ModelsforChange
Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice

Juvenile Justice Mapping Process- A How To Guide

Louisiana MacArthur Models for Change Program

Prepared by:

Kathryn Lawing

&

Paul Frick

Department of Psychology

University of New Orleans

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

Supported by a grant provided by the John T. and Catherine D. MacArthur Foundation to the University of New Orleans (UNO), a system for conducting a comprehensive mapping of the key decisions points in the juvenile justice system was developed by the Department of Psychology of UNO. The mapping process was developed in collaboration with the Data Group of the MacArthur Louisiana Models for Change in Juvenile Justice Program (La-MfC) consisting of representatives from UNO, Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, National Center for Juvenile Justice Research and the Vera Institute. Also, other members of the National Resource Bank (NRB) of the MacArthur Foundation provided technical assistance in the development of this mapping process.

The purpose of the mapping process is:

- to provide a clear description of the operation of the juvenile justice system in a Louisiana parish to guide changes and improvements in how the system serves youth, and
- to make the decision-making procedures at each point in the juvenile justice system transparent to all those involved to hopefully foster cooperation among the various agencies involved in the parish's juvenile justice system.

The "decisions" that are the focus of this mapping process are those decisions that use information about a youth's background, behavior, and mental health needs to influence the next step in the youth's processing in the juvenile justice system.

The goals of this process are to clearly define:

- the most common and important decisions that are made in the parish for

youth who come in contact with the juvenile justice system,

- how these decisions are made at various points in the juvenile justice system,

- the mechanisms for funding that influence these decisions, and

- what data are obtained, stored, and shared related to these decisions.

The mapping process was designed to be repeated so that information can be collected at multiple points in time in order to track any changes that may take place over time within the parish.

UNO conducted the mapping process in Jefferson and Rapides parishes in 2007 and 2011, as part of La-MfC initiative in these parishes.   In 2009, the University of Louisiana-Monroe conducted a similar mapping in the 4th Judicial District in Northern Louisiana to demonstrate that the other jurisdictions could successfully replicate the mapping process.   The following is a description of how the mapping process was carried out in the three different jurisdictions.

II. Phases

Phase 1. Planning the Mapping Process

To begin planning the mapping process, meetings were held with major juvenile justice stakeholders in the parishes in which the mapping would take place. These stakeholders included juvenile court judges, district attorneys, probation officers, diversion coordinators, school personal, and mental health providers. These meetings were coordinated through the Children and Youth Planning Boards of the participating parishes.   The primary purpose of these meetings was to determine the types of information which would be useful to these stakeholders and what juvenile justice agencies would participate in the mapping process.   The choice of participating agencies was based on their role in making key decisions that

had a major influence on whether a youth entered the juvenile justice system or whether the youth went deeper into the system. Based on these meetings, the following agencies were chosen to participate in the mapping process:

- law enforcement,

- Families In Need of Service (FINS),

- juvenile detention,

- district attorney's office, and

- juvenile court.

Although many other agencies were considered (e.g., probation, schools), the decision was made to limit the number of agencies involved to five in order to increase the feasibility of completing the mapping process in a timely manner. Further, in each parish, one or more local representatives were chosen to consult on the development of the mapping procedures and to be liaison with the various juvenile justice agencies in collecting the information needed for the mapping process.

Phase 2. Developing the Mapping Survey

The mapping process was designed to collect information in a manner that minimized the burden to the participating agencies. Thus, the initial stage of data collection was to send out an initial time-efficient e-mail survey to each of the participating agencies. This survey was developed with input from members of the local agencies and with consultation from the La-MfC National Resource Bank of national experts in juvenile justice reform. A copy of this survey is included in Appendix A. In Appendix B, we include the slightly revised survey that was used at follow-up (i.e., the second mapping process).

Phase 3. Collecting Information

Once the mapping survey was developed, initial phone calls were made to parish agencies to notify them that UNO would be conducting a mapping survey and to describe the procedures involved in the mapping process.   Key contact persons at each agency were identified and the parish agency was given the option of being emailed the survey or to have it mailed to them.   One week following the first contact, the mapping survey was disseminated by the agency's preferred contact method.   These surveys were accompanied by a cover letter from UNO. An example of this cover letter is also included in Appendices A and B.   Parish agencies were asked to complete the survey in 2 weeks.   If surveys were not answered within the 2-week time period, follow up emails and phone calls were made to encourage agencies to complete the survey.

After all surveys were returned, the information provided was reviewed and follow-up visits, phone calls, and e-mails were made to the agencies to collect additional information as needed. That is, some items on surveys were not completed or some answers required clarification. This additional information was collected through these various follow-up methods.

Phase 4. Writing of the Report.

All of the information obtained in the mapping process was summarized in a report.   The various sections of the report are described in the next section. The information included in the report was first reviewed by the primary contact person from each agency to ensure its accuracy.   Next, the report was reviewed by the local liaisons and with the LA-MfC Data Group. Finally, it was approved by MacArthur Foundation who provided funding for the development of the mapping process.

6

Phase 5. Reviewing Results with Parishes

After the mapping report was completed, the parish liaisons were contacted to discuss how to disseminate the results to the parish and to encourage its use in decision-making to improve the services provided to justice-involved youths in the parish. This dissemination was typically done in two formats. First, a presentation was made to all local stakeholders, typically through the parish's Children and Youth Planning Board. Second, smaller group meetings were held with the individual agencies who participated in the mapping process. These small group meetings focused largely on how this information could be used to guide policy decisions in their agency and in their parish.

III. Content of Mapping Report

Introductory Material

The first section of the report summarizing the results of the mapping process introduced the external agencies supporting and collaborating with individuals involved in mapping process. In this section, the various parish agencies that would be participating in the mapping process were identified. This section also described the purpose of the mapping survey and the methods which were used to conduct the mapping process.

Youth Entering the Juvenile Justice System.

The next section of the mapping report described the numbers and sources through which youths typically entered the juvenile justice system in the parish. In each report, a table was included that summarized the available information on youth served by each agency participating in the mapping process. Importantly, detailed information on how the youth were referred to each agency was provided.

For example, the information from the DA's office would provide the number of youth referred to the DA from the local police agencies and the number referred from other sources (e.g., schools,   FINS, and family members).   A template for this table is provided below.   This table was followed by a text summary describing who provided the information from each agency and the source of the information (e.g., from clerk of court records, from an agency data base, from a review of case files).   Also, if the agency provided more detailed information about the youth entering the system (e.g., race, ethnicity, age, gender, average length of stay in detention) from their agency, this was provided using additional charts and graphs.

Table Template 1. Youth Entering the Juvenile Justice System

Decision Point	Source of Entry into Juvenile Justice System	Number of Youth
Sheriff's Office		
DA		
Court		
Informal FINS		
Detention		

Note: DA - District Attorney; FINS - Families in Need of Services.

Decision-making with Justice-involved Youth

The next section of the mapping report summarized information on the key decisions that are made for youths involved in the juvenile justice system at the chosen decision points. For example, juvenile court may indicate that the following decisions are made for youths who appear in court:

- to decide the guilt or innocence of the youth;

- to detain or release the youth;

- to refer the youth to the DA for an Informal Adjustment Agreement (IAA) involving an agreement between the judge, youth, and DA on an appropriate diversion alternative; and

- to determine the types of post-dispositional services for the youth.

This section also summarized how these decisions were being made (e.g., does the agency use any standardized tools when making these decisions) and who made the decisions (e.g., judge, court probation officer, court case manager). A template for a table summarizing this information is provided below.

As part of the mapping survey, each agency was asked to provide a quantitative rating for their level of satisfaction with the methods for making decisions on youths and to provide qualitative comments on how the process could be improved. A template for a table summarizing these ratings of satisfaction and suggestions for improvement is also provided below. As with other sections of the mapping report, a text description describing who provided the data included in the table and highlighting key findings were also included in the report.

Table Template 2: Key Decision and Methods

Decision Point	Important Decisions	Standardized Tools	Other Tools	Persons Involved
Sheriff's Office				
DA				

Court				
FINS				
Detention				

Note: DA - District Attorney; FINS - Families in Need of Services.

Table Template 3: Satisfaction with the Decision Making Process

Decision Point	Self-Reported Satisfaction with Decision-Making Process [*]	Suggested Improvements
Sheriff's Office		
DA		
Court		
FINS		
Detention		

Note: DA - District Attorney; FINS - Families in Need of Services.
[*]Summary of response to question, "In considering how your agency currently makes decisions on youth, please describe how satisfied your agency is in the current methods used?", with the following response options, "Not at all", "Somewhat", "Very", "Extremely".

Information Sharing

An important factor in understanding how decisions are made for youth in the juvenile justice system is determining how information is shared among different agencies. Thus, the mapping process also focused on how agencies that work with justice-involved youth and families shared information. For example, a typical law enforcement agency may share information with:

- juvenile court,

- the department of juvenile services, and

- the local school board.

This information sharing is typically done through a combination of formal

information sharing agreements, state and federal statutes, court orders, and

informal relationships among agencies.   Thus, the mapping report provided a table

(see below for a template) summarizing the agencies that share information based

on existing formal information sharing agreements and state or federal statutes.

Table Template 4: Information Sharing

Decision Point	Information shared due to existing formal agreements	Information shared due to state/federal statutes
Sheriff's Office		
DA		
Court		
FINS		
Detention		

Note: DA - District Attorney; FINS - Families in Need of Services.

Data Systems

The last section of the mapping survey described basic information on the

data systems used to track youths involved in the various juvenile justice agencies in

the parish.   This information was important because it described whether agencies

used or had the capability to use data to improve the way they served youths and/or

to evaluate the effects of any reforms they may want to implement.

Agencies were asked to provide any information regarding the types of

systems used to store data, what the primary identifiers for youth were used at each

agency (e.g., case number, docket number), and whether external parish agencies

had access to data systems. This information was summarized in a single table (see

template below).   Two additional tables (templates also provided below) were included in the mapping report to summarize what types of data were stored and how they were stored at each agency. One table summarized the available background information and the second table summarized available information on the youth's offending history.

Table Template 5: Data Systems - Basic Information

Decision Point	Tracking & Storing Methods	Software	Primary Identifiers	Existing Links
Sheriff's Office				
DA				
Court				
FINS				
Detention Center				

Note: DA - District Attorney; FINS - Families in Need of Services.

Table Template 6: Available Data Points – Background

Decision Points	Identifying Info		Race/Ethnicity		Neighborhood/Zip Code of Residence	
	Available	*electronic*	*available*	*electronic*	*available*	*electronic*
Sheriff's Office						
DA						
Court						
FINS						
Detention						
	Academic History		**Mental Health/ Substance Use History**		**OCS Investigations**	
	Available	*electronic*	*available*	*electronic*	*available*	*electronic*
Sheriff's Office						
DA						
Court						
FINS						
Detention						

Note: Available- is the data element available to the agency?; Electronic- is the data element available electronically?; DA - District Attorney; FINS - Families in Need of Services

Table Template 7: Available Data Points – Offense History

Decision Points	Arrests		Delinquency Petitions		FINS info	
	available	*electronic*	*available*	*electronic*	*available*	*electronic*
Sheriff's Office						
DA						
Court						
FINS						
Detention						
	Detentions		Diversions		OYD Commitments	
Decision Points	*available*	*electronic*	*available*	*electronic*	*available*	*electronic*
Sheriff's Office						
DA						
Court						
FINS						
Detention						

Note: Available- is the data element available to the agency?; Electronic- is the data element available electronically?; DA - District Attorney; FINS - Families in Need of Services

IV. Lessons Learned

Overall, individual parishes were very cooperative and engaged in the mapping process.   There were several likely contributors to this positive level of engagement:

- All participating parishes had received grants from the MacArthur Foundation to support juvenile justice reform, although this did not include funds specifically for participating in the mapping process.

- The mapping process was conducted with substantial involvement from the Children and Youth Planning Boards in each of the parishes.

- Stakeholders were involved in the planning of the mapping process and local liaisons were involved in all phases of the process.

However, there were a number of challenges encountered in conducting the mapping process.

Identifying Key Decision Points

A difficult issue in planning the mapping survey was in deciding the scope of project. That is, in initial discussions with stakeholders, a large number of potential decision points were identified, each of which could be important for understanding how youths enter and progress through the juvenile justice system in each parish. For example, each parish participating in the mapping process identified schools as a major source of entry for youth in the juvenile justice system.   However, providing an adequate mapping of the schools in each jurisdiction, the number of youths each one refers to the juvenile justice system, the procedures through which they make these referrals, and their data collection methods for tracking youth referred to the juvenile justice system would have greatly expanded the scope of the mapping process.   Thus, it was necessary to help parishes prioritize the key decision points and determine what could be accomplished with the available resources.

Gathering Survey Data

Another difficult issue was collecting the survey data from all agencies. A number of agencies did not return the survey in a timely manner. Further, many of the surveys were returned with incomplete or partially incomplete answers. In order to gather surveys in a time efficient manner and to help agencies answer all questions, follow up emails and phone calls were made to agency representatives. In many cases it was necessary to visit the agency site and conduct in person meetings in order to answer all questions required by the mapping process.

14

Limited Access to Data

Another obstacle to completing the mapping process was that some parish agencies had limited data capacity. In particular, data that required the number of youth required from different sources or data that required the racial and gender breakdown of the youth involved in a particular agency were not always available. This was because some agencies did not keep track of this information or did not know how to access to this information from existing data sources. For some information, other agencies had to collaborate to provide the information. For example, the clerk of court provided certain data when it was not available from a targeted agency.

Utilization of Report Data

Another difficult task was to help the agencies understand the implications and use the results provided by the mapping report. That is, the mapping process was designed to generate data that agencies could use to improve how they serve youths in the juvenile justice system. However, agencies often needed assistance in determining how the data could be used to make reforms and required incentives for maintaining quality data systems (e.g., ease of use for mandatory reporting requirements; data available for funding applications).

Juvenile Justice Follow-up Mapping Survey
Louisiana MacArthur Models for Change Program

Introduction to Survey

We greatly appreciate your parish's involvement in the Louisiana MacArthur Models for Change (MfC) program which focuses on assisting parishes in Louisiana to develop model juvenile justice systems. Your parish's involvement in this program clearly signals its commitment to improving the lives of youth who come in contact with the juvenile justice system and its goal to be a model for the rest of the state. As part of its involvement in this effort, your parish has identified the need to clearly map how critical decisions that have a major impact on youth in the juvenile justice system are made in your parish. Your parish asked us (the University of New Orleans) to assist in this process. The goals of this process are to clearly define:

- the most common and important decisions that are made in your parish for youth who come in contact with the juvenile justice system,

- how these decisions are made at various points in the juvenile justice system,

- the mechanisms for funding that influence these decisions, and

- what data are obtained, stored, and shared related to these decisions.

The "decisions" that are the focus of this survey are those decisions that use information about a youth's background, behavior, and mental health needs to influence the next step in the youth's processing in the juvenile justice system.

A clear mapping of these decisions is important for a number of reasons:

- It can provide important information to guide changes and improvements to meet the MfC targeted areas of improvements for your parish.

- It can start an ongoing mapping process in your parish, that is continually updated to reflect changes in statutes and policies, which makes the decision-making procedures at each point in the juvenile justice system transparent to all those involved and fosters collaboration among the various agencies involved in your parish's juvenile justice system.

The mapping process will involve multiple steps. The process will start by mapping how decisions are made at five critical points in the juvenile justice system in your parish:

- law enforcement,

- juvenile court,

- district attorney's office,

- FINS, and

- detention center

This survey was designed to be the first step in the mapping process. It was designed to obtain information related to the four objectives noted above in a time efficient manner. Throughout the survey, if your agency has manuals or other statements of policies that would provide the requested information, please feel free to attach them to the survey. The information you provide will then be reviewed to determine what additional information is needed to obtain an accurate mapping of your juvenile justice system and what might be the best methods for gathering this information.

Once completed, please return the survey either by e-mail (sklawing@uno.edu), fax (504-280-6049), or mail:

Katie Lawing
Department of Psychology
University of New Orleans
2001 Geology and Psychology Bldg.
New Orleans, LA 70148

Please feel free to contact me at the e-mail address listed above or at 504-289-5995 if you have any questions about this survey. Again, I want to thank you for taking the time to complete this survey in a careful manner. Your willingness to do so again demonstrates the commitment of your parish to developing a model juvenile justice system. I, and the rest of Louisiana MfC group, look forward to working with you on this important endeavor.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Frick, Ph.D., University Research Professor
Chair, Department of Psychology
University of New Orleans
Coordinator, MacArthur Models for Change Data Work Group

Informant Information

Your Name:

Title:

Parish:

Agency:

E-Mail Address:

Phone Number:

Information on Key Decisions

1. Please list the pathways that youth take to get to your agency (e.g., arrests by police/sheriff; school referrals; FINS**) and, if possible, the total number of youth referred from each source in 2010.**

2. **Please list the most common and most important decisions that are made about youth in the juvenile justice system at your agency** (e.g., will a charge be accepted, is a youth eligible for diversion, will the youth be detained, will a formal FINS petition be filed, is a youth at suicide risk, does a youth need mental health treatment).

3. **For these decisions, please describe the amount of discretion that is allowed by law in making these decisions and what factors** (e.g., severity of charge; age of the child; available beds in detention center; level of staffing) **influence these decisions.** If your agency has a written policy manual governing these decisions, please provide this and/or list the most relevant statutes governing your decisions**.**

Methods for Making Decisions
4. Please describe how many people are involved in making each key decision and their training (e.g., lawyer, police officer, social worker, psychologist).

5. Please describe the procedures, both informal and formal, that are used by your agency to make these decisions (if you plan to return the form electronically, use the check box feature by double clicking on the selected box and choose "checked").

a. Collecting and reviewing records or documents   Yes ☐ No ☐
        If yes, for what percentage of cases:

        If yes, please describe:

b. Interviews with: Youth   Yes ☐ No ☐
                     Caretaker   Yes ☐ No ☐
        If yes, for what percentage of cases:

        If yes, please describe (e.g., are there standard questions; what types of questions are asked; what is the length) or provide copies with this survey.

c. Standardized tools: Yes ☐ No ☐
        If yes, for what percentage of cases:

        If yes, please list all that are used (e.g., BASC, MAJOR, MAYSI-2, GAIN-SS, POSIT) and the level of training of the person(s) administering them (e.g., social worker, parole officer, psychologist).

d. List any other sources of information or procedures that are used in decision-making for youth by your agency.

6. What procedures are used at your agency for working with youth and families who are not proficient in English, are hearing impaired, or have other potential barriers to communication?

7. In considering how your agency currently makes decisions on youth, please describe how satisfied your agency is in the current methods used?

Not all ☐   Somewhat ☐   Very ☐   Extremely ☐

a. What improvements would you recommend in these methods that would aid you in serving youth at your agency?

Information on Funding Sources

8. Please list all of the programs (e.g., drug court; family strengthening) **and their funding sources** (e.g., local, state, federal, private; faith-based; volunteer) **that are currently used to serve justice-involved youth within your agency.** If a referral list is available, please attach.

9. Please list what you consider are the most pressing funding needs for your agency.

Information on Data Systems

10. Please list the primary methods for tracking and storing information on youth referred to your agency (e.g., computerized records, manual/paper files, log books)**.**

11. Please list any unique identifiers (e.g., case numbers, data of birth, docket number, social security number) **that are assigned to track information on youth referred to your agency.**

12. Please list the primary person(s) responsible for managing this information on youth and her/his/their training.

13. Please list all agencies to which information on youth served is disclosed or that have access to this information for each of following reasons:

      a. Allowed because of an existing information sharing agreement;

      b. Allowed or mandated by current state/federal statutes;

      c. Allowed because you obtain written consent, or is mandated by a court order;

14. If your information system is automated, either totally or for certain pieces of information, please answer the following questions (if not, please skip to # 15)

      a. Please describe the software used to manage the information system for your agency.

      b. Can information on youth referred to your agency be linked to other databases (e.g., parish, state, or national) and, if so, please list these databases.

15. Does your office produce routine reports/summary statistics on youth referred to your agency?

                                    Yes ☐ No ☐

      If yes, please describe what information is provided in these reports or attach copies of past reports.

16. Please check all pieces of information on youth that are obtained and stored by your agency and the method of storage. If your agency has a manual describing these data storage methods, please attach.

      a. Identifying information on child
(e.g., date of birth, gender, home zip code)   Yes ☐ No ☐

         If yes, computerized?   Yes ☐ No ☐

      b. Information on race and ethnicity of child   Yes ☐ No ☐

         If yes, computerized?   Yes ☐ No ☐

c. Information on substantiated OCS investigations　　Yes ☐ No ☐

　　　If yes, computerized?　Yes ☐ No ☐

d. Information on youth's academic history　　Yes ☐ No ☐

　　　If yes, computerized?　Yes ☐ No ☐

e. Information on youth's mental health history　　Yes ☐ No ☐

　　　If yes, computerized?　Yes ☐ No ☐

f. Information on youth's substance abuse history　　Yes ☐ No ☐

　　　If yes, computerized?　Yes ☐ No ☐

g. Information on arrests　　Yes ☐ No ☐

　　　If yes, computerized?　Yes ☐ No ☐

h. Information on detentions　　Yes ☐ No ☐

　　　If yes, computerized?　Yes ☐ No ☐

i. Information on diversions　　Yes ☐ No ☐

　　　If yes, computerized?　Yes ☐ No ☐

j. Information on delinquency petitions　　Yes ☐ No ☐

　　　If yes, computerized?　Yes ☐ No ☐

k. Information on OYD commitments　　Yes ☐ No ☐

　　　If yes, computerized?　Yes ☐ No ☐

l. FINS information　　Yes ☐ No ☐

　　　If yes, computerized?　Yes ☐ No ☐

m. After your agency's involvement with the youth has ended, is there follow-up information collected and stored on that youth (e.g., future arrests, FINS petitions, mental health referrals, etc)?

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please describe:

n. Are there any other types of information stored?　　Yes ☐ No ☐

　　　If yes, please describe:

17. Referring to categories of information listed in Question 16 above, is there any information that other agencies have requested from you but that you have not been able to provide them?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please list the agencies, the information they sought and why you were not able to provide them with it (e.g., prohibited by state law, did not have properly executed consent form).

Thank you again for completing this survey!

Once completed, please return the survey either by e-mail (sklawing@uno.edu), fax (504-280-6049), or mail:

Katie Lawing
Department of Psychology
University of New Orleans
2001 Geology and Psychology Bldg.
New Orleans, LA 70148

Juvenile Justice Follow-up Mapping Survey
Louisiana MacArthur Models for Change Program

Introduction to Survey

We greatly appreciate your parish's involvement in the Louisiana MacArthur Models for Change (MfC) program which focuses on assisting parishes in Louisiana to develop model juvenile justice systems. Your parish's involvement in this program clearly signals its commitment to improving the lives of youth who come in contact with the juvenile justice system and its goal to be a model for the rest of the state. As part of its involvement in this effort, your parish identified the need to clearly map how critical decisions that have a major impact on youth in the juvenile justice system are made in your parish. In 2007, we at the University of New Orleans worked with your parish to conduct an initial mapping of your juvenile justice system. Using data from 2006, the goals of this process were to clearly define:

- the most common and important decisions that are made in your parish for youth who come in contact with the juvenile justice system,

- how these decisions are made at various points in the juvenile justice system,

- the mechanisms for funding that influence these decisions, and

- what data are obtained, stored, and shared related to these decisions.

The "decisions" that were the focus of this survey are those decisions that use information about a youth's background, behavior, and mental health needs to influence the next step in the youth's processing in the juvenile justice system.

This mapping process was important for a number of reasons:

- It provided important information to guide changes and improvements to meet the MfC targeted areas of improvements for your parish.

- It made the decision-making procedures at each point in the juvenile justice system transparent to all those involved and hopefully fostered cooperation among the various agencies involved in your parish's juvenile justice system.

As we noted in the previous mapping process, we are now ready to repeat this process using information from 2010. This follow-up mapping allows us compare information we obtained in 2006 with information from 2010 to determine the areas in which your parish may have changed over this four year period when MfC was on-going in your parish. As before, the process will start by mapping how decisions are made at five critical points in the juvenile justice system in your parish:

- law enforcement,

- juvenile court,

- district attorney's office,

- FINS, and

- detention center

This information was designed to be initially collected through the attached survey completed by your agency. It was designed to be just the first step in the mapping process by obtaining information related to the four objectives noted above in a time efficient manner. Throughout the survey, if your agency has manuals or other statements of policies that would provide the requested information, please feel free to attach them to the survey. The information you provide will then be reviewed to determine what additional information is needed to obtain an accurate mapping of your juvenile justice system and what might be the best methods for gathering this information.

Once completed, please return the survey either by e-mail (sklawing@uno.edu), fax (504-280-6049), or mail:

Katie Lawing
Department of Psychology
University of New Orleans
2001 Geology and Psychology Bldg.
New Orleans, LA 70148

Please feel free to contact me at the e-mail address listed above or at 504-289-5995 if you have any questions about this survey. Again, I want to thank you for taking the time to complete this survey in a careful manner. Your willingness to do so again demonstrates the commitment of your parish to developing a model juvenile justice system. I, and the rest of Louisiana MfC group, look forward to working with you on this important endeavor.

Sincerely,

Paul J. Frick, Ph.D., University Research Professor
Chair, Department of Psychology
University of New Orleans
Coordinator, MacArthur Models for Change Data Work Group

Informant Information

Your Name:

Title:

Parish:

Agency:

E-Mail Address:

Phone Number:

Information on Key Decisions

1. Please list the pathways that youth take to get to your agency (e.g., arrests by police/sheriff; school referrals; FINS**) and, if possible, the total number of youth referred from each source in 2010.**

2. **Please list the most common and most important decisions that are made about youth in the juvenile justice system at your agency** (e.g., will a charge be accepted, is a youth eligible for diversion, will the youth be detained, will a formal FINS petition be filed, is a youth at suicide risk, does a youth need mental health treatment).

3. **For these decisions, please describe the amount of discretion that is allowed by law in making these decisions and what factors** (e.g., severity of charge; age of the child; available beds in detention center; level of staffing) **influence these decisions.** If your agency has a written policy manual governing these decisions, please provide this and/or list the most relevant statutes governing your decisions**.**

Methods for Making Decisions

4. Please describe how many people are involved in making each key decision and their training (e.g., lawyer, police officer, social worker, psychologist).

5. Please describe the procedures, both informal and formal, that are used by your agency to make these decisions (if you plan to return the form electronically, use the check box feature by double clicking on the selected box and choose "checked").

    a. Collecting and reviewing records or documents   Yes ☐ No ☐
          If yes, for what percentage of cases:

          If yes, please describe:

    b. Interviews with: Youth   Yes ☐ No ☐
                          Caretaker   Yes ☐ No ☐
          If yes, for what percentage of cases:

          If yes, please describe (e.g., are there standard questions; what types of questions are asked; what is the length) or provide copies with this survey.

    c. Standardized tools: Yes ☐ No ☐
          If yes, for what percentage of cases:

          If yes, please list all that are used (e.g., BASC, MAJOR, MAYSI-2, GAIN-SS, POSIT) and the level of training of the person(s) administering them (e.g., social worker, parole officer, psychologist).

    d. List any other sources of information or procedures that are used in decision-making for youth by your agency.

6. What procedures are used at your agency for working with youth and families who are not proficient in English, are hearing impaired, or have other potential barriers to communication?

7. In considering how your agency currently makes decisions on youth, please describe how satisfied your agency is in the current methods used?

Not all ☐   Somewhat ☐   Very ☐   Extremely ☐

a. What improvements would you recommend in these methods that would aid you in serving youth at your agency?

Information on Funding Sources

8. Please list all of the programs (e.g., drug court; family strengthening) **and their funding sources** (e.g., local, state, federal, private; faith-based; volunteer) **that are currently used to serve justice-involved youth within your agency.** If a referral list is available, please attach.

9. Please list what you consider are the most pressing funding needs for your agency.

Information on Data Systems

10. Please list the primary methods for tracking and storing information on youth referred to your agency (e.g., computerized records, manual/paper files, log books)**.**

11. Please list any unique identifiers (e.g., case numbers, data of birth, docket number, social security number) **that are assigned to track information on youth referred to your agency.**

12. Please list the primary person(s) responsible for managing this information on youth and her/his/their training.

13. Please list all agencies to which information on youth served is disclosed or that have access to this information for each of following reasons:

a. Allowed because of an existing information sharing agreement;

b. Allowed or mandated by current state/federal statutes;

c. Allowed because you obtain written consent, or is mandated by a court order;

14. If your information system is automated, either totally or for certain pieces of information, please answer the following questions (if not, please skip to # 15)

a. Please describe the software used to manage the information system for your agency.

b. Can information on youth referred to your agency be linked to other databases (e.g., parish, state, or national) and, if so, please list these databases.

15. Does your office produce routine reports/summary statistics on youth referred to your agency?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please describe what information is provided in these reports or attach copies of past reports.

16. Please check all pieces of information on youth that are obtained and stored by your agency and the method of storage. If your agency has a manual describing these data storage methods, please attach.

a. Identifying information on child
(e.g., date of birth, gender, home zip code) Yes ☐ No ☐

    If yes, computerized? Yes ☐ No ☐

b. Information on race and ethnicity of child Yes ☐ No ☐

    If yes, computerized? Yes ☐ No ☐

c. Information on substantiated OCS investigations Yes ☐ No ☐

    If yes, computerized? Yes ☐ No ☐

d. Information on youth's academic history Yes ☐ No ☐

    If yes, computerized? Yes ☐ No ☐

e. Information on youth's mental health history Yes ☐ No ☐

    If yes, computerized? Yes ☐ No ☐

f. Information on youth's substance abuse history Yes ☐ No ☐

    If yes, computerized? Yes ☐ No ☐

g. Information on arrests Yes ☐ No ☐

    If yes, computerized? Yes ☐ No ☐

h. Information on detentions Yes ☐ No ☐

    If yes, computerized? Yes ☐ No ☐

i. Information on diversions Yes ☐ No ☐

    If yes, computerized? Yes ☐ No ☐

j. Information on delinquency petitions Yes ☐ No ☐

    If yes, computerized? Yes ☐ No ☐

k. Information on OYD commitments Yes ☐ No ☐

    If yes, computerized? Yes ☐ No ☐

l. FINS information   Yes ☐ No ☐

    If yes, computerized?   Yes ☐ No ☐

m. After your agency's involvement with the youth has ended, is there follow-up information collected and stored on that youth (e.g., future arrests, FINS petitions, mental health referrals, etc)?

    Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please describe:

n. Are there any other types of information stored?   Yes ☐ No ☐

    If yes, please describe:

17. Referring to categories of information listed in Question 16 above, is there any information that other agencies have requested from you but that you have not been able to provide them?

    Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please list the agencies, the information they sought and why you were not able to provide them with it (e.g., prohibited by state law, did not have properly executed consent form).

18. How satisfied are you with the your parish's involvement in the Louisiana MacArthur Models for Change (MfC) Program?

Very Satisfied ☐   Satisfied ☐   Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ☐   Dissatisfied ☐   Very dissatisfied ☐

19. Please list the most positive outcomes of your parish's involvement with the MfC Program?

20. Please list the most negative and challenging aspects of your parish's involvement with the MfC Program?

Thank you again for completing this survey!
Once completed, please return the survey either by e-mail (sklawing@uno.edu), fax (504-280-6049), or mail:

Katie Lawing
Department of Psychology
University of New Orleans
2001 Geology and Psychology Bldg.
New Orleans, LA 70148