervention strategies that prevent delinquency by focusing on youth’s risk factors; and (2) providing a continuum of treatment and services, including sanctions, that are community-based (OJJDP, 2000). Multi-systemic therapy (MST) treatment and wraparound diversion services fit this framework. Specific components of both of these concepts were listed in chapter two. Programs in Ohio containing all or some activities listed in these two strategies will be considered to be comprehensive in nature and evidence-based.
Why employ evidence-based practice in juvenile delinquency prevention? Failure to address the multiple problems of juveniles results in increased delinquency and juvenile recidivism. For the 41,000 juveniles who are arrested each year in the state of Ohio (Uniform Crime Report, 2005), integrated and comprehensive diversion programming is needed. For youth who are first-time, status, misdemeanor, and non-violent offenders, juvenile court judges may opt to offer diversion programming as a way of escape from further involvement in the juvenile justice system. The issue is whether or not Ohio’s diversion programs are actually employing what is known to work in reducing delinquency.

In order to explore existing juvenile diversion in programs across Ohio, a survey questionnaire was created and delivered via the Internet, and/or paper or telephone interviews as necessary, and used to obtain data from program providers. Detailed descriptions of program activities, delivery systems, and implementation practices were taken from responses to the survey questionnaire developed for this study. Data obtained from the original survey was analyzed to address the research questions presented in this paper. The ultimate goal is to explore the variation of program content and delivery across Ohio counties.
3.2 Using Survey Research to Explore Juvenile Diversion in Ohio

Why use survey research to explore diversion programming in Ohio? The survey research method allows the author to investigate contemporary programs and explore details concerning program components of services being delivered every day throughout the state of Ohio without having to conduct direct observation by traveling to meet program administrators for face-to-face interviews. The objective is to obtain data from a sample of diversion programs in Ohio so that details and characteristics of diversion programs currently being used across the state may be examined. The survey research method allows data to be collected at one point in time, using a self-administered Internet-based questionnaire. The rationale for using a web-based survey to explore juvenile diversion programming in Ohio rests on the strengths of survey research methodology. Specifically, web-based survey research is inexpensive, has quick turnaround time for reaching large populations, allows the researcher to target special populations and offers convenience and ease for both the researcher and the respondent (Nesbary, 2000).

3.3 Validity of the Survey Research Method

To be valid, Nesbary (2000) suggests the survey questionnaire contain the following attributes. In gathering information the survey must:
• Be precisely worded to obtain specific data desired by the researcher;
• Contain questions that elicit a uniform response from respondents;
• Allow ample time for respondents to complete the questionnaire;
• Be free of misleading questions and be written in a way that encourages respondents to complete it.

Moreover, the researcher must have an idea of the specific information needed.

In this study, parameters determining what data is needed are set by examples of evidence-based practice (EBP) and effective diversion programming as examined in the review of literature in chapter two of this paper. In addition to using information gathered from the literature review to design the survey questionnaire, a focus group evaluation was conducted using program administrators in the city of Stow, Ohio where a comprehensive wraparound service juvenile diversion program has existed for many years. Why conduct a focus group? Rea and Parker (1997) describe the concept of the focus group as being an information-gathering technique in survey research. The focus group allows the researcher to pretest the survey questionnaire for clarity, questionnaire acceptability (for example, if questions are too long or vague), and comprehensiveness.

As a general rule, the best group to pretest a survey instrument is a group of experts in the subject being examined. In the case of this study, the experts are a diversion program director and program staff/practitioners who are currently using comprehensive strategy techniques. During the focus group, the primary researcher moderated and directed a semi-structured discussion, allowing participants to interact and share their opinions and
attitudes about the survey. The main purpose of the focus group was to test the overall quality of the survey questionnaire (Rea & Parker, 1997). In addition to providing feedback from the focus group, the staff at the Stow Police Department Juvenile Diversion Program was given the opportunity to take the on-line survey.

The author selected Stow after contacting Summit County officials to identify local programs employing MST or wraparound strategies. In return for their participation, the author provided a catered lunch for the Stow Juvenile Diversion Program staff. Findings from the focus group were utilized as part of the research process of this study. Findings, including notes taken at the session and remarks from participants, were incorporated in the final report of this dissertation.

3.4 Research Period

Once the focus group’s responses had been analyzed and appropriate changes were made to the survey questionnaire, data collection began. Collection of the data via the on-line survey questionnaire was scheduled to take place once appropriate program administrators were identified and contacted by telephone. Respondents were notified by phone to ask them to participate and to inform them of the on-line survey. The survey questionnaire was sent to respondents agreeing to participate by April 17, 2008. The data was scheduled for collection for the on-line survey questionnaires from April 21 through
June 1, 2008. The primary researcher accessed the on-line survey daily to track responses to the survey and to be sure the web-based system was working properly.

3.5 Research Population, Respondents and Sample

This research examines juvenile diversion programming serving first time, misdemeanor, status and non-violent juvenile offenders in counties across the state of Ohio. Specifically, all 88 Ohio counties receiving funding for diversionary programming services for juveniles were examined for the purpose of exploring the existence of evidence-based components. Each program is considered a unit of analysis. The population, a clearly defined set of subjects (Agresti & Finlay, 1997), consists of all 88 counties in the state of Ohio. Since RECLAIM funds are sent to the county juvenile court for disbursal, only programs at the county-level, county-seat were surveyed. The sampling frame for this research consists of a list of juvenile courts in the state of Ohio. Juvenile court administrators were asked to identify the person(s) to whom a survey should be directed to obtain information about program components and activities for first-time juvenile offenders. According to officials at the DYS, all Ohio counties receiving some funding either through RECLAIM or Youth Services Grants. This is the initial population size (N = 88). Limiting the study to Ohio counties brought the survey to a manageable figure, as opposed to identifying all cities with juvenile diversion programs in Ohio, allowing the author to complete the project in a reasonable time period.
Although research on some diversion programs receiving Ohio RECLAIM funds has been conducted, no current research focuses distinctly on juvenile diversion programming serving first-time, misdemeanor, status, and non-violent offenders in all 88 counties. In 1999, Dr. Edward Latessa and his colleagues at the University of Cincinnati evaluated the quality of 28 juvenile justice programs (the programs that were evaluated included private and public programs and all types of programs, not just diversion agencies) in Ohio using the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI). The CPAI, developed by Genreau and Andrews (1998), is used to assess the quality of program treatment based on a list of pre-determined principles and includes questions about how programs are implemented, types of assessment instruments used, program activities and staff demographics (Latessa, Jones, Fulton, Stichman, and Moon, 1999). Findings from the study indicated 39 percent of the programs in Ohio were unsatisfactory in many areas (Latessa, et. al., 1999). Dr. Edward Latessa and his colleagues at the University of Cincinnati also conducted the most recent study evaluating juvenile diversion programs in Ohio, completed in 2005. The study evaluated RECLAIM funded programs, including community correction facilities and Department of Youth Services institutions, serving all juvenile offenders, violent and non-violent, repeat and first-time juvenile offenders in Ohio. Dr. Latessa’s research consisted of a study of recidivism rates and program activities across DYS facilities.

The research being done for this paper differs from Dr. Latessa’s study in that this study specifically examines program components, activities and service delivery of
community-based diversion programs serving non-violent and first-time offenders and no surveys will be sent to correction facilities. The reasoning for this approach lies in the fact that the author desires to explore the extent to which diversion programs are assisting juveniles who have not completely been immersed in the juvenile justice system yet (a secondary approach to delinquency prevention) and who are participating in community-based diversion. This study targets first-time juvenile offenders because the literature suggests that early intervention, in the form of intensive, integrative and family-centered juvenile diversion, if properly implemented, may be effective in deterring young people from further involvement in the juvenile justice system. County-level juvenile diversion programs serving non-violent and first-time offenders meet these criteria.

In order to explore the similarities and differences in programs throughout the state, individual program administrators and staff who are familiar with the details of the program were asked to provide information about each local program’s design and implementation. Respondents were program directors and assistant directors or program staff members (as appointed by the program director) who provide day-to-day juvenile diversion services in counties agencies receiving funds from the state of Ohio.

3.6 Data Collection Procedures

In this study examining juvenile diversion programming in Ohio, the data was collected using a survey questionnaire created specifically for this research and based on
the literature review of the program components of evidence-based practice in effective juvenile diversion. Describing this method of data collection, (Kerlinger & Lee, p. 692, 1992), suggest, “Data collection methods are categorized by the degree of their directness.” Survey questionnaires are considered to be very direct. For example, if we want to know something about how juvenile diversion programs are run, we can ask program providers and directors themselves. Citing the strength and weakness of this method, Kerlinger & Lee (1992), argue that the strength of direct inquiry via the questionnaire lies in the fact that the researcher can obtain an enormous amount of information. The weakness is that respondents may be reluctant to give answers concerning sensitive information. Direct questioning may yield responses that may not be valid. To minimize invalid responses, the questionnaire was evaluated by a team of program service providers at a local model comprehensive diversion program in Stow, Ohio. The weaknesses were expected to be minimal once the information received from the focus group was applied to the design of the survey.

3.6.1 Instrument - The On-line Survey Questionnaire

In search of data exploring and describing juvenile diversion programming in Ohio, this research uses a self-administered questionnaire, delivered via the worldwide web. Why use an Internet survey to explore program components of juvenile diversion programs in the State of Ohio? Web-based survey research is a relatively new technique
in social science research. Although survey research has strengths and weaknesses, it does allow the researcher to use the questionnaire to collect data from a large population quickly. Although the use of standardized survey questionnaires presents the inherent problem of being somewhat inflexible, self-administered surveys can be considered largely reliable if the questions are carefully selected (Babbie, 2005; Nesbary, 2000).

To avoid receiving questionnaire responses that are not useful to the data set, the author selected the format of closed-ended questions. Closed-end questions elicit specific and uniform responses (yes, no, true, false) and they are easier to code and less likely to result in invalid responses (Nesbary 2000). The survey questionnaire also contained requests for demographic information on juvenile clients being served, along with specific questions that allowed respondents to provide descriptions in their own words, explaining program components, program goals, program evaluation, etc. In order to reach juvenile program practitioners across the State of Ohio, the author:

- Contacted the Ohio Department of Youth Services administrative office to confirm the accuracy of the on-line list of Ohio juvenile courts. A telephone request was then made to identify counties receiving funding from RECLAIM funds.

- Contacted the juvenile court judge’s office in each of Ohio’s 88 counties.

- Upon contact via telephone, each program director was asked to identify/confirm his/her position/title and describe their official job duties to be sure he/she is the main administrator of the program. The program director was then asked to participate in the study.
3.6.2 Assuring Response Rates

Generally, program administrators may initially be sensitive when asked to answer questions evaluating services provided by their agencies. To encourage their participation and to insure the highest response rate possible author designed:

- A clear, short, 6 page, questionnaire that could be easily completed using the Internet;
- Notified program administrators in advance;
- Informed program administrators of the importance of their participation in providing data that may be used to help researchers, academics and policy makers determine what services are currently being provided in Ohio;
- Provided an incentive to encourage the participation of program providers. They were notified that their program would be included in a drawing for a $150 gift certificate once they complete and return the on-line survey.
- All surveys were sent via e-mail unless participants requested a paper survey or telephone interview.
- E-mail messages were sent with a University of Akron research subject line to alert respondents to the survey;
- The primary researcher followed-up, contacting county representatives as necessary, to ensure that respondents completed the survey.

To maintain confidentiality of survey respondents, there were no attempts to match survey responses to program names. Responses were kept anonymous and no attempts were made to match individuals with their comments made on the survey. These are some of the guidelines that should be followed to improve Internet-based survey research response and participation rates (Babbie, 2005; Dillman, 2000; Fowler, 2002; Nesbary, 2000; Rea & Parker, 1997).

Also, regarding the issue of confidentiality, that is, protecting information obtained from participants from being disclosed to the public in such a way as to identify
the respondent, researchers are expected to consider confidentiality in social science studies. In order to maintain confidentiality and anonymity, the author took the following precautions:

- Assigned a number to each survey for purposes of identification;
- No individual’s names were used;
- Once the data had been received and analyzed, the primary researcher did not disseminate information matching responses to individual respondents;
- The survey included a consent form explaining the confidentiality to be maintained in the research process.

Although the primary researcher had knowledge of the program name/city/director who was asked to complete the survey, this information was not made public and there were no efforts to identify individual survey comments and remarks with respondents.

In addition to taking steps to obtain the highest response rate and maintain respondent anonymity, the author stored all data received from program directors in a secure location. Data was not shared with the public and responses were analyzed in a confidential manner.

3.6.3 Institutional Review Board (IRB)

In order to be sure that research participants are not put at risk of harm and respect is maintained for vulnerable populations (such as juveniles), social science researchers at the University of Akron are required to obtain approval for their research through the university agency responsible for human subject research. The University of Akron
Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects requires that all student research conducted “to obtain information from living humans in order to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge should be submitted to the IRB for review” (University of Akron IRB, 2003). In this case, since program administrators, not juvenile clients, completed the survey and no individual information such as name and addresses of clients or program administrators were requested, no human risks to survey subjects were anticipated. However, in pursuance of the University’s IRB requirements, approval for this research was requested and received via the standard university application, as such is required for completion of research for the doctoral dissertation. Acknowledging these ethical issues, the author notified participants that:

- The survey questionnaire would include a cover page informing them that their participation indicates consent;
- That their participation was voluntary and they had the right to refuse to participate;
- The purpose of the study - to examine the specific program components of Ohio’s juvenile diversion agencies;
- They had a right to ask questions, request a copy of the final report and have their identity protected;
- The study will contribute to an understanding of how well Ohio is meeting the needs of the juvenile offender population;
- That no information would be disclosed to identify them individually (IRB, 2005).

3.7 Questionnaire Format

According to Babbie (2005), the format of a survey questionnaire is just as important as the wording of the sentences. The survey should be clear, easy to read, not
confusing, uncluttered, with a single question on each line with as few pages as possible. Most importantly, the format of the questionnaire should be spread out on the page. This makes self-administered surveys, such as the one being done for this study, easier to complete. This study used a common format. Respondents were instructed to click on a box, beside which a code number is shown and a check mark will appear. For example,

[ ] We do not provide    [ ] We contract out    [ ] We do not provide

When appropriate, the survey also contained contingency questions, subsequent questions that were answered based on the response of the first question.

For example,

Does your program address protective factors involving parents?

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

If yes, check all that apply:

[ ] Parent Anger Management
[ ] Substance abuse treatment for parents
[ ] Communication skill training for parents
[ ] Parents attend program workshops
[ ] Parents kept aware of juvenile’s progress, problems.

Questions were formulated based on information presented in the literature review on evidence-based practice and the input and suggestions of the personnel at the Stow Police Department Juvenile Diversion Program.
3.7.1 Instructions for Completing the Questionnaire

In order to encourage full completion of the survey, the questionnaire must include clear instructions (Babbie, 2005; Nesbary, 2000). In this study, the author included an introductory cover letter. Open-ended question included explanations and definitions as appropriate to elicit uniform responses. And, as mentioned earlier, suggestions from the program providers in Stow, Ohio, related to the clarity of the questions, were used to design the study and questionnaire format and content (Nesbary, 2000).

3.7.2 Questionnaire Pre-Test - Maximizing Validity

According to Presser and Blair (1994), the best way to obtain the most valid answers and minimize ambiguous questions on a survey is the use of a pre-test. Fowler (2002), suggests that one way to compare the reality about how respondents will be answering the survey questionnaire is to conduct a focus group of people who are in the population of interest. To test the validity of the survey questionnaire created and used for this study, program practitioners at the Stow, Ohio Police Department’s Juvenile Diversion Program completed the on-line survey once it had been developed. A description of their responses is included in chapter four of the study. Stow’s responses to the final on-line survey were not included in the data analysis because the study focuses on services provided at the county-seat level. The pre-testing mechanism gave
the author an approximation of how well the proposed questionnaires for the data collection would be received from program practitioners who were asked to participate in the study.

The researcher also took precautions to diminish ambiguous answers. According to Fowler (2002), people are less likely to answer questions that are ambiguous. In order to be sure that questions have a consistent meaning to all respondents, the researcher must use words, which have the same meaning to all participants. Otherwise, if respondents understand the question differently, based on the differences of their education or culture, their responses will be different. To avoid this, Fowler (2002), suggests using short and simple words that are widely understood when designing the survey questionnaire. To this end, the author used terminology that is widely understood and used in everyday practice of juvenile delinquency prevention. Additionally, members of the Stow diversion program had input into the creation and formatting of survey questions. For example, instead of asking, “How does your program help youth who have emotional problems?” The survey questionnaire being used for this study specifically asked questions such as, “Does your agency provide mental health treatment to youth? Does your agency include supervised activities for youth to socialize, such as skating, attending plays, community dances?” As Fowler suggests, in order to make the questionnaire valid, the researcher must provide definitions within the question.

How will validity be established in this study of juvenile diversion programs in Ohio? Validity refers to whether or not meaningful and useful inferences can be drawn
from the information obtained from the questionnaire survey completed by respondents in this study. Creswell (2003), discusses three traditional forms of validity:

- **Content validity** – asks whether the questions being posed are measuring the content the researcher is looking for;
- **Predictive validity** – asks whether the scores obtained correlate with results of similar studies;
- **Construct validity** - asks whether the questions of the study are actually measuring the concepts and constructs the researcher desires.

In order to increase the experimenter’s ability to draw valid content, construct and predictive inferences from the data obtained in this survey, the author used terms and variables based on constructs described in the literature review on effective diversion programming that reduces juvenile recidivism. The intention was to design good questions, questions that would measure evidence of program components that are known to be effective in reducing juvenile delinquency, questions that reveal the reality of juvenile diversion programming activities in the state of Ohio.

### 3.8.1 Measures - Research Questions

This dissertation examined the broad research of whether existing juvenile diversion programs in the state of Ohio contain evidence-based program components, specifically comprehensive versions of MST and wraparound services. Based on the premises of empirical social science literature on effective juvenile diversion programming, the main research question is:
Do existing juvenile diversion programs serving first-time, misdemeanor, status, and non-violent offenders in the state of Ohio use evidence-based interventions that are matched to youth’s needs with programs that are properly designed according to what is known to work to deter youth from criminal behavior, that is programs provide individualized and different levels of intervention?

In order to create a series of appropriate questions to address this specific inquiry, the quantitative researcher “links a conceptual definition to a specific set of measurement techniques or procedures” referred to “operationalization” (Cresswell, p. 174, 2003). Based on an operationalization of the main research question and evidence-based components described in literature review in chapter two, the author included questions designed to elicit responses that identify the existence of evidence-based practice. The survey questionnaire created included some of the following questions:

1. Program Capacity - What is the total number of juveniles your program is equipped to serve? How many juveniles are enrolled in your program today?
2. Client Population - Which juvenile offender population does your program serve?
3. [ ] First-time [ ] Non-violent [ ] Repeat Offenders [ ] Status Violent
4. Client Demographics: Describe your program client population today: [ ] total number of males [ ] total number of females [ ] total number of whites [ ] African Americans [ ] Hispanics [ ] others. Number of clients being served in your program today in each age category.
5. Mission and Goals: What is your agency’s stated mission? List your agency’s stated goals?
6. Program Theory - What is your agency’s program theory? For example, is your program theory based on intervening to help families? Treating behavior? Treating substance abuse?
7. Risk/Needs Assessment Instrument (RAI) Does your agency use an written RAI to identify the risks and needs of youth? If yes, specifically, name the assessment your program uses ______________. If no, why not? (a) How frequently is assessment being done? (b) At which points in the program is assessment done? [ ] initially [ ] several weeks after entering program [ ] other; 

8. Social Skills Building Components - Does your program include conventional activities (after school events, supervised weekend events, athletic events)? List and name specific activities your program conducts for juvenile clients.

7. Family Intervention - (a) family assessment; (b) parent education/training; (c) What steps are taken to stabilize the youth’s family life? Describe. (d) Does your agency provide workshops/ seminars or open communication sessions for juvenile clients and/or their family members? Describe briefly.

8. Mentoring - Does your agency provide opportunities for youth to be mentored? Describe.

9. Thinking Skills and Cognitive Behavior Training - Describe, name, activities that help youth build their social, thinking and behavior skills.

10. Tobacco and Alcohol/Substance Treatment and Education - Describe, name activities your agency provides to help youth with these problems. How often do they receive this treatment?

11. Academic Performance - How does your program address youth who have problems in school performance, low grades, etc.? Does the program provide academic tutoring? Does the program monitor scholastic performance and school behavior? Describe. How often do they receive this treatment?

12. Behavior Management - Does your agency provide training in this area? Describe, name the activity. How often do youth receive this treatment?

13. Violence Prevention - Does your agency include this? Describe, name the program.

14. Risk Factors - How are they identified? How are they addressed? Name specific program activities.

16. Mental Health Issues - How are youth with mental health issues being served? Name specific program components.

17. Female Component - Does the program provide information about prenatal care, domestic violence education, sexual abuse information, physical abuse education, or gender-specific counseling, female-workshops/seminars, or opportunities for communication sharing in all-female groups?

18. Work Experience: Does your program provide employment experiences for youth?
19. Case Management - Does the program include intensive supervision; case management conducted by trained staff, a systems approach in which the youth’s entire family is involved in the diversion program and process. How often do youth receive this treatment?

20. Staff Credentials - Specifically, list each member of the program staff, their job title, brief job duties and their qualifications, accreditation and licenses.

21. Service Intensity - How often do program administrators, staff or case managers meet with the juvenile client? How often do program administrators, staff or case managers meet with the parents?

22. Special Populations - Are there any special program components targeted toward helping boys distinctly? Girls? African Americans? Hispanics? Describe each activity and name the group for which it is intended.

23. Program Length - How long does it take for juveniles to complete program?

24. Program Follow-up - Does your agency follow-up with its clients after they complete the program?

25. How many times is a juvenile allowed to go through your program? Under what circumstances would a juvenile be rejected from entry into your program?

26. Funding - What is the exact dollar amount of funding your program receives from the state of Ohio’s Department of Youth Services? Do you receive funds from your city or the juvenile court in your county? List amounts you receive from each.

27. Recidivism Rates - Does your agency track recidivism (repeat instances of delinquent or criminal behavior) among clients currently in the program?

3.9 Measures of MST and Wraparound Services

In addition to asking the questions operationalizing the main research question as shown above, the author posed sub-questions that are specific to statements made in the literature review concerning empirical evidence of how MST and wraparound services are used to reduce juvenile delinquency. Specifically, the author included questions to
obtain data that identifies the existence of the nine principles of MST and the 13 core
tasks of wraparound services (listed in chapter two of this study) in existing juvenile
diversion programs in Ohio. These principles will provide the basis for the variables to
be studied in this research.

MST functions through the incorporation of nine principles of treatment:
(1) Assessment of each individual juvenile’s problems;
(2) Therapy emphasizing strengths;
(3) Therapy building responsible behavior, reducing recidivism;
(4) Therapy targeting specifically identified problems and goals;
(5) Multiple systems of delinquency influences addressed;
(6) Therapy intervenes according to youth’s age development;
(7) Family members, including siblings, are included in activities regularly;
(8) Continuous evaluation and frequent assessment and reassessment;
(9) Therapy aimed at long-term changes through empowerment to entire family of
juvenile (Howell, p. 235, 2003).

Wraparound relies on 13 core tasks:

1) Identifying significant others in child’s life;
(2) Encourages a strong non-judgmental approach that centers on the family;
(3) Wraparound team meetings to create the service plan;
(4) Team identifies which services are needed for the child and the family;
(5) Identifying cost of services and expected outcomes;
(6) Preparing for training of team to deliver services;
(7) Creating crisis intervention plan;
(8) Arranging for services that may not exist;
(9) Working with fiscal staff to fund services;
(10) Delivery of services;
(11) Evaluating delivery of services on calendar;
(12) Creating a transition plan and long-term follow-up plans for youth and family;
(13) Gathering and summarizing outcome data for use in program evaluation (Carney &
For example, respondents were asked:

- How does your agency assist youth with family crisis situations?
- How many people are on the team that assists each youth?
- Does your agency have a transition plan for youth leaving the program?
- Does your agency conduct a program evaluation? How often?
- What is a child has a problem for which your agency has not services?
- Under what circumstances does your agency absolutely refuse to offer services to a juvenile?

These are examples of questions that were operationalized from the main research question of whether existing juvenile diversion programs serving first time and non-violent offenders are based on empirical evidence supporting what works in reducing juvenile recidivism and juvenile delinquency (see Appendix C – Measurement Map) for definitions of concept, construct, operationalization and measure of EBP components).

3.9.1 Measures – Proposed Demographic Hypotheses

In addition to addressing the broad research question of whether juvenile diversion programs in Ohio counties exhibit components of evidence-based practice (EBP), the author examined demographic information to see how different variables predict the existence or absence of EBP. To examine the influence of demographic variables of each Ohio county, several hypotheses were formulated based on the indicators discussed in section 2.7.4 of the literature review regarding latent attitudes of the American public, police discretion in disposing juvenile cases, disproportionate minority contact, urban theories of elitism, pluralism, regime theory and organizational theories that may impact the existence of EBP:
1. **H_A**: Counties with higher crime rates are more likely to include EBP components.

2. **H_A**: Counties with high percentages of residents with high school diplomas will be more likely to have programming that exhibits principles of EBP.

3. **H_A**: Counties with greater minority populations will be less likely to use EBP components in juvenile diversion.

4. **H_A**: Counties that receive RECLAIM funding from the state of Ohio will be more likely to utilize evidence-based diversion programming.

To assess the impact of the demographic variables listed above logistic regression analysis was conducted using data obtained from the Ohio Department of Development’s online description of Ohio county profiles.

3.10 Survey Data Analysis

Data obtained for this research was analyzed using SPSS 15.0 for Windows. Survey answers obtained from the original questionnaire examining juvenile diversion programs serving first time, misdemeanor, status and non-violent offenders in Ohio were transformed into data files for statistical analysis. Once the data had been collected via the Internet-based survey, telephone interviews and mail-in survey questionnaires, the author formatted a database with information about responses from each program. Each survey questionnaire was assigned a different number. The data was coded in order as they appeared in the survey questionnaire. Responses were categorized into groups by
concept and construct, based on evidence from the literature review on juvenile
delinquency prevention and effective MST and wraparound services. Tables, graphs, and
descriptive statistics were used to analyze the evidence collected by the researcher. As
appropriate, qualitative concepts were coded into nominal and ordinal scale categories
and quantitative data retrieved was coded into interval scale categories (Agresti & Finlay,
1997). If a program director failed to complete at least half of the questions on the
survey, the researcher considered the questionnaire invalid and the data was not included
in the analysis.

Once the data collection period expired information collected from respondents
was categorized into evidence-based and non-evidence based, depending on their
reported list of programmatic components. To be considered as being evidence-based,
programs had to have at least half of the core MST or wraparound services components
and include interventions that include the juvenile’s family.

3.11 Statistical Analysis

Once information from the Internet-based, telephone and mail survey
questionnaire responses was entered into SPSS 15.0 statistical analysis was conducted,
including descriptive statistics for each question in the survey. A total of 92 variables
were entered into SPSS. Hypotheses tests were conducted to determine whether Ohio
counties use any version of comprehensive strategy (MST or wraparound). Four
predictor variables were examined. EPB is the response variable $y$ that is predicted by demographic variables 1-4.

3.11 Conclusion - Policy Implications

As mentioned in chapter one describing the author’s rationale for this study, juvenile justice policy has democratic implications. The author believes the degree to which local programs adhere to evidence-based practice in their delivery of juvenile diversion services makes a statement about what and who is important to local governments. Diversion, as a crime control policy, is concerned with controlling dangerous juveniles. One problem is the criminal justice system decides who is dangerous based on a “carnival mirror” that leads Americans to believe that the most likely to be criminals are poor people (Reiman, 2001). As a result, the stereotypical suspect is expected to be young, black and male (Reiman, 2001). As discussed in chapter two of this study, young black males are in dire need of diversion services. The question is whether or not juvenile diversion services in the state of Ohio are serving their respective populations based on the evidence of effective programming.

Policy design, in the form of juvenile diversion programming, is at its best when it is fulfilling the purposes of democracy. An example of this concept concerns the policy’s target population. Which target population is selected to receive the most comprehensive juvenile diversion services says something how which population is most valued. If a county where most of the juveniles who come into contact with the justice system are
Hispanic and Black and they are not offered comprehensive services, this has implications relating to democratic values.

Regarding the impact of how the agents of policy (program providers who deliver daily juvenile diversion services) impact the democratic values of justice, fairness, equality and equity, the way the agents implement the program can either add or take away from the value of the program simply by making the decision of how resources will be allocated (Ingram & Schneider, 1991).

Although there is an enormous amount of research providing evidence about juvenile delinquency, risk and protective predictors, and evidence about what works to reduce juvenile recidivism, many existing diversion programs across the nation and in the state of Ohio may not really be based on what existing literature suggests works in helping troubled juveniles. This study examined juvenile diversion programs in Ohio to see if they are based on the empirical evidence and social science research of what works in juvenile delinquency prevention. The goal is to see if existing programs are meeting the real needs of juveniles in Ohio. Why is this important? Hurley (1977), argues that child centered institutions (such as agencies that provide juvenile diversion services), make up the core of our country’s social welfare system. Their integrity, Hurley continues, depends on the performance of functions (in this case diversion functions as a crime policy) and the fulfillment of needs (offering services that can really change the lives of troubled youth).
In light of what the literature suggests about the effectiveness of MST and wraparound service strategies, this study has several additional policy implications. First, similar to the one hundred years ago, when the Progressives pushed for legislation creating the first juvenile court system based on the belief that the state should act as the preeminent social welfare agency, and that the government should use scientific methods (Getis, 2000), contemporary policy makers and program providers should recognize that a research base on what works to prevent juvenile delinquency does exist and it should be taken advantage of. Policy makers and program providers can take their lead from the Illinois reformers who believed juvenile delinquents were partially the victims of their circumstances. They believed in science, expertise, efficiency, and disinterested inquiry (Rosenberg in Getis, p. 20, 2000). They believed science could and should be used to help solve societal problems. Specifically, they believed scientific research and expert opinion should be used to study the criminal to obtain effective methods for the treatment and rehabilitation of children.

Second, although it is generally understood and accepted that today’s juvenile justice system and the programs that are used to divert troubled children are the result of an amalgamation of changes in public attitudes toward children, policy makers can still do more. Policy makers can encourage practitioners to use evidence-based research to help young offenders. They can protect the public by supporting programs that by provide real therapy and rehabilitation to treat the juvenile offenders.

Third, data obtained for this study, gives evidence of exactly what local juvenile courts in the state of Ohio are providing in the form of juvenile diversion programming.
and whether or not these programs are actually assisting juveniles. The fact is, juveniles come into the courts with a system of problems: family issues, mental health problems, medical and even psychiatric (mental disorders) or psychological problems (behavioral disorders). Taken together, these factors demand the application of juvenile delinquency programs that provide comprehensive, integrated and individualized services and treatment that includes those who are closest to juveniles – family members. To meet these challenges, programs serving juvenile delinquents must address the systems influencing a child’s life through a series of interrelated interventions. If these challenges are not being met by the use of ineffective programming, stakeholders can use scientific evidence to “hold officials accountable for results” (MacKenzie, 2000).

To be sure, effective juvenile diversion programming saves money, especially at the local level where funding is needed. It also saves court costs. Diverting young people away from the juvenile and criminal justice systems diminishes incarceration costs and fewer young people’s lives are destroyed. As this study explores the existence of evidence-based juvenile diversion programming in Ohio, the implication for policy suggests support for services that are comprehensive, identifying and addressing the multiplicity of problems, risks and interventions young people need. The problem is there may be so much variation across counties in Ohio that the practice of designing and implementing juvenile diversion programs that are evidence-based practice is lost in the process.

What is needed is an evaluation of existing practice to see if the application of evidence-based principles, as described in the literature mentioned in this research, is
being accomplished in programs already receiving funds from local government. What is the best way to intervene in the lives of young offenders? Evidence-based intervention, specifically, treatment that addresses multi-systemic individual and family issues has been proven to work best. Again, the question is whether or not the evidence is being used in juvenile diversion programs across the state of Ohio.

Finally, regarding policy implications, the justice system is expected to exemplify appropriate correctional responses that are based on logical concepts (Shireman & Reamer, 1986). Certainly, it is logical for policymakers and stakeholders of juvenile justice to want state funds to be spent on what really works. The bottom line is, when given a choice between building more prisons or funding services and treatment that prevents juvenile delinquency, generally, the American public sides on the prevention component ((Moon, Sundt, Cullen and Wright, 2000). What the public needs to know now is whether or not they are getting their money’s worth in existing juvenile diversion programming being implemented across the state of Ohio. The data analysis presented in chapter four mitigates this discussion.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of survey questionnaire responses obtained for this research exploring services for first-time juvenile offenders in the state of Ohio. As mentioned in the literature review, the challenge is many adolescents who come into contact with the juvenile justice system arrive with a host of problems, including emotional and mental health issues, family abuse and substance and alcohol problems. The questions this research seeks to address are: What kinds of services are available for juveniles in counties who receive RECLAIM funds? Do existing programs at the county-level contain components that social science research suggests are the best strategies, specifically, do they use comprehensive strategies such as MST and wraparound services? Finally, what demographic variables of each county influence the existence of evidence-based practice?

Using the survey questionnaire as the investigatory approach to answer these questions, the analysis presented in this chapter compares juvenile diversion programs in Ohio counties to accomplish two goals: to identify the extent to which programs in Ohio are using comprehensive strategy in juvenile corrections, specifically, multi-systemic
therapy (MST) and wraparound services and to determine the effect of demographic variables on the existence or absence of the utilization of comprehensive strategies in juvenile diversion programs throughout the State of Ohio.

4.1.2 Proposed Hypotheses

In addition to addressing the broad question of whether Ohio counties use evidence-based diversion strategies, the following hypotheses were postulated to explore how various demographic variables influence each county’s diversion programming.

1. \( H_A \): Counties with higher crime rates are more likely to include EBP components.

2. \( H_A \): Counties with high graduation rates will be more likely to have programming that exhibits principles of EBP.

3. \( H_A \): Counties with greater minority populations will be less likely to use EBP components in juvenile diversion.

4. \( H_A \): Counties that receive RECLAIM funding from the state of Ohio will be more likely to utilize evidence-based diversion programming.

Again, the research question asks, “Which indicators of demographic context can be linked to the existence or absence of comprehensive strategy, specifically, MST or wraparound in programs serving first-time juvenile offenders at the county-level?” To assess the impact of the demographic variables listed above; logistic regression analysis was conducted using data obtained from the Ohio Department of Development’s
description of Ohio county profiles. Results will be presented later in this chapter. A comparison between Ohio counties is presented in this chapter using data obtained from a survey created for this study.

4.2 Research Methodology

The methodology used in this investigation of Ohio juvenile diversion programs consists of an original survey questionnaire that was developed by the author based on a review of the literature. The questionnaire was placed on the Internet using the University of Akron’s “Checkbox” survey manager software on-line. The Internet survey was duplicated for use in telephone interviews and mail surveys. The survey was set-up and available on-line on April 7, 2008. Calls were made to all 88 Ohio county juvenile court headquarter offices between April 5 through May 17. Calls were made to county offices since state funding for juvenile diversion (such as RECLAIM funds) is sent from the state of Ohio Department of Youth Services to each county’s juvenile court. Counties then distribute monies for diversion to various cities, based on the discretion of the county’s juvenile court judge. All counties were contacted a maximum of five times by telephone to request a representative familiar with services available to first-time offenders who could respond to the survey. Prior to sending the survey, a focus group
was conducted with staff at the Stow, Ohio, Department of Juvenile Diversion Services to pre-test the survey instrument and procedures. A description of findings from that focus group follows.

4.3 Survey Questionnaire Pre-Test

Fowler (2002) suggests that researchers use a focus group of people who are familiar with the subject to be studied in order to establish the validity of a survey questionnaire prior to conducting the research project. Lunch was provided for the staff and director of the Stow Police Department Juvenile Diversion Program in return for their participation as test-takers.

The Stow program had been identified as having a comprehensive strategy, employing the wraparound service model. The program director and staff were asked to take the on-line survey to view the tentative set of questions in order to detect flaws before the questionnaire was sent. During the focus group, the director and four diversion staff members who provide services to youth in the Stow program made the following comments, suggestions and recommendations regarding the survey questionnaire:

1. The survey was too long and needed to be shortened.
2. The response boxes were too small, limiting the space needed to type in answers.
3. The questionnaire format required too much typing to answer the questions.
4. The survey did not allow respondents to skip questions. The Stow staffers felt that if the survey is voluntary respondents should have the option of whether or not to answer each question. They felt too many questions required an answer and the survey do not allow them to continue without completing some answers.
5. The survey did not allow respondents to stop and resume later.
6. They were able to complete the on-line survey in 30 minutes to one hour, depending on the amount of time each person spent on the questions that required more descriptions and information.
7. There were some problems putting dollar figures in.
8. There were some problems with the “piping” of one question to another.
9. They also believed individuals would be more apt to participate if they were assured responses would remain confidential.

Adjustments were made and all of these issues were addressed prior to the survey being sent. The survey was shortened. Response boxes were enlarged. Responses were set up so answers could be given by using checkmarks or bullets. Survey parameters where changed so respondents could stop and resume later and save their answers. Parameters were also set so there were no mandatory questions so respondents could skip questions if they did not want to answer them.

4.4 Survey Limitations

There were several limitations to the survey that are worth mentioning here. First, regarding the statistical analysis, this study uses cross-sectional data. Since there is no temporal ordering, directional predictions are not appropriate. The hypotheses merely state what is expected, based on the literature review.

Second, as discussed in chapter one, although there is one criminal justice system for adults, there is no single juvenile justice system. Each U.S. state has a different and
separate juvenile justice system. Likewise, in Ohio, each county has an autonomous juvenile justice court system that operates on the basis of “home rule.” This means juvenile diversion programs differ in each county system (National Center of Juvenile Justice, 2008). One problem is there is currently no mechanism in place to monitor the specific program components of existing juvenile diversion programs in Ohio. The main purpose for this study is to find out what types of services are being provided and how intensely the services are being delivered to Ohio’s first-time and non-violent juvenile offenders. One obstacle to conducting this study was that no one seems to know exactly how many diversion programs exist in the State of Ohio. Officials at the Ohio Department of Youth Services do not know because counties are not required to provide this information. Juvenile court judges do not know because they have no mandate to keep track of what specific services each city within their jurisdiction offers status offenders. In spite of these limitations, substantial information was obtained.

During the course of making the initial telephone calls for this research, the author telephoned each county’s court administrator first and asked to speak with the person who could provide detailed information about two things: details about specific activities and services currently being offered to first-time, misdemeanor and status juvenile offenders within the county and information about other cities, other than the county seat where the juvenile court presides, where diversion services are provided for first-time juvenile offenders. Responses included:
- We [the juvenile court] provide “county-wide” services for all juveniles who get into trouble with the law;
- RECLAIM funds stay at the county level and are used to service all cities;
- Municipalities, villages and townships may have their own services through their police departments;
- Smaller counties said, “No other cities have diversion;”
- Many larger counties indicated they did have knowledge of other cities within the county that offered diversion, but had few details;
- The court administrator often works with the juvenile court judge in determining which how RECLAIM funds will be distributed.

4.5 Survey Response

During the initial telephone calls to identify county officials who were familiar with juvenile diversion and to ask for their participation, the author spoke with a staff person from the Ohio Juvenile Diversion Association who agreed to send e-mail messages to all members of the Association, informing them of the study and asking for their cooperation and participation. This was critical because the Association had recently (within the last few months) asked all Ohio counties to participate in a survey (35 counties completed the Ohio Juvenile Diversion Association study). The author believes more responses were received for this study because telephone calls were repeatedly made to each county, the author speaking directly with judges, court administrators, diversion directors, truancy officers, probation officers, and juvenile prosecutors. The author made the research pertinent to juvenile court staff members by contacting them individually, informing them of the importance of the study examining
what kinds of services are available for kids who get into trouble for the first time in Ohio. The response rate as 81.8 percent (see Table 2 below).

Table 2. Actual response received from counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1 Method of Response

Information for this study was obtained for a total of 72 of Ohio’s 88 counties. And, although only 40 of 88 counties actually took the survey on-line, 30 individuals completed the survey questionnaire over the telephone and two completed the survey by mail. Out of the 16 counties refusing to participate, detailed information about diversion programming was available on the Internet for 10 counties (see Table 3).

Working from a list provided by the Ohio Department of Youth Services, the primary investigator contacted each county’s juvenile court office and followed a strict script during each telephone call. Keeping in mind suggestions from the staff at the Stow Police Department Juvenile Diversion Program, the author introduced herself as a
graduate student from the University of Akron and then asked to speak with “the person who could answer detailed questions on a survey exploring services for first-time juvenile offenders their county.” Initial telephone calls were made to all 88 Ohio counties in the by April 17. Once the person responsible for diversion programming was identified and contacted by telephone, he or she was then made aware of the confidentiality of the survey, ensuring them that no attempts would be made to match their comments with their county. Surveys were only sent after a person who was familiar with current diversion services agreed to complete the questionnaire. Only two individuals stated that they absolutely did not want to participate in the survey. Fourteen people agreed to complete the survey but selected not to do so after it was e-mailed to the Internet address they provided. Again, of the 88 Ohio counties, a total of 16 counties elected not to complete the survey or provide any information describing services available for first-time juvenile offenders. For ten of these counties, some information about diversion was gathered from their websites and from literature forwarded to the primary investigator of this study. Many of these counties had websites that included detailed information about their diversion programs, specifically describing how they use wraparound services, parent training and activities for juvenile diversion programming (see Table 3). All Ohio counties were contacted by telephone. One county completed both the telephone survey and the on-line survey. The web-based survey was used since this was the primary mode intended for this study.
Table 3. Method used to obtain data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet survey</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone interview</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County website/brochures</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to participate and no information available on website</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 45.5% (40 counties) on-line surveys were returned with responses describing components of services for first-time juvenile offenders in their county. A total of 34.1% (30 counties) completed the survey via a telephone interview. A total of 2.3% (two) surveys were completed and then returned by mail. The response rate was 81.8% (n = 72). This is an excellent rate of return for a research project using the questionnaire survey methodology (Fowler, 2002). Why such a great response? When individuals indicated they did not want to complete the on-line survey, they were immediately asked, “Do you have time to answer the survey by telephone now?” Babbie (2005, p. 279) suggests “sometimes respondents will be more honest in giving” information “if they don’t have to look you in the eye.”

Again, for ten out of the 16 counties that elected not to participate in the study, detailed information describing each county’s juvenile diversion programming was available on their websites. Thus, some program information was gathered for a total of
84 counties. Demographic information was obtained for all 88 counties including, county population, the crime rate, minority population, and the county’s percent of residents with high school diplomas. These data were obtained from the Ohio Department of Development website where a detailed description of all 88 Ohio counties is found.

After the initial contact made by telephone the survey was immediately e-mailed to each person as they agreed to participate in the study. By May 21 information had been obtained for 72 counties. Data from the survey questionnaire and demographic data was entered into SPSS by May 28th, 2007 (see Tables 11-14).

4.5.2 Counties with Structured Diversion

When asked whether the county has a structured diversion program for first-time juvenile offenders, respondents said (see Table 4):

Table 4. Counties with Structured Diversion Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, has structured diversion at county-level</td>
<td>69*</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, does not have structured diversion</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response/refused to participate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(n =10) Detailed information available and obtained from Juvenile Court website.
Over 78% (69) of Ohio counties said they do have a structured program in place to divert first-time, status and misdemeanor juvenile offenders.

4.5.3 Respondent Demographics

In each county, various members of the juvenile court administrate juvenile corrections programs. During each telephone call initiating the inquiry to obtain information for the study, the investigator requested to speak with the person who could provide the most detailed information about what types of services were available for first-time juvenile offenders. Individuals who provided information during a telephone interview or on-line surveys included (see Table 5):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job title of person responding</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversion Program Director</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Administrator</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Court Judge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation officer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy grant coordinator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy or juvenile staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other juvenile court personnel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information obtained via Juvenile Court Website</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response or refused</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Measures - Variables

A total of 92 variables were included in the survey instrument used for this study. Descriptive statistics were used to provide a basic overview of the characteristics of the sample (n = 72) using graphs and tables.

4.6.1 Dependent Variables

Four dependent, response or outcome variables were examined – MST, wraparound services, comprehensive strategy, and evidence-based practice (EBP). These variables were constructed by assigning a value of (1) to each county that included the core components of each variable. Based on the literature review, MST, comprehensive strategy and wraparound services have some common threads:

1. Family empowerment, stabilization, crisis intervention, parent training, and inclusiveness;
2. Provision of ancillary services as needed;
3. Providing individualized services such as psychiatric care, mental health, academic help, behavior and character building activities, etc., that address the core influences of delinquency, especially, school.
Social science researchers argue that programs serving first-time juvenile offenders should include these strategies if they are to contribute to the positive growth of minors, and successfully reduce delinquent behavior. Following is a discussion of findings from the data obtained in this study. Referring to the literature review and describing specific principles of MST, wraparound and comprehensive strategy, the tables list overall findings for Ohio counties.

4.6.2 Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) Dependent Variable

An indicator of use of evidence-based practice “EBP” was created based on information gathered in the literature review. According to the literature, what works in juvenile diversion is juvenile “correctional decision-making” that is based on social science research. EBP should be used to “shape the best practice” (MacKenzie, 2000, p. 463). Research suggests there is evidence that juvenile programs containing components and characteristics such as those explored in this research project work to reduce juvenile delinquency (see chapter three and Gendreau, Little, & Goggin, 1996; MacKenzie, 2000). As discussed in the literature review, effective juvenile diversion programs focus on multiple problem areas, help youth develop social skills, include parents and siblings, change behavior and thinking, and are generally designed to address the multiple issues associated with juvenile offenders. Treatment should include cognitive behavioral
therapy that addresses thinking and helps youth develop reasoning processes, focusing on correcting errors in thinking works to reduce delinquency (MacKenzie, 2000, p. 465).

Several of the core characteristics of evidence-based practice appear as components of comprehensive strategy, MST and wraparound services. For the purposes of the analysis being conducted for this study a variable “Evidence-Based Practice” (EBP) was created based on these reoccurring characteristics. Counties with juvenile diversion services and programs that include the following characteristics are considered to be evidence-based:

- Components of MST – (1) Family involved in treatment: activities and treatment that involves, strengthens, empowers, or stabilizes the family (using crisis intervention, parenting classes/training or counseling for parents, or ancillary services); (2) Assessment of risks and/or protective factors, (3) Activities that address multiple influences of delinquency.

- Components of Wraparound – (1) Family receives services; (2) Team approach to treatment; (3) Arranges for ancillary services as needed.

- Components of Comprehensive Strategy – (1) Family is strengthened by services and activities; (2) Community agencies are enlisted to provide additional services; (3) Core influences of juvenile’s life are addressed; (4) Early intervention – allows clients as young as age seven.

Based on a the literature review of social science research describing evidence-based practice and according to recommendations from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, these are the minimal components required for a program to be effective in disrupting delinquent behavior and to be considered evidence-based. Counties with programs that fit into one of these three categories are considered to be
evidence-based in practice. A new variable was constructed (EBP) with the values of 0 = Not evidence-based and 1 = Yes, evidence-based.

4.6.3 Independent Variables

Several independent variables, also called explanatory variables, were used in this study – the dollar amount of RECLAIM funding; the percent of minorities in the county; the percent of county residents with high school diplomas; and the county’s crime rate. Table 6 below shows Ohio counties receiving RECLAIM funds in 2008. No tables depicting demographic independent variables will be presented here since each county’s statistics were different and tabulation is too large to show here. Statistics for demographic independent variables will be discussed later describing results of the figures resulting from regression analysis.

Table 6. Receives RECLAIM Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, receives RECLAIM funds</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, does not receive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Results

This section presents results of responses to questions concerning which specific components of EBP, particularly, comprehensive strategy, are being used currently in
juvenile diversion programs across Ohio counties. Results of hypotheses tests will also be presented in this section.

4.7.1 Components of Comprehensive Strategy

The main tenet of comprehensive strategy rests on the provision of a continuum of treatment for youth that strengthens the family. Comprehensive strategy simply means providing services that address the core institutions influencing juveniles. Below (see Table 7) is a comparison of survey respondents’ answers to question exploring components of comprehensive strategy as outlined in the literature (see 2.7.2, 3.8.1, and 3.9). Counties practicing comprehensive strategy will employ a continuum of treatment, prevention and rehabilitation services. They should also include an integration of ancillary services, using resources from the immediate community whenever necessary to meet the individualized needs as identified by risk assessment. Most importantly, counties using comprehensive strategy will have activities and treatment services that strengthen the family. When asked about comprehensive services that are available for first-time, status and misdemeanor juvenile offenders, counties responded:

Comprehensive strategy, as recommended by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, means counties have programs that support the core institutions influencing delinquent behavior, especially school performance, and programs should
link services, thus, strengthening treatment, affording opportunities for the multiple problems of juveniles to be addressed.

Table 7. Components of Comprehensive Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program offers:</th>
<th>%Yes</th>
<th>n =</th>
<th>% No</th>
<th>n =</th>
<th>% Refers out</th>
<th>n =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes family in treatment</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent training</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides workshops for girls</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides workshops for boys</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides mentoring</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluated</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally sensitive programs</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracks youth after program</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early intervention takes 7 yr. olds</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides tutoring</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34.10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranges for services as needed</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Programs may have more than one component so n will not total 88.

How did Ohio counties respond when asked about components exemplifying comprehensive strategy in comparison to the literature on effective juvenile diversion? Exploring programs at the county-level, the data (see Table 7) responses were:

1. Strengthening family – by including family in treatment 40.9% (36 counties) said yes, 35.2% (31 counties) said no, 23.9% (21 counties) said they contract out for services to strengthen the family; providing training for parents to help them supervise youth, 19.3% (17 counties) said yes, 34.1% (30 counties) said no, while 46.6% (41 counties) said although they do not provide classes to train parents they do contract out for these services.
2. Supporting core institutions – such as community and school by providing mentoring 50.2% (44 counties) said no, tutoring 53% (47 counties) said no.

3. Enlisting help from the communities – by arranging for ancillary services through community agencies 69.3% (61 counties) said yes, they arrange for services outside of what the county is able to provide as needed.

4. Intervening quickly – meaning programs take clients as young as seven years old – 79.5% (70 counties) said yes (see Table 7).

4.7.2 Components of MST

Similar to comprehensive strategy and wraparound services, multi-systemic therapy, or MST, has as its main aim, preservation and stabilizing of the child’s family to reduce juvenile delinquency (Mihalic & Irwin, 2003). Section 2.7.3 describes the difference between MST and wraparound services. How did Ohio counties fare in providing services that are synonymous with the principles of MST (see 2.7.3)? Responses were (see Table 8).

Comparing Ohio counties and their responses to question about components found in MST with the nine principles of this approach (see 2.7.3) responses are shown above in and the following discussion (see Table 8).

1. Family empowerment and providing services for parents – only 25% (22 counties) of juvenile courts said they actually provide counseling for the family, over 51% (45 counties) said they do refer or contract out for family counseling services when needed.

2. Assessment – is limited at the county-level: 48.9% (43 counties) do not assess alcohol or drug problems; 43.2% (38 counties) do not assess school performance; 59 (67.5%) do not assess reading skills; and 58.5% (51 counties) do not assess family abuse.
3. Therapy that emphasizes strengths and builds responsible behavior – activities such as supervised special events and field trips: 62.5% (55 counties) do not include these activities; 53 (60.2%) do not provide self-esteem classes; 70.5% (62 counties) do not provide workshops for girls; and 71.6% (63 counties) do not provide workshops for boys; 46.6% (41 counties) said no they do not provide thinking and behavior modification training, however 39.8% (35 counties) said they do contract or refer out to other agencies for behavior modification.

4. Regarding taking measures to reduce poor family functioning, 36.4% (32 counties) said yes, they provide this service, 26.4% (23 counties) said no, their program does not offer this service, and 26.1% (23 counties) said they contract refer families to outside agencies to reduce poor family functioning.

5. Targets problems – this is done through risk assessment, yet, as mentioned above in #1, many counties do not assess risks such as alcohol or drug use, family abuse, or poor reading.

6. Addresses multiple systems of delinquency influences using case management–data regarding how county programs simultaneously address school, family, peers and individual problems included: 38.6% (34 counties) said they do not use case management; 45.5% (40 counties) do work to reduce school failure; 43.2% (38 counties) do not provide tobacco education; 60.2% (28 counties) do not provide self-esteem classes; and 43.2 (38 counties) said they do not provide services for youth needing psychiatric care.

7. Includes family in treatment and activities – 40.9% (36 counties) said yes, they involve the family in treatment; 35.2% (31 counties) said they do not involve the family in treatment.

8. Evaluates continuously – 54.4% (48 counties) do not provide continuous assessment for juveniles during their.

9. Treatment/program is aimed at long-term changes via empowering family – here, treatment must occur for a period that allows the youth to become involved in appropriate services (at least three months). Treatment must help stabilize the family. Regarding program intensity, counties responded: 26.1% (23 counties) said their program lasts at least three months; 18.2% (16 counties) said their program last 3-6 months; while only 8% (7 counties) said their program lasts 6-12 months.
Table 8. Components of MST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program offers MST:</th>
<th>%Yes</th>
<th>n =</th>
<th>% No</th>
<th>n =</th>
<th>% Refers out</th>
<th>n =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes family in treatment</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides family counseling</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides parenting classes</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does hair/urine testing</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides academic tutoring</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has licensed social workers on staff</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis intervention for family</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral training</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home monitoring</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco education</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger management</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem classes</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works to reduce school failure</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program offers MST:</td>
<td>%Yes</td>
<td>n =</td>
<td>% No</td>
<td>n =</td>
<td>% Refers out</td>
<td>n =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case management</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes thinking skills training</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous assessment</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses mental health at intake</td>
<td>36.42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse treatment</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses drug/alcohol use at intake</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses school performance at intake</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses reading skills at intake</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses family abuse at intake</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Components of MST (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program offers MST:</th>
<th>%Yes</th>
<th>n =</th>
<th>% No</th>
<th>n =</th>
<th>% Refers out</th>
<th>n =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assesses gang involvement at in-take</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works to address low grades</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric care</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early intervention takes 7 yr-olds</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program length at least 3 months</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 3-6 months</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 6-12 months</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides special events</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem classes</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides workshops for girls</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides workshops for boys</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A team creates a treatment plan</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Programs may have more than one component so n will not total 88.
The bar charts below make it easier to see the proportion of respondents who said their county does provide services that are critical to comprehensive strategies such as MST and wraparound services.

![Figure 4.1 Counseling for family](image)

Using data obtained from the survey questionnaire (see Tables 7 and 8.), a bar chart clearly shows many Ohio counties do not provide counseling for families. However, many counties said they refer families out or contract with other agencies for counseling services as needed 51.1% (45 counties).

![Figure 4.2 Involves family in treatment](image)
Data examined shows 40.9% (36 counties) include the family in diversion program treatment and services; 35.2 (31 counties) do not include the family in treatment (see Table 8.).

![Figure 4.3 Reduces poor family functioning](image)

When asked if their programs work to reduce poor family functioning 36.45 (32 counties) said yes, 26.1% (23 counties) said no and 26.1% (23 counties) said they contract with community agencies to provide services that diminish poor family functioning (see Table 8.).

![Figure 4.4 Assesses alcohol/drug risks](image)
Risk assessment is a major part of MST. Targeting risks allows program providers to identify risk factors so services can be tailored to alter behavior, reducing delinquency. Assessment for alcohol and drug use/abuse is important because young people are exposed to these problems so early. Counties responded: 31.8% (28 counties) conduct this assessment, 48.9% (43 counties) do not, and 8.02% (7 counties) contract out for this service.

According to the literature, another major assessment needed for juvenile corrections is the mental health assessment. Counties responded: yes 32 (36.42), no 44.3% (39 counties), and 8% (7) contract out for mental health assessments.

![Figure 4.5 Assesses mental health](image)

4.7.3 Components of Wraparound

“Wraparound service planning” involves “coordinating and organizing service delivery for children and families with complex needs” (Pullman, Kerbs, Koroloff, Veach-White, Gaylor, & Sieler, 2006, p. 378). Wraparound “has demonstrated a reduction in recidivism” (Kamradt, 2000; Kamradt & Meyers, 1999 in Pullman, Kerbs,
Koroloff, Veach-White, Gaylor, & Sieler, 2006, p. 379). As described in the literature review (see 2.7.3), there are 13 core tasks associated with the wraparound service methodology. Responses to questions about wraparound services are shown in Table 9 below. Examining the 13 core tasks of wraparound services in comparison to the responses by individuals representing county-level juvenile diversion programs, the data shows:

1. Identifies significant others in child’s life – this would be done through assessment of the family – 58.0% (51 counties) said they do not provide an assessment of the family, 22.7% (20 counties) do assess the family.

2. Centers services around the family – 40.9% (36 counties) said yes, 27.3% (24 counties) said no, they do no provide services for families and 21.6% (19 counties) contract or refer families out to outside agencies.

3. Wraparound team meets to create a service plan – 25% (22 counties) said yes, 54.5% (48 counties) said they do not use a team to create a treatment plan for juveniles and 9.1% (8 counties) said they contract out for a team to provide a treatment plan.

4. Team identifies which services an adolescent needs – only 25% (22 counties) said they have a team that creates a plan for each juvenile.

5. Identifies costs of services – this was not addressed in this study.

6. Organizes training of each team member – not addressed in this study.

7. Provides crisis intervention for families - 12.5% (11 counties) said they provide services or address youth whose families are in crisis, 38.6% (34 counties) do not provide crisis intervention, and 48.8% (43 counties) contract outside agencies to provide crisis intervention services.

8. Arranges for services – 68.2% (60 counties) said they do arrange for services as necessary to help youth who get into trouble the first time.

9. Funding of services – 86.4% (76 Ohio counties) receive RECLAIM funds.
10. Delivery of services – Staff members meet with clients: 53.4% (47 counties) said staff members meet with clients weekly and as needed; 46.6% (41 counties) did not respond to this question. Staff members meet with or inform parents of their child’s progress: 48.9% (43 counties) said they meet with parents as needed, while 51.1% (45 counties) did not respond to this question.

11. Evaluates the delivery of services/program 47.7% (42 counties) said their program has not been evaluated (this does not include evaluations done by the Ohio Department of Youth Services). The ODYS does some evaluation of all programs receiving RECLAIM funds; 40.9% (36 counties) responded yes, their program is evaluated, in addition to the evaluation done by the Ohio Department of Youth Services.

12. Creates transition plan and follow-up for youth and family – 69.3% (61 counties) answered no, their program does not include a specific plan to help youth transition from diversion services to home/community.

13. Gather and summarize outcome data for use in program evaluation - not addressed in this study (see core list in Carney & Buttell, p. 558, 2003).

Table 9. Components of Wraparound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program offers Wraparound</th>
<th>%Yes</th>
<th>n =</th>
<th>% No</th>
<th>n =</th>
<th>% Refers out</th>
<th>n =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes family in treatment</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis intervention</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service activities</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive supervision</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home visits</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field trips</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9. Components of Wraparound (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program offers Wraparound</th>
<th>%Yes</th>
<th>n =</th>
<th>% No</th>
<th>n =</th>
<th>% Refers out</th>
<th>n =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information about college</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying classes</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prenatal information</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages athletics</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition plan</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranges for services as needed</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides psychiatric care</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting classes</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team creates a treatment plan</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has licensed social workers on staff</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early intervention, takes 7 yr. olds</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early intervention, takes 8 yr. olds</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses of family abuse at in-take</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluated</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracks youth</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>no response</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8 Data Analysis – Characteristics of programs that provide EBP, MST, Wraparound, and Comprehensive Strategy

The following analysis tests the hypotheses proposed in section 4.1.1. To summarize how demographic variables predict the absence or existence of EBP, constructs of the variables were analyzed using SPSS. Statistical tests include the independent sample t-test statistic, and logistic regression.
4.8.1 Demographic Independent Variables

Before tests of the evidence-based practice variable (EBP) are presented, the t-tests of mean differences on the demographic independent variables, percent of high school graduates, minority population, and RECLAIM funds are compared for those counties employing EBP, MST, Wraparound, and Comprehensive Strategy to counties not employing these program components.

4.8.2 Statistical Analysis

There are four predictor variables. EPB is the response variable \( y \) that is predicted by demographic variables 1-4.

1. \( H_A: \) Counties with higher crime rates will be more likely to include EBP components.

2. \( H_A: \) Counties with high percentages of residents with high school diplomas will have programming that exhibits principles of EBP.

3. \( H_A: \) Counties with greater the minority populations will be less likely to use EBP components in juvenile diversion than those with smaller minority populations.

4. \( H_A: \) Counties that receive RECLAIM funding from the state of Ohio will be more likely to be evidence-based.

All of the analyses use the standard 2-tailed test to reject the null: \( H_0 \) of no mean differences. Below, Table 10 shows an examination of the zero-order correlations between the demographic measures.
Table 10. Demographic Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic variables</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Receives RECLAIM funds</th>
<th>Percent crime rate of county</th>
<th>Percent of minority population in county</th>
<th>Percent of county population with high school diploma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receives RECLAIM funds</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of crime in county</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.631(**</td>
<td>-.326(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of minority population in county</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.631(**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.306(**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of county population with high school diploma</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>-.326(**</td>
<td>-.306(**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001

Table 10 lists correlations among the independent variables. The Pearson Correlation coefficient ($r$), between percent minority and crime rate is strong ($r=.631; p<.01$) indicating counties with a higher proportion of minority residents are also more likely to have higher crime rates. The correlation between the percentage of residents with high school diplomas and minority population is moderate and negative ($r=.306; p<.01$) indicating counties with higher minority populations have a lower proportion of high
school graduates. A higher proportion of high school graduates is also correlated with lower proportion of minority residents ($r = .306; p< .01$). The amount of RECLAIM funding is not correlated with any of the other independent variables.

4.8.3. Hypotheses Test Results

Results for the independent samples T-test comparing the means of counties that have EBP to those without EBP (see Table 11), indicate there is one difference between counties using EBP and those not using EBP on their percent crime rate. The mean crime rate for counties who do not employ EBP is significantly lower than for counties that do employ EBP (mean no EBP = 1.8 versus mean EBP = 2.7: $p = .019$). That is, counties that use EBP for juvenile diversion, have on average higher crime rates than those that do not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11. Uses Evidence-Based Practice (EBP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent crime rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent w/high school diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of minority population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECLAIM '08 funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P-value < .05.
There are no significant differences for those county diversion programs which use EBP and those that do not on the mean proportion of residents with a high school diploma, minority population or dollar amount of RECLAIM funding (tables of comparisons of mean differences between the sample (n=72) and the population (N=88) are not included as there were no significant statistical differences).

Counties employing MST and those not using MST (see Table 12), differ on only two of the demographic measures – crime and percent with high school diplomas. Counties using MST have a higher crime rates (2.9 vs. 1.9: p = .012) and lower proportion of high school graduates (37.5 vs. 42.7: p = .024) than counties that do not use MST.

Table 12. Uses MST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Uses MST</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent w/high school diploma</td>
<td>37 no</td>
<td>42.6622</td>
<td>7.91336</td>
<td>2.309</td>
<td>.024*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 yes</td>
<td>37.4750</td>
<td>11.34537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent minority population</td>
<td>37 no</td>
<td>6.4297</td>
<td>6.05919</td>
<td>-1.193</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 yes</td>
<td>8.2300</td>
<td>7.09153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent crime rate</td>
<td>37 no</td>
<td>1.9058</td>
<td>1.25965</td>
<td>2.570</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 yes</td>
<td>2.8500</td>
<td>1.87754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECLAIM '08 funding</td>
<td>37 no</td>
<td>$304657.0</td>
<td>$527577.6566</td>
<td>-.896</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 yes</td>
<td>$410548.6</td>
<td>$509063.0299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P-value < .05.
The table below displays the results of t-test comparing the means of counties that use wraparound versus those that do not. There were no differences between programs that use wraparound services and those that do not on any of the four independent variables of crime rate, percent minority population, proportion of residents with high school diplomas or RECLAIM funding (see Table 13).

Below, in Table 14, the mean comparisons for programs that use comprehensive strategy and those that do not were similar to those comparing wraparound programming. That is, there are no statistically significant differences in the means for each of the independent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent w/high school diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 no</td>
<td>40 yes</td>
<td>40.1189</td>
<td>10.95810</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.8275</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.42854</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent minority population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 no</td>
<td>40 yes</td>
<td>6.9189</td>
<td>6.54870</td>
<td>-.565</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7775</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.76956</td>
<td>-.565</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent crime rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 no</td>
<td>40 yes</td>
<td>2.1109</td>
<td>1.34515</td>
<td>-1.454</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6603</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.90004</td>
<td>-1.454</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECLAIM ’08 funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 no</td>
<td>40 yes</td>
<td>$381489.2</td>
<td>$618764.8698</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>$339495.4</td>
<td>$409034.8931</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P-value < .05.
Table 14. Uses Comprehensive Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent w/high school diploma</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40.3827</td>
<td>10.42088</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39.1040</td>
<td>9.62975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent minority population</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6.4365</td>
<td>5.91170</td>
<td>-1.797</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.2960</td>
<td>7.70522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent crime rate</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.1584</td>
<td>1.46818</td>
<td>1.832</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.8913</td>
<td>1.96563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECLAIM '08 funding</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$358439.5</td>
<td>$551406.7045</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$362242.6</td>
<td>$448865.4721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P-value < .05.

4.8.4 Regression Analysis Logistic Tables

Finally, logistic regression models were run for each of the four dependent variables with crime rate, percent minority population, proportion of residents with high school diploma and dollar amount of RECLAIM funding as independent variables. These models provide effect sizes and significance tests for each of the independent variables controlling for each of the other independent variables, allowing the researcher to compare the relative contribution of each to the dependent variable. The first model, with EBP as the outcome variable produced no significant relationships. That is, when minority population, proportion of population with high school diploma, and RECLAIM funding is controlled for, the significant relationship between crime rate and the utilization of EBP becomes non-significant.
Similarly, the significant differences in crime rates and proportion with high school diploma for programs using “MST” compared to those not using MST disappear when RECLAIM funding and proportion of minorities are controlled for. There are no statistically significant effects of any of the independent variables on the use of MST when all are included in the regression model (see Table 16).

Tables 17 and 18 display the logistic regression models predicting use of wraparound services and comprehensive strategies. The results of these two models confirm the bivariate means tests in that none of the independent variables (proportion minority,
proportion with high school diploma, crime rate and RECLAIM funding) have a significant effect on either of the two outcomes.

Table 17. Uses Wraparound- Variables in the equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome:</th>
<th>MST</th>
<th>B(Beta)</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald (t)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95.0% CI</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% HighSch</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Minorities</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECLAIM</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Crime</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>1.830</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>1.297</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>1.889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.619</td>
<td>1.239</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P-value < .05.

Table 18. Uses Comprehensive Strategy - Variables in the equation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome:</th>
<th>Wraparound</th>
<th>B(Beta)</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald (t)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
<th>95.0% CI</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% HighSch</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Minorities</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECLAIM</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Crime</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>1.830</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>1.297</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>1.889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.619</td>
<td>1.239</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P-value < .05.

The final results of hypotheses tests were:

1. \( H_A \): Counties with higher crime rates will be more likely to include EBP components. Findings suggest that counties that use EBP for juvenile diversion in fact do have on average higher crime rates than those that do not.

2. \( H_A \): Counties with high percentages of residents with high school diplomas will have programming that exhibits principles of EBP. Findings and analysis suggest the opposite is true. Counties with more high school graduates do not use EBP.
3. **Hₐ**: Counties with greater the minority populations will be less likely to use EBP components in juvenile diversion than those with smaller minority populations. There were no statistically significant statistics.

4. **Hₐ**: Counties that receive RECLAIM funding from the state of Ohio will be more likely to be evidence-based. There were no statistically significant statistics.

In fact, there were no statistically significant effects of any of the independent variables on the use of EBP when all are included in the regression model (see Table 15).

4.9 Qualitative Measures

In addition to the data obtained for statistical analysis, qualitative data was obtained via telephone surveys with individuals who elected not to complete the on-line questionnaire and from sections of the on-line survey questionnaire where space was provided for comments. Ad lib survey responses provide insight that is not addressed in statistical analysis. Juvenile court personnel shared detailed information about what types of offenses were committed by juveniles who were considered for diversion, what kinds of services, activities and program components they would like to see added and how successful they felt their program meets the needs of troubled juveniles. Comments included:

- When we don’t have the services kids need, we try to find someone (an agency) in the community to help.
- Our county does everything we can to help kids, whatever it takes.
- I’d like to see more anger management for disorderly conduct cases, more substance abuse programs and more gender-specific counseling.
- We need more cognitive and behavior programs for girls,
First-time offenses include shoplifting, underage consumption, truancy, running away from home, fighting with parents or siblings, and traffic violations.

“Help the family” was the number one answer. This is a powerful indicator of EBP.

Counties also had a wide range of program activities such as:
- Mediation,
- Day treatment,
- Safe driving classes,
- Unsupervised probation,
- Fishing field trips.

When asked about the “top three approaches you believe reduce juvenile delinquency” and repeat offenses, representatives of Ohio counties said (see Table 19):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help the family</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold youth accountable</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restitution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative justice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early intervention</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of risks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use wraparound, MST or comprehensive strategy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 52, percent adjusted for missing data

Although much information was gathered for 74 of Ohio’s 88 counties, there were many questions that remained unanswered.
4.10 Missing Data

Regardless of the data collection method, missing data can be a problem (Babbie, 2005, p. 167). This research is no exception. Missing data was a problem particularly with questions requesting specific data such as the exact number of clients being served in the program today and the exact number of African Americans and other minority clients being currently served in the county’s program. Exactly 23 counties provided information about the racial makeup of the current juvenile population being served in their program. According to the Ohio Department of Youth Services, over 100,000 juveniles are served in various types of diversion services in Ohio. Counties responding to this part of the survey reported approximately 1,088 African American juvenile clients and 1,080 juveniles of “other” racial groups currently participating in diversion at the county-level. Since so many counties were unable or elected not to answer this question, the variable was discarded. There may be some explanations for some of the missing data on client population. First, some data may be missing because the information was not readily available to respondents in that it required some research. Second, since participants completing the Internet survey were permitted to skip questions and start and stop randomly and then resume filling out the survey, some questions went unanswered. Third, participants who indicated they would rather complete the telephone survey usually did so after saying their time was limited, and they did not want to take the time to retrieve specific numeric data. In addition to missing data enumerating client
population, many Ohio counties with juvenile diversion programs did not track juveniles after they completed the program (see Figure 4.6).

4.10.1 Missing Data – Recidivism Rates

The literature suggests there is a gap in the research exploring recidivism. Although recidivism was not the focus of this study, programs administrators were asked to provide statistics on recidivism rates. This variable posed a problem because very few diversion program administrators were able to list the total number of clients who had returned to juvenile court since completing the county’s juvenile diversion program in 2007. During the telephone interviews, several counties mentioned that the Ohio Department of Youth Services only required counties to keep track of previous clients returning to court in the last three or four months. For this reason, many counties said they did not have information specific to listing how many juveniles had returned to court since completing the program in 2007. When asked how many clients returned to court since their release from the program in 2007, 62.5% (55 counties) said they do not keep records or track youth after they leave the program (see Figure 4.6).
Also, measuring recidivism rates, counties were asked to provide information about the total number of juveniles who had completed the program in 2007 and had been returned to juvenile court (see Table 20).

Table 20. Clients who return to court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% clients who returned to court after completing program</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 percent or less</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 percent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 percent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 percent success rate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 percent or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing no response</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The implications of the results of this research will be discussed in chapter five.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This study explored juvenile delinquency prevention at the county-level in the state of Ohio. Juvenile court personnel responded to a survey questionnaire inquiring about specific components in current juvenile programming serving first-time adolescent offenders. Statistical analysis was conducted to inform whether county-level programs contain activities and components exhibiting evidence-based practice (EBP). This chapter presents a discussion of the findings, policy implications from the data analysis and recommendations for future evidence-based practice in juvenile diversion programs in Ohio.

5.2 Findings

The research results of this study show that many Ohio counties provide services that resemble evidence-based practice activities and program components. After testing a set of hypotheses designed to predict the absence or existence of EBP in Ohio counties,
the findings suggest that two variables influence the existence of EBP in Ohio counties –
the crime rate and the number of residents with high school diplomas. Counties that use
EBP for juvenile diversion, on average have higher crime rates than those that do not.
Examining a specific type of EBP, multi-systemic therapy (MST), counties using MST
have higher crime rates and a lower proportion of residents with high school diplomas
than counties that do not employ MST.

Why would counties that do not use MST have more high school graduates than
counties that do not use MST? One explanation of the impact education has on the
existence or absence of evidence-based juvenile diversion programming involves the
process of parenting. Family intervention is the basis of evidence-based practice in all of
its forms because the family is one of the major socializing structures for juveniles.
Research suggests there is a definite and strong relationship between poor parenting and
juvenile delinquency (Siegel & Welsh, 2008). Parent mismanagement of juveniles is
strongly related to delinquency. Education, albeit a high school diploma, is a stabilizing
factor because it influences job preparedness, possibly minimizing unemployment and
resulting stress. Further research examining whether counties with higher rates of
residents with high school diplomas have lower rates of juveniles entering the justice
system is a topic worth exploring.

Regarding the impact crime has on county-level juvenile diversion programming,
again, counties that use EBP for juvenile diversion, have on average higher crime rates
than those that do not. The data supports the hypothesis that counties with high crime
rates use EBP. Reiterating an earlier discussion, in spite of the lens of a slanted media that predetermines the image of criminals to be young, male, Black or Hispanic (Reiman, 2001), and the belief that perhaps these groups of youth are not deserving of rehabilitative services (see Greenwood, 2006, p. 168; Waste, 1998; Reiman, 2001), many Ohio counties with high crime rates are using EBP, and rightfully so, it is needed.

Overall, the data suggests that Ohio counties are using a systems approach to addressing the needs of local children and their families. Evidence of this is shown in the myriad of responses to the list of variables outlined in the questionnaire. Many counties said they do provide services for and include the parents as a vital part of the child’s treatment. Involving parents in the treatment plan is the one of the main components of evidence-based practice in MST, wraparound and comprehensive strategy. Many Ohio counties also provide ancillary services, integrating community-based activities, making use of agency referrals and community resources as needed to help children who are in trouble with the law. The multi-agency access and community collaboration is impressive. In many cases, when the counties do not have the services or treatment a particular child needs, they “refer” or “contract out” so adolescents who require services such as psychiatric care or substance abuse treatment have access to the care they need. Substance abuse treatment is an excellent example of the EBP process because it is mentioned often in the literature as one of the most widely recognized risk factors contributing to delinquency. When asked if they provide substance abuse treatment
for youth, 54.5 percent (48 counties) said they use community agencies to provide these services when children need them if the county is not equipped to provide this treatment.

How did Ohio counties measure in their use of effective program ingredients?

Using a list provided in Bartollas and Miller’s 2008 text “Juvenile Justice in America,” describing some of the most important principles of effective juvenile delinquency prevention and evidence-based practice, the findings were:

- A unified team approach – 65.9% (54 counties) said no; 23.9% (24 counties) said yes;
- A transmittable philosophy, written mission or program aim – 70.3% (52 counties) said no; 25% (19 counties) said yes;
- An integrated treatment model – counties arranging for services in the community when they could not provide them included, 69.3% (61 counties) said yes;
- Ongoing program evaluation - 40.9% (36 counties) said yes (Bartollas & Miller, 2008, p. 391);
- Assessment – 54.4% (48 counties) said they do not conduct continuous assessment during the program; 44.3% (39 counties) do not assess mental health; 48.9% (43 counties) do not assess drug or alcohol use/abuse; 67% (59 counties) do not assess reading skills; and 43.2% (38 counties) do not assess school performance (see Table 8). According to the literature, these are all key risk factors and predictors of juvenile offending. In particular, for African American males, poor school performance and illiteracy are major predictors of juvenile delinquency (see Voelkl, Welte, & Wieczorek, 1999; Hamilton & Hamilton, 2004; Blake & Darling, 1994; Hawkins & Kempf-Leonard, 2005).

These figures suggest that although many counties do work to provide a myriad of needs appropriate services for juvenile offenders, at the same time they also fail to measure up to some of the main expectations of EBP, Wraparound Services and MST, such as using
a team to create a treatment plan, having a written statement of program theory, using professional assessment instruments, and conducting program evaluations.

5.3 OJJDP Model Program Guide

As discussed in chapter one, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) provides a list of approved model programs via a CD or on-line that is available to the public (see section 2.6). The model program guide suggests that the most effective juvenile corrections programs include activities that address juveniles’ mental health needs, social issues, and family problems. The core tenet of the model program guide is matching the child’s individual’s needs and risks with program activities and services. Findings regarding how Ohio counties measure against the OJJDP list of evidence-based practice programs accompany each entry below.

Multi-leveled and family-centered therapy and education, addressing both family and adolescent problem behaviors:
- 59.1% (53 counties) do provide therapy services for families;
- 52.3% (46 counties) arrange for or provide behavioral training;
- 62.5% (55 counties) provide, contract out to reduce poor family functioning;
- 62.5% (55 counties) include the family in treatment.

Psychotherapeutic interventions that work to reduce aggressive behavior:
- 61.3% (54 counties) counties provide, arrange for anger management classes;
- 56.8% (50 counties) arrange for or provide psychiatric care for youth;
- 42.1% (37 counties) provide or refer youth out for thinking skills training.
Curriculums that include alcohol, tobacco and substance misuse prevention for the adolescent and the entire family;
- 13.5% (12 counties) provide substance abuse treatment at the county-level;
  54.5% (48 counties) refer, contract out for these services;
- 55.6% (49 counties) provide, arrange for youth have tobacco education classes.

Culturally tailored curriculums that address the values and norms of the particular ethnic or racial group being served;
- 75% (66 counties) said they do not provide culturally sensitive programs.

Character building or leadership skills from experiences working or volunteering in the community:
- 61.4% (54 counties) said they do not provide work experience or employment;
- 44.3% (39 counties) said they do provide community service activities that involve volunteering at local agencies, fairs and parks.

Training that reduces victimization and violence among family and peers:
- 37.5% (33 counties) arrange for or provide violence prevention classes.

Programs that foster academic success:
- 48.9% (43 counties) encourage after school athletics;
- 56.9% (50 counties) work to reduce school failure;
- 61.4% (54 counties) monitor school performance.

Focusing on increasing academic skills:
- 46.6% (41 counties) of counties provide or contract out for tutoring.

Pro-social activities that reduce gang involvement;
- 61.4% (54 counties) said they do not provide field trips for youth;
- 27.3% (24 counties) do include field trips such as visits to fairs, museums.

Family support services for crisis situations:
- 59.1% (53 counties) of programs respond to families in crisis by providing or referring service.
Many of the juvenile diversion programs in Ohio counties include portions of evidence-based practice and OJJDP approved programs components in correction services for first-time, misdemeanor and status juvenile offenders.

5.4 Policy Implications

Several important policy issues were mentioned in earlier chapters of this research. First, constantly changing public attitudes about adolescent criminality have resulted in a vacillation between policy and programming in support of rehabilitating youth versus punishing them. Scientific research should inevitably be the source of authority guiding juvenile corrections. However, many juvenile justice practitioners may not be aware of evidence-based practice: 52.3% (46 counties) counties said they were not familiar with wraparound services; 69.3% (61 counties) were not familiar with MST and; 75% (66 counties) were not familiar with comprehensive strategy. In spite of this lack of knowledge about EBP, 55.7% (49 counties) counties use at least one version of EBP – MST, wraparound services or comprehensive strategy. This is good news in terms of the data findings supporting the use of EBP in Ohio counties. However, there are some public policy issues evident in the data analyzed.

What are the social justice concerns of information obtained about juvenile diversion program services in Ohio counties? In chapter one, the question was posed, “What does public policy have to do with the design of juvenile diversion
programming?” First, public policy (in the form of juvenile program design) has
democratic implications because the types of services that are offered to juvenile
offenders are connected to the nation’s belief about how adolescents, the most vulnerable
citizens, should be treated. Public policy impacts all citizens, including juveniles
(Schneider & Ingram, 1997).

An area of policy concern is the subject of how much power the gatekeepers of
the juvenile justice system, such as juvenile court judges, police officers, and prosecutors,
exert in determining who gains access to services. The implications of such power are far
reaching. The democratic values of the nation are tested at the point where juvenile
justice gatekeepers decide which youth receives treatment and rehabilitation or
punishment. The population reaping the benefits of EBP in juvenile diversion makes a
statement about who is important in society and in the community. The actions of policy
agents, judges, prosecutors and police officers, determines which youth receives
diversion and program providers who create and deliver program services, make a
statement about who they believe to be worthy of the program’s benefits, and how they
believe county resources should be distributed.

Another policy concern regarding juvenile justice practice in Ohio counties has to
do with how the data about current programs reflect the values of the U.S. Constitution,
that is, justice, fairness, equality and, equity. Are services reaching the most vulnerable
populations, children who are exposed to high-risk environments (high crime, poverty
areas) and are perhaps the most needful of EBP services. The reluctance of respondents to provide information about how many minority youth are currently being served in their programs could be interpreted as a breakdown in the implementation of democratic principles. A more in-depth discussion is appropriate here.

5.4.1 The Racialization of Juvenile Diversion

Earlier in this paper, the author stated that one rationale for this study is the author’s belief that juvenile justice practice in Ohio should reflect democratic values. One question that can be addressed using the data obtained in this project is the whether diversion services currently in place are available to the populations of adolescents who live in the toughest urban environments in Ohio. Also of critical importance is the fact that only three Ohio counties indicated they provide services and activities that relate to helping Black or Hispanic youth. One county did say their programming includes activities geared to the Amish community. Here’s the policy dilemma.

The isolation demonstrated in the lack of culturally sensitive programs and the absence of information regarding real numbers of minority clients who are actually participating in juvenile diversion programs in Ohio is alarming, but not new. “Poverty, social and political isolation, immense segregation, joblessness, family disruption, failing schools, crime, and drugs are concentrated in inner cities” across America (Lawson & Wilson, 1995, in Fainstein & Campbell, 2002, p. 150). The government has “tolerated
extensive segregation against Blacks” in various sectors of American life (Sampson & Wilson, 1994 in Fainstein & Campbell, 2002, p. 153). Many existing programs in Ohio are structured so they reduce juvenile delinquency for minorities, even without culturally sensitive programming, however, respondents’ reaction to this question may be indicative of the fact that not many African American or Hispanic juveniles are permitted to take advantage of whatever evidence-based programming is in place.

Clearly, contemporary literature and modern media have both provided enough information about the problem of disproportionate minority contact and confinement in the criminal and juvenile justice systems. So, it seems safe to make the assumption that juvenile justice practitioners and gatekeepers are aware that minority juveniles need the kinds of services offered in EBP. However, out of the 23 respondents who did give information about the makeup of the juvenile client population being served in current diversion programs, again, only three counties included activities that are culturally sensitive, meeting the needs of African American and Hispanic youth. Does this mean existing diversion programs contribute to the mechanisms of institutionalized racism? Evidence gathered for this paper suggests existing juvenile diversion programs in Ohio include many of the activities, treatment and services that troubled adolescents need. The programs are not the issue. It is the “network of inter-organizational relationships” and the “institutional inter-relations” that work to maintain inequality (Kleinberg, 1995, p. xiv). Equality is a value that is “interwoven in the American political fabric,” but the application of this value “remains illusive” (Barker & Jones, 1994, p. 54). If this is in
fact the case, the ramifications of unequally assigned juvenile diversion services are enormous. Repeating a quote mentioned earlier, McCord, Widom & Cromwell (2001) argued,

_The existence of disproportionate racial representation in the juvenile justice system raises questions about fundamental fairness and equality of treatment of these youth by police, courts, and other personnel connected with the juvenile justice system_” (p. 228).

Does existing juvenile diversion practice in Ohio reflect the democratic values of justice, fairness, equity and equality? There is no indication that current practice itself does not reflect these values, except the absence of programming for minority populations is obvious. During telephone interviews several respondents said, “We don’t have a large minority population in our county.” This may be one explanation for the absence of culturally sensitive programming. Ohio's total population of 11,459,001 is 83.3% (9,547,385) White; 12.5% (1,441,383) Black; 2.2% (252,269) Hispanic; Asian, American Indian, Alaskan Natives and Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders combined make up the remaining 2% of Ohio’s population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2008). Despite these figures, the absence of minorities in Ohio’s population is no excuse for the lack of attention to the special needs of vulnerable minority juveniles - recall earlier black youths are least four times more likely to be arrested as compared to white juveniles (The Sentencing Project, 2004). Counties with large minority populations should, but do not include culturally appropriate programming for juveniles. Five Ohio counties (Cuyahoga, Franklin,
Summit, Hamilton, and Montgomery) account for over 55% of Ohio Department of Youth Services admissions (ODYS, 2008). Only one of these counties said they include culturally sensitive activities or programs.

Underlying this discussion are issues of racial disparity. Research examining racial disparity in adult arrests and sentencing has been conducted. “Statistics indicate African American adults receive more punitive sentences than white” (Walker, Spohn & DeLone, 1996, in Cole & Gertz, 1998, p. 353; see also McCord, Widom & Crowell, 2001; Pinderhughes, 1997; Ruddell, 2004; Hawkins & Kempf-Leonard, 2005). A research project exploring the effect of race on the diversion decision-making and adjudication outcomes of minority juveniles would be useful.

The problem is, juvenile diversion is a type of public good because it is a public, government funded (RECLAIM monies) program. Therefore, juvenile diversion programming should be considered “organizational public goods” (Weimer & Vining, 1999, p. 189). Public goods are “nonrivalrous in consumption and nonexcludable in use” (Weimer & Vining, 1999, p. 75). Excludability means gatekeepers can exclude juveniles from having access to the use of the goods [diversion services]. While RECLAIM funds do provide juvenile court judges with “local autonomy” in designing diversion services, it also provides them with the freedom to practice the public administration of what is in essence a crime policy with little public scrutiny.
5.4.2 Social Policy, Juvenile Crime and Administrative Practice

In the text, “Poverty Knowledge,” author Alice O’Connor (2001) discusses the paradox of how so much poverty [crime] exists in a nation as rich in finances and scientific knowledge as the U.S. O’Connor (2001) suggests that for many Americans, poverty [or juvenile crime in this case] is believed to be a form of “black pathology” that is caused and sustained by the underclass (p. 15). O’Connor proceeds with a discussion asserting that in order to do something about poverty [or crime], a radical change is necessary to redistribute wealth and power. Adopting O’Connor’s argument, replacing crime for poverty as the context to be examined, and based on the author’s review of the literature and the analysis and review of data obtained from practitioners and administrators of existing juvenile diversion programs in Ohio, what is needed is “crime knowledge.” Revamping O’Connor’s (2001) discourse on poverty, if crime, similar to poverty, is treated as a “cultural deviance” then there is a reluctance to attempt redress of the structural inequities in the poverty [criminal] economy (p. 19). What is needed is what Jun (2002) refers to as a “rethinking of the administrative theory” of juvenile corrections because historically “the practice of public administration” has included “interacting perspectives that are largely opposed to democratic values and the democratic governance of public institutions” (Jun, 2002, p. xiv). Jun insists that it is “the influence of elites and professionals” (judges, prosecutors, police officers) and “pluralistic politics in policy-making” that impact the type of public policy implementation and design,” again determining which juvenile diversion programs are
offered in Ohio and the decisions about who receives program services (Jun, 2002, p. xiv). The challenge for public administrators [juvenile justice administrators] Jun suggests, is to “realize the importance of the critical use of both scientific and nonscientific knowledge” in determining program design and access and to recognize that there are “values embedded in concrete situations” and in “practices” (p. 121).

5.4.3 Predicting Evidence-Based Practice in Ohio

As stated earlier, one of the reasons the author elected to conduct this study on juvenile diversion in Ohio counties has to do with the author’s commitment to systems theory as an effective approach to juvenile delinquency prevention (see 1.10). The systems approach, exemplified in MST, wraparound and comprehensive strategy, involves the application of a wide spectrum of treatment for juveniles and their families. One of the purposes of this research was to see if existing juvenile service components are really tailored to meet each juvenile’s individual needs. Analysis of the data suggests that many counties do provide intervention in the broadest sense, coupling existing services available at the county juvenile court level with ancillary services through local community agencies. The problem is, comprehensive strategy only works to reduce the number of juveniles entering the juvenile justice system according to the number of youth who have access to evidence-based services. The crux of the matter is the fact that juvenile delinquency prevention is based on deterrence theory and labeling theory.
Juvenile justice policies are in theory to be designed to deter youth, avoiding the labeling stigma. What may be missing is a concrete mechanism to ensure that services are dispersed equally. Continuing an earlier discussion, some explanations for the unequal delivery of public services and public goods is appropriate here.

There were several urban and organization theories mentioned (see section 2.7.4) in an effort to explain why some counties adopt evidence-based practice and some do not. The first theory mentioned was pluralism. Simply put, pluralism means there are diverse groups of street-level bureaucrats who implement public policy each day as they provide services to the public [juvenile diversion services]. A second urban theory, elite theory, suggests that there is a hierarchy in American society that maintains inequality in U.S. institutions. Third, critical elite theory holds that the power elite, individuals who hold positions that afford them the capacity to exercise the most impact on the design, delivery, allocation and implementation of public programs, services, resources, and goods, use their power to monopolize government resources (see Judge, Stoker & Wolman, 1998). Another urban theory that can possibly provide an explanation why some counties have EBP and others do not is regime theory. Regime theory holds that there are groups of power bases at the foundation of Western society where those in positions of authority at the most critical junctures of American institutions use their power to impact the urban system, reinforcing institutionalized inequality by exclusionary delivery of public services and goods. Any of these theories could be used to explain why evidence-based practice in juvenile diversion does not exist in all
counties receiving state funds for juvenile services, why there is an absence of culturally sensitive programs and why the question of how many minority clients were being served was so difficult for respondents to answer. Reiterating Katz and Kahn (1966), every organization, including public organizations, is purposeful “in its design and it is a social device” for accomplishing “some practical objective (p. 207). In this case, an elite group, perhaps local juvenile court judges, is ultimately the sole determinant of the design, delivery, allocation, and implementation of juvenile justice programming at the county-level in Ohio. Future research should be conducted to examine the federal government’s initiatives to address disproportionate minority contact (DMC) in comparison to the actual delivery of juvenile program services at the local level. To be sure, local political actors, again, judges, prosecutors, and police officers, are the individuals who decide if a child is diverted. Their actions either inhibit or adhere to the basic principles of democracy – delivering or impeding the delivery of social equity and social justice.

5.4.4 Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC)

A discussion about DMC cannot be exhausted. The question is how do we make opportunities for minority youth to be successful in avoiding delinquent behavior? First, juveniles who get into trouble for the first time should be considered for diversion as often as possible. Then, once they are admitted to programs, there should be activities
specific to meeting the needs of minority populations. Although “social goods are of limited supply” (Gomberg (2007, p. 105) and “inequality is inevitable,” (John Rawls 1999) “inequality is not necessary” (Gomberg (2007). “It arises because those who can centralize control of force can create and maintain inequality; they can use their force” [decision making to accept or reject minority juveniles into diversion programs] to control who receives scarce resources [program treatment] (Gomberg (2007, p. 113).

5.5 How Counties Measures of Success

One of the most interesting findings of the study involves responses to the question of how counties measure program success. When asked how successful they feel their program is, counties responded: 43.2% (38 counties) said, yes, their program is very successful, 17% (15 counties) felt their program is somewhat successful, and 28.4% (25 counties) felt their program is not successful at all. When asked how he or she measures success, every respondent said they measure success by the number of youth who return to court or are charged again. Yet, 68.5% (51 counties) said they do not track recidivism rates for youth who have completed their program. County representatives also indicated they are only required to provide information about recidivism rates for the past few months as a requirement of the Ohio Department of Youth Services, but very few (34 counties) could provide information about youth who had completed the program.
more than 12 months ago. How can counties measure success if there is such inconsistency in tracking youth after they leave the program? Despite the fact that important data regarding recidivism rates was missing from survey responses, this research is very valuable because it provided detailed information about specific program components currently being used in juvenile diversion programs in Ohio.

5.6 Speaking Truth to Power

Overall, RECLAIM funding is meant to allow local juvenile courts to create “needs appropriate services and sanctions” (OJJDP, 2006). According to the data obtained in this research, that’s exactly what officials in Ohio counties are doing. How can we make this a better world for America’s young people? Howell (2003, p. 245) asks, “What can communities and the juvenile justice system do to prevent the development of and interrupt the progression of delinquent and criminal careers?” Aaron Wildavsky (2004) suggests social scientists, policy makers and policy analysts speak truth to power. Wildavsky asserts although the “power is in pieces, which resist picking up, and truth is partial, resistant to being made whole” the social scientist researcher must take the responsibility to ask the questions, conduct the research and present a case in support of public policies that uphold and re-enforce the pillars of democracy – equity, fairness, justice and equality. This study on juvenile delinquency prevention could be used to start the dialogue. Some counties may be lacking program focus, however,
during telephone interviews and conversations with county officials many communicated a sincerity with regard to their commitment to providing the services young offenders need.

5.7 Policy Recommendations

The contemporary juvenile justice system has two main responsibilities: to protect the public and to provide social services to youth who may have multiple medical, psychological, educational, family, community, and legal problems (Guarino-Ghezzi & Loughran, 2004, p. 5). In lieu of the many variables and risks in the environments, at home (abuse, violence, trauma), in the neighborhood (guns, drugs, violence), and school (delinquent peers), that young people face today, juvenile justice stakeholders and policy makers have a tough job deciphering the needs of young offenders and matching services, treatment and programs according to each county’s finances. The data obtained in this research suggests that the interventions being offered to first-time, misdemeanor and status juvenile offenders are wide-ranging and indicative of credible attempts to divert young people who are just beginning their experience in the juvenile justice system. Based on the findings of the data gathered for this research, as it compares to the principles of EBP outlined in the literature, the author offers the following policy recommendations:
1. Literacy Skills – Illiteracy is a significant barrier in life. Juveniles involved in the Ohio Department of Youth Services have an average reading level of four grade levels below his or her age (ODYS). Diversion programs serving Ohio’s juveniles should include activities that address poor academic performance since the lack of literacy skills and poor grades are major indicators of disruptive behavior because school performance may influence self-esteem - 43.2% (38 Ohio counties) do not assess school performance at all and 67% (59 counties) do not assess reading skills at intake. Every county should be able to partner with local schools to provide academic services and tutoring.

2. Assessment - All counties should have access to standardized tools that assess literacy, family abuse, gang involvement, mental health issues and substance abuse. Dr. Lowencamp and Dr. Latessa, at the University of Cincinnati, are currently developing an assessment tool for use in all Ohio county juvenile corrections programs (ODYS, 2008). Over 43% (38 counties) do not conduct assessment. Currently, each county is free to select its own assessment tool. Having a standardized tool could potentially provide service continuity across the state.

3. Culturally sensitive programming – Counties with sizeable minority juvenile populations should find ways to provide activities and programs that address the needs of this population if they really want to be effective in deterring minority youth. Keeping the mechanisms of inequality that were discussed earlier in mind, the author recommends that policy makers and stakeholders engage in meaningful discussions for solutions to DMC, involving parents, educators, pastors and public leaders at the local level because ultimately, crime control is a local issue. As mentioned in chapter one, the DYS website says their stated mission is:

   To encourage positive change in the lives of youthful offenders through collaborative partnerships and culturally relevant therapeutic and academic interventions that support safety and prepare youth to lead productive lives

   (DYS, 2007).

4. Recidivism tracking – Counties receiving funds from the Ohio Department of Youth Services should be required to provide information about clients who completed the program in the last 12 months. Tracking youth for a few months does not provide sufficient data.
5. DMC tracking - Counties receiving funds from the Ohio Department of Youth Services should be required to provide details about the number of minority youth being served in their diversion program. This information was not made available for this research.

Finally, the fact of disproportionate minority contact is precipitously stated in current literature and publicized in the media. It is not insignificant that only one of respondents from the largest Ohio counties said they have programs that cater to minority youth. What can be done? Public administration research, such as what was done in this study exploring juvenile diversion in Ohio, should be used to “improve administrative practices such as supervision, leadership, motivation, control, planning, decision-making and a host of other activities” (White, p. 13, 1999). Evidence-based practice (EBP) is a philosophy and a process that involves the integration of professional judgment and research information, “taking into consideration regarding each client’s unique characteristics, circumstances, preferences and actions and external research findings (Gambrill, 2006, p. 339).” EBP should be the plummet line and “guide for thinking about how decisions should be made” in treating juvenile offenders (Gambrill, 2006, p. 339). The reduction of juvenile delinquency and particularly disproportionate minority contact and confinement in the juvenile justice system will not curtail unless strategies are developed to address the specialized needs of this population.
In conclusion, as mentioned earlier, the theory of RECLAIM is to provide local juvenile justice officials with the autonomy to create and administrate programs as they deem appropriate. RECLAIM does accomplish this as it provides local judges with the freedom to design diversion programs as alternatives to sentencing. Evidence-based practice however, is not based on individual preferences. It is based on empirical knowledge.

Throughout the text, the literature discussing the problem of disproportionate minority contact and the predetermination of whom the criminals are (young, male, Hispanic and black) and how these groups are not seen as being deserving of rehabilitation was cited. What the author found in this research was many Ohio counties are using EBP, but there are some important missing data when it comes to questions about whether minority groups are participating in existing EBP programming. Do existing programs for juvenile offenders in Ohio counties provide evidence-based practice and comprehensive interventions for first-time, misdemeanor and status offenders? Data from the survey questionnaire administered for this project indicate that over 55 percent of Ohio county-level juvenile diversion programs provide at least one version of EBP, that is MST, wraparound services or comprehensive strategy. What’s next?

What is needed is a comprehensive discussion of the primary considerations that policymakers should use in striking a balance between holding youths accountable ...and providing services and opportunities to change their environments so their future behaviors will be guided by constructive, rather than destructive forces (Guarino-Ghezzi & Loughran, 2004, p. 5).
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   "Exploring Evidence-Based Practice in Juvenile Diversion in Ohio: With Implications for Policy and Practice
   Supporting Multisystemic Therapy (MST) and Wraparound Services"

Thank you for submitting your IRB Application for Review. Your application was approved on February 18, 2008. Your protocol represents minimal risk to subjects and matches the following federal category for exemption:
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March 31, 2008

Victoria Sheppard
1700 W. Market St. C 122
Akron, Ohio

Dear Mrs. Sheppard,

The Stow Youth Services staff is looking forward to assisting you with your project. As a diversion program for the City of Stow, we will assist you in your research and your efforts to complete this project. We know you have been very enthusiastic and have put in countless hours to complete this project in a timely manner.

We appreciate your excitement learning about Diversion in the State of Ohio and its efforts and outcomes with youthful offenders. We feel our program has a lot to offer to our families and their children. It has been a pleasure assisting you with your endeavors and will continue to support you in any way that we can.

Sincerely,

Renee L. Armbuster
Renee L. Armbuster LSW, LICDC
Stow Youth Services
Stow Police Department
# APPENDIX C.

## MEASUREMENT MAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Strategy</strong></td>
<td><strong>A SPECTRUM OF SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>Does program provide services for clients with mental health issues?</td>
<td>Yes = 1, No = 2, Contract out = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SYSTEMS APPROACH</strong> targeting all members of the family, all systems influencing delinquency</td>
<td>Are family members included in group therapy or other services, activities?</td>
<td>Yes = 1, No = 2, Contract out = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SERVICE INTENSITY</strong> matching needs and criminogenic risk factors at all five levels - individual, family, school, peers and community</td>
<td>How often do clients meet with case workers, staff?</td>
<td>Weekly, Daily, Monthly, 1-2 times per week, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Activities that reinforce protective factors</strong></td>
<td>How often are group therapy, workshops held with family?</td>
<td>Weekly, Daily, Monthly, 1-2 times per week, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strengthen core social influences</strong></td>
<td>Does the program provide crisis intervention?</td>
<td>Yes = 1, No = 2, Contract out = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strengthen academic performance</strong></td>
<td>Provides academic tutoring?</td>
<td>Yes = 1, No = 2, Contract out = 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Measurement Map (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Operationalization</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-systemic</td>
<td>Family centered Individualized Uses risk</td>
<td>Does program provide: Family counseling Parent Training Detox Alcohol education</td>
<td>Yes = 1, No = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td>assessment Treats risk factors</td>
<td>Tobacco education</td>
<td>Contract out = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wraparound</td>
<td>Focus on collaboration with community agencies</td>
<td>What does your program do if a child has a problem for which your agency does not</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Model</td>
<td>to provide services as needed and assessed</td>
<td>have services (example, mental health issues)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-Based</td>
<td>Frequency of services (2 sessions per week</td>
<td>How many times do clients receive services? Length of maximum involvement in</td>
<td>Describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice (EBP)</td>
<td>Lipsey, 2001)</td>
<td>program?</td>
<td>Describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration of services</td>
<td>Quality of staff</td>
<td>Licensed Social Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of staff</td>
<td>Quality of treatment</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Yes, 2 = No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Ohio Juvenile Program Administrator or Director: You are invited to participate in a research project: Exploring Juvenile Diversion in Ohio. This project is being conducted by Victoria C. Sheppard, principal investigator, from the University of Akron, Department of Public Administration and Urban Studies as part of requirements for a graduate degree. Along with this letter is a short questionnaire that asks a variety of questions about your delinquency prevention/juvenile diversion program. I am asking you to look over the questionnaire and, if you choose to do so, complete it and send it back to me. It should take you about 30 minutes to complete. Your participation is voluntary. If you do not wish to participate, simply discard the questionnaire. Responses will be completely anonymous; your name will not appear anywhere on the survey. Completing and returning the questionnaire constitutes your consent to participate.

The results of this project will contribute to our understanding of how to best serve Ohio’s youth at the community-based programming level. I do not know of any risks to you if you decide to participate in this survey and I guarantee that your responses will not be identified with you personally, nor will there be any effort made to link your responses with your identify. All responses will be kept confidential. I promise not to share any information that identifies you with anyone outside my research group, which consists of my graduate faculty committee members.

Please remember, do not put your name anywhere on the questionnaire. Each questionnaire will be assigned an identifying number that will be removed once your questionnaire has been returned. We use the number to contact those who have not returned their questionnaire. In exchange for your participation, your program will automatically be entered into a drawing for a $150.00 book gift certificate. I hope you will take the time to complete this questionnaire and return it. Your participation is totally voluntary and there is no absolutely no penalty if you do not participate. Regardless of whether you choose to participate, please let me know if you would like a summary of my findings. If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact me at (330) 972-7618 or by e-mail at vickie2@uakron.edu. The Institutional...
Review Board at The University of Akron has approved this project. Thank you for your help. We appreciate your cooperation. Victoria C. Sheppard, Department of Public Administration & Urban Studies.
INSTRUCTIONS: The following questionnaire is to be completed by a juvenile diversion program director and/or program staff. There are no right or wrong answers to any of these questions. Be as descriptive as you can. This will help us understand how programs in Ohio help children who are in trouble. All responses will be kept confidential and no attempts will be made to identify individual responses to this survey. Most questions are asking for responses regarding your program for fiscal year 2007. Thank you for your participation.

NAME OF COUNTY      NAME OF CITY
Your job title (person completing this survey)

Do you have a structured juvenile diversion program? If yes, what is the name of the program? If not, describe activities you conduct that “divert” juveniles from the juvenile justice court system. Years your program has been in operation?

How long does it take for youth to complete your program?

Do you contract with any program providers to provide juvenile diversion services for first-time, status and misdemeanor offenders? Name, list, and describe services they provide?

What is the stated mission of your program? Example, to divert youth from court by helping them cope with family problems.

Describe your top 3 approaches that you believe work best to reduce juvenile delinquency and repeat offenses?
  1. ______________________________________
  2. ______________________________________
  3. ______________________________________

Does your program have a theory it is based on? For example, some programs are based on stabilizing the family to help children. Describe the basis for your program.

Describe your program in detail, what juvenile services you provide.

Do you have the freedom to create program services as needed? For instance, if a child comes to your program with mental health needs and you cannot provide them, how do you handle this case?

POPULATION TODAY
Total Caucasian clients
Total African American clients
Total other clients
Does your program use any of the following diversion models?  
Mark one Y (yes) N (no) or Not familiar with this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT FAMILIAR WITH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wraparound Services Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-systemic Therapy (MST)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other juvenile service models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe the population served by your program today.

Mark bullets Yes or No

- Adolescent’s ages 7-17
- 18 year olds
- Clients with alcohol/drug disorders
- Status offenders
- First-time offenders
- Misdemeanor offenders
- Non-violent offenders
- Repeat non-violent offenders
- Clients with mental disorders
- Violent offenders

2007 Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$ Received 2007</th>
<th>Funds Diversion</th>
<th>Funds Other Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- RECLAIM Ohio
- Youth Services Grants
- City funding
- Police Funding
- Other

How successful do you feel your diversion program is?

Mark bullets

- Very successful
- Somewhat successful
- Not very successful
- Not successful at all

Services your program provides:

Mark bullets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We provide</th>
<th>Contract Out</th>
<th>Does not provide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detoxification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parent training
Special events (teen dances, etc.)
Hair/Urine testing
Academic Tutoring
Employment preparation
Mentoring
Workshops for girls
Workshops for boys
Family crisis intervention
Psychiatric care
Behavioral training
Community activities
Intensive supervision
Home visits
Home monitoring
Field trips
Violence prevention training
Information about college
Prenatal care information
Sex education information
Tobacco education
Anger management
Self-esteem classes
Cultural programs
House arrest
Monitoring school performance
Encourages after school athletics
Helps to reduce failure in school
Works to reduce poor family functioning
Case management
Involves family in treatment
Provides work experience, employment
Cognitive thinking skills training
Arranges for services with agencies as needed
A team creates a case management plan
Helps youth transition out of program with job
Continuous assessment during program

ASSESSMENT - Mark appropriate bullet
No, not assessed at in-take
Yes, assessed at in-take
If yes, name instrument used
If someone other than you program staff assesses, who does this?
Reassessed during program? Total times reassessed?
Mental health issues
Drug/alcohol use/abuse
Gang involvement
Academic performance
Reading skills
Family abuse

How many of your 2007 clients were referred to juvenile court since they completed your program?

SERVICE INTENSITY
Mark appropriate bullet
Daily - Weekly - Monthly
Not often or 2-4 times per week or Less than 2 times per week
Not applicable
Parents made aware of youth's progress
How often do case workers/staff you meet with clients
How often does staff meet to discuss cases
Contact made at youth's home

Program capacity what is the maximum number of youth for which your program can provide services at one time?

Program Clients: Total boys served in 2007 _______ Total girls served in 2007______

Describe steps that are taken to stabilize the youth's family life?

How does the program address youth who have problems in school, low grades?
Describe.

Describe innovative activities/services/programs you provide.

Where do you feel your program falls short, what additional services do you believe are needed in your program to help juveniles in your city/county?

Explain why your city has adopted a diversion program to help young people who are in trouble with the law? Who made the decision to do so?
Are you, the person completing this survey, a

*Check all that apply.*
Law enforcement officer
Probation officer
Licensed social worker
Juvenile court judge
Diversion staff person

Has your program been evaluated?
Mark appropriate answer  Yes  or  NO
Evaluated annually
Evaluated by staff
Evaluated by outsider
Not evaluated yet

Credentials of staff who work with juveniles in your program
Total # staff licensed social workers
Total staff with undergraduate degrees
Total staff with graduate degrees
Total # of staff delivering services to juveniles

How many times are juveniles allowed to go through the diversion process/program?

Anything else you would like to share about your program?

Does the program provide diversion services to youth on a countywide basis? Or, do cities in your county divert youth themselves? Describe, if applicable.

How do you track the progress of youth who have completed your program?
Do you have contact with youth after they complete your program?

How does your program measure success?

Thank you!