

JANUARY 2024 – DECEMBER 2026

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN



*NEW JERSEY
JUVENILE JUSTICE COMMISSION*

Matthew J. Platkin, Attorney General
Chair, JJC Executive Board

Jennifer LeBaron, Ph. D, Executive Director

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

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

DEMOGRAPHICS

YOUTH POPULATION

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

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

The total youth population declined by -3.6%. The larger decline were among male youth by -4.2%. The female population also declined by -3.0%. In reference to prior years' data, the youth population continues to decline in Sussex County year after year.

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

Ninety-two percent of the youth population in Sussex County remains of the white race. Four percent is of the black race, and 3.5% is categorized in other. Overall, white youth has declined, only slightly since 2018, at -4.1%. There has been a slight increase of 4.6% among black youth. There was no change according to the data among the other youth race. Overall the population decreased.

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

The Hispanic youth population has increased by 6.8% from 2018 to 2020. The non-Hispanic youth population has decreased by -5.1% from 2018 to 2020. Overall the total youth population has decreased by -3.6%, or 1,007 youth. In 2018, there was a 87.9% non-Hispanic population and a 12.1% Hispanic population. In 2020, there was an 86.6% non-Hispanic population and a 13.4% Hispanic population. Overall from 2018 to 2020 there was decrease in non-hispanic population and an increase in hispanic population. However, Sussex County continues to be predominantly white, non Hispanic.

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

Overall Sussex County youth continues to be white, non Hispanic males. However, the genders of both male and female are closely split between the two. There has been an increase in the Hispanic and black population from 2018 to 2020, but the overall youth population has declined.

**It should be noted, societal norms relating to gender are beginning to change. This change is not reflective in the data of the OJJDP Easy Access to Juvenile Population, however, local data collected by the Youth Services Commission illustrates youth identifying as non-binary or other, as well as male and female.

NATURE & EXTENT OF DELINQUENCY

JUVENILE ARRESTS

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

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

The juvenile arrests from 2018 to 2020 have significantly decreased by -63.0%, from 189 arrests to 70 arrests or 2.6 per 1000 youth. It is possible this is due to the Attorney General Directive to police departments, changing and strengthening the use of curbside warnings and stationhouse adjustments in lieu of arrests and court formal involvement. In 2018, there were significant arrests for drug/alcohol offenses which in 2020 this category fell in arrests drastically. This may be in part due to the legalization of marijuana and the AG directive. The number one arrest category has shifted to property offenses in 2020. Although even in this category, there was a decrease of -10.0% from 2018 to 2020. All categories showed a decrease from 2018 to 2020 except for Special Needs Offenses. Please note, the increase in Special Needs Offenses reflects an increase of 60% however, it is only three arrests. Violent Offenses decreased by four arrests (-33.3%), Weapons Offenses decreased by two arrests (-100.0%), Drug/Alcohol Offenses decreased by 99 arrests (-86.8%), Property Offenses decreased by two arrests (-10.5%), Public Order and Status Offenses decreased by three arrests (-21.4%), and All Other Offenses decreased by 12 arrests (-52.2%).

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

Property Offenses: 17, Drug/Alcohol Offenses: 15, Public Order and Status Offenses and All Other Offenses: both at 11, Special Needs Offenses and Violent Offenses: both at 8, Weapons Offenses: 0. Criminal activity towards a person(s) has decreased with an increase in property and public order and status offenses.

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

Weapons Offenses: -100%, Drug/Alcohol Offenses: -86.8%, Special Needs Offenses: 60%, All Other Offenses: -52.2%, Violent Offenses: -33.3%, Public Order and Status offenses: -21.4%, Property Offenses: -

10.5%. All categories showed a decrease from 2018 to 2020 except for Special Needs Offenses. Please note, the increase in Special Needs Offenses reflects an increase of 60% however, it is only three arrests. Violent Offenses decreased by four arrests (-33.3%), Weapons Offenses decreased by two arrests (-100.0%), Drug/Alcohol Offenses decreased by 99 arrests (-86.8%), Property Offenses decreased by two arrests (-10.5%), Public Order and Status Offenses decreased by three arrests (-21.4%), and All Other Offenses decreased by 12 arrests (-52.2%).

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

Juvenile arrests have significantly decreased from 2018 to 2020. As previously stated this in part may be the result of the AG Directive and change in marijuana laws. It should be noted, and will be illustrated in Diversion section, curbside warnings and stationhouse adjustments have significantly increased in Sussex County.

DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONTACT

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

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

Youth population by race remains consistent from the data used in 2018 through 2020. For year 2020, the white population decreased by .2% or from 140 arrests to 63. The black population decreased by .4% or from 9 arrests to 5. The other category also had a decrease at .1% or from 3 arrests to 2 arrests. Overall, there was a decrease of 53.9% total arrests from 2018 to 2020. Black youth population increased from 2018 to 2020 by 4.6% or by 49 youth.

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

For year 2020, the white population decreased by .2% or from 140 arrests to 63. The black population decreased by .4% or from 9 arrests to 5. The other category also had a decrease at .1% or from 3 arrests to 2 arrests. Overall, there was a decrease of 53.9% total arrests from 2018 to 2020. Black youth population increased from 2018 to 2020 by 4.6% or by 49 youth where white youth population decreased by -4.1% and there was no change in other youth.

11. Using Table 5 (Total County Youth Population Compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race, 2018-2020), compare the percent change 2018-2020 in youth population and in juvenile arrests for each category, highlighting any data that shows disproportionate minority contact. Then, rank the top three categories of juvenile arrest by race for 2018 and 2020 by percent change, beginning with the largest percent change. Draw comparisons between the categories.

For white youth, there was a -4.1% change in youth population with a decrease of -55% overall. For black youth, there was an increase in population of 4.6% but a decrease in -44.4% arrests. For other youth, the

population remained the same but there was a -33.3% decrease in arrests. Arrest data is consistent with the make up of Sussex County youth by race. The highest change in data was decrease in white youth arrests at -55%, second was black youth decreasing by -44.4% and lastly, other youth decreasing by -33.3%.

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

Youth population by ethnicity in 2020 illustrates an overall decrease of population by -3.6% with a -53.9% decrease in overall arrests. The hispanic population increased by 6.8% or by 230 hispanic youth. The non-hispanic youth decreased by -5.1% or by 1237 youth in 2020.

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

Youth population by ethnicity in 2020 illustrates an overall decrease of population by -3.6% with a -53.9% decrease in overall arrests. The hispanic population increased by 6.8% or by 230 hispanic youth. The non-hispanic youth decreased by -5.1% or by 1237 youth in 2020.

14. Using Table 6 (Total County Youth Population Compared to Juvenile Arrests by Ethnicity, 2018-2020), compare the percent change 2018-2020 in youth population and in juvenile arrests for each category, highlighting any data that shows disproportionate minority contact. Then, rank the top three categories of juvenile arrest by ethnicity for 2018 and 2022 by percent change, beginning with the largest percent change. Draw comparisons between the categories.

The largest percentage change of juvenile arrests by ethnicity was of non hispanic youth at -56.5% decrease, followed by a -38.1% decrease in hispanic arrests. Overall, juvenile arrests significantly decreased from 2018 to 2020 from 152 to 70.

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

Juvenile arrests have declined since 2018 to 2020. Where there is an increase in the hispanic population there was a decrease in arrests. The nonhispanic population had decreased as well as arrests.

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

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

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

The total number of school incidents has had a significant increase by 78.7%, or an increase of 140 incidents, from the 2017-18 school year to the 2021-22 school year.

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

The greatest number of incidents was of violence at 52, followed by substances at 46, vandalism at 33, and last weapons at 9. The 2021-2022 school year was following the Covid-19 pandemic and a return to school after virtual learning for the year prior.

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

The greatest number of incidents in 2021-2022 was vandalism at 366.7%, an increase of 33. Following was weapons at 300% an increase of 9, then the incidents of substances at 85.2% an increase of 46, and lastly the incidents of violence an increase of 52. The 2021-2022 school year was following the Covid-19 pandemic and a return to school after virtual learning for the year prior. .

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

As stated in the prior answers, the 2021-2022 school year was following the Covid-19 pandemic and a return to school after virtual learning for the year prior. The increase in school based incidents may be contributed to the readjustment in person academic learning, lack of socialization and conflict resolution, anxiety, and the recent changes in the marijuana laws may contribute to the low perception of harm among youth using substances.

NATURE & EXTENT OF COMMUNITY FACTORS THAT PUT YOUTH AT RISK

ENROLLMENT IN AND DROPOUTS FROM COUNTY SCHOOLS

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

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

The data available through the Department of Education is captured differently from school year 2019-20 and 2021-22. There were 6,783 students enrolled in high school throughout the county districts in the 2021-22 school year, 29 students choose to drop out in the 2021-22 school year, a 1.7% increase from 2019-20.

COMMUNITY INDICATORS OF CHILDREN AT RISK

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

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

In 2021, the most recent year available, the largest change was a decrease of children receiving TANF assistance at -43%, followed by a decrease of approximately -27% in births to adolescents since 2019, then a decrease in child abuse/neglect sustanations of -18%, and lastly a small increase in NJ SNAP at 3%. NJ SNAP beneficiaries seem to trend around the same in children receiving this service over the past five years with an increase in 2020, may be due to the covid-19 pandemic, but then decreases again the following year.

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

All Municipal Alliance programming was considered during the planning process in the prevention and early intervention areas. The Municipal Alliance Plan does not include overall risk factors however, other data sets such as the MS PRIDE survey, the school incidents reports, and station house adjustment data was utilized.

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

According to the data from the Department of Education, there were no school dropouts in the 2021-22 school year, a decrease of 100% from the previous year in Sussex County. Additionally, according to the Kids Count data, there was a decrease of -43% overtime of children receiving TANF services in 2022. There was also a decrease in children receiving NJ SNAP benefits from 2021 to 2022, however, over time there was a 3% increase in this area. Taken in its totality, children's risk factors have decreased over a five year period.

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

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

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

In addition to the data supplied by the JJC or through identified websites, the MS PRIDE survey, the local stationhouse adjustment data, the youth feedback survey, and local programming data were all used when looking at the Prevention services. As Sussex County does not have a significant and diverse racial/ethnic make up, programming has always and will continue to be culturally focused to address the disproportionate, racial, and ethnic disparities.

IMPLICATIONS FOR DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PLAN

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

PJ*	What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
A	Healthy decision making, social skill building	2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/community), VVSA school reports, JAMS reports, stopbullying.gov, SHA reporting, FCIU reports, UCR arrest data, Annie E Casey Foundation, NJ KidsCount data, community events dialogue	psycho-educational programming to address healthy decision making, interpersonal skill building, conflict resolution, inclusion practices and acceptance, within the community and in a school setting
B	conflict resolution, anger and aggression among youth	2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/community), VVSA school reports, JAMS reports, stopbullying.gov, SHA reporting, FCIU reports, UCR arrest data, Annie E Casey Foundation, NJ KidsCount data, community events dialogue	psycho-educational programming to address conflict, anger management techniques, positive communication skills, inclusion practices and acceptance, within the community and in a school setting
C	Peer, family, community engagement	2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/community), VVSA school reports, JAMS reports, stopbullying.gov, SHA reporting, FCIU reports, UCR arrest data, Annie E Casey Foundation, NJ KidsCount data, community events dialogue	psycho-educational programming to address problem areas of peer to peer, peer to adult, family conflicts. Positive and appropriate social interactions. Inclusion practices and acceptance within the community and in a school setting
D	substance use services: education	2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/community), VVSA school reports, JAMS reports, stopbullying.gov, SHA reporting, FCIU reports, UCR arrest data, Annie E Casey Foundation, NJ KidsCount data, community events dialogue	substance use services from early education and intervention within the community and in a school setting

E			
F			
G			

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

Comments:

As Sussex County does not have a significant and diverse racial/ethnic make up, programming has always and will continue to be culturally focused to address the disproportionate, racial, and ethnic disparities. All awarded Prevention programming will require its staff to address racial and ethnic disparities and be proficient in cultural competency.

**DELINQUENCY PREVENTION
DATA WORKSHEETS**

DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 1. County Youth Population (under 18) by Gender, 2018, 2019 and 2020

	2018		2019		2020		% Change 2018-2020
	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	
Males (under 18)	14,193	51.0%	13,815	50.7%	13,591	50.6%	-4.2%
Females (under 18)	13,655	49.0%	13,459	49.3%	13,259	49.4%	-3.0%
Total Youth Population (under 18)	27,848	100%	27,274	100%	26,841	100%	-3.6%

Table 2. Total County Youth Population (under 18) by Race, 2018 and 2020

Race	2018		2020		% Change 2018-2020
	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	
White	15,927	92.7%	24,771	91.3%	-4.1%
Black	1,071	3.8%	1,120	4.2%	4.6%
Other*	850	3.4%	950	3.5%	0.0%
Total Youth Population	27,848	100.0%	26,841	100.0%	-3.6%

Table 3. Total County Youth Population (under 18) by Ethnicity, 2018 and 2020

Ethnicity	2018		2020		% Change 2018-2020
	Number	% of Total Population	Number	% of Total Population	
Hispanic	3,370	12.1%	3,660	13.4%	6.8%
Non-Hispanic	24,478	87.9%	23,241	86.6%	-5.1%
Total Youth Population	27,848	100.0%	26,841	100.0%	-3.6%

NATURE AND EXTENT OF DELINQUENCY

Table 4. County Juvenile Arrests by Offense Category, 2018, 2019 and 2020

Offense Categories*	2018			2019			2020			% Change in Number of Arrests 2018-2020
	Number	% of All Juvenile Arrests	Rate per 1,000 youth	Number	% of All Juvenile Arrests	Rate per 1,000 youth	Number	% of All Juvenile Arrests	Rate per 1,000 youth	
Violent Offenses	12	6.3%	0.43	0	0.0%	0.0%	8	11.4%	0.3	-33.3%
Weapons Offenses	2	1.1%	0.1	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0	-100.0%
Property Offenses	19	10.1%	0.7	0	0.0%	0.0%	17	24.3%	0.6	-10.5%
Drug/Alcohol Offenses	114	60.3%	4.1	0	0.0%	0.0%	15	21.4%	0.6	-86.8%
Special Needs Offenses	5	2.6%	0.2	0	0.0%	0.0%	8	11.4%	0.3	60.0%
Public Order & Status Offenses	14	7.4%	0.5	0	0.0%	0.0%	11	15.7%	0.4	-21.4%
All Other Offenses	23	12.2%	0.8	0	0.0%	0.0%	11	15.7%	0.4	-52.2%
Total Juvenile Arrests	119	100%	6.8	170	0%	6.2	70	100%	2.6	-63.0%

Table 5. Total County Youth Population Compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race, 2018 and 2020

Race	2018			2020			% Change 2018-2020	
	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests	% of Youth Population Arrested	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests	% of Youth Population Arrested	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests
White	25,827	149	0.5%	24,771	63	0.3%	-4.1%	-55.0%
Black	1,071	9	0.8%	1,120	5	0.4%	4.6%	-41.4%
Other*	950	3	0.3%	950	2	0.2%	0.0%	-33.3%
Total	27,848	152	0.5%	26,841	70	0.3%	-3.6%	-53.9%

Table 6. Total County Youth Population Compared to Juvenile Arrests by Ethnicity, 2018 and 2020

Ethnicity	2018			2020			% Change 2018-2020	
	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests	% of Youth Population Arrested	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests	% of Youth Population Arrested	Youth Population	Juvenile Arrests
Hispanic	3,370	21	0.6%	3,660	13	0.4%	6.8%	-38.1%
Non-Hispanic	24,478	131	0.5%	23,241	57	0.2%	-5.1%	-55.5%
Total Youth Population	27,848	152	0.5%	26,841	70	0.3%	-3.6%	-53.9%

Table 7. Violence, Vandalism, Weapons, and Substance Abuse in County Schools, 2017-2018 & 2021-2022

School Based Incidences	2017-2018		2021-2022		% Change in School Based Incidents
	Number	% of Total Incidences	Number	% of Total Incidences	
Incidents of Violence	112	62.9%	161	51.6%	46.4%
Incidents of Vandalism	9	5.1%	42	13.2%	366.7%
Incidents of Weapons	3	1.7%	12	3.8%	300.0%
Incidents of Substances	54	30.3%	100	31.4%	85.2%
TOTAL SCHOOL BASED INCIDENCES	178	100%	318	100%	78.7%

NATURE & EXTENT OF COMMUNITY FACTORS THAT PUT YOUTH AT RISK

Table 8. Enrollment in and Dropouts from County Schools, Last 2 Years for Which Data are Available

Academic Indicators	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	% Change Over Years
Total Enrollment	19,503	19,023	19,291	-1.1%
Total Dropouts*	6%	2%	0	-100.0%

Table 9. Community Indicators of Children At Risk, Last Years for Which Data are Available

Community Indicators	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	% Change
Children Receiving TANF (Widows)	83	62	69	49	46	-43%
Children receiving NJ SNAP (formerly food stamps)	1417	1298	1550	1674	1457	5%
Child abuse/neglect substantiations	67	92	64	55		-18%
Births to adolescents (ages 10-19)	12	15	15			25%

DIVERSION ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

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

NATURE & EXTENT OF DIVERTED CASES

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

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

1. Describe the data used to understand the nature and extent of the use of diversion in your county. Submit a copy of the data in Chapter 11.

Quarterly stationhouse adjustment reports are provided by the Prosecutor's office for each municipality. Unfortunately, Sussex County has many towns patrolled by the New Jersey State Police. The NJSP are not required to provide station house or curbside adjustment data to the Prosecutor's office. This leads to towns in the county where data is not available. The planning committee must rely on school information, and the courts to assist with this data to which both were not available.

2. Describe the use of stationhouse adjustments by police in 2018 and in 2022 or in the most recent year.

The use of Station House Adjustments by police have slightly increased in Sussex County along with curbside warnings from 2018 to 2022. In 2018, Station House Adjustments totaled 74 among 13 police departments, with curbside warnings not being reported. In 2022, there were 77 Station House Adjustments and 86 Curbside Warnings.

3. Describe the use of stationhouse adjustments by race/ethnicity in 2018 and in 2022, or the most recent year, for each category. Then, calculate the percent change between 2018 and 2022 overall and by category. Rank the categories, beginning with the group that has the highest percent change. Describe the overall change in the use of stationhouse adjustments and the rank order by drawing comparisons between the categories.

For this question, we relied on the JAMS data for Sussex County's diversion programs. Please note, this data does not encompass all curbside or Station House adjustments throughout the county, but it is the most available data to get a picture of the county. Station House Adjustments declined from 2018 to 2022 overall by 26 youth (from 70 to 44). White youth decreased by 36 or -70%, Hispanic/Latino youth increased by 8 or 20%, Black youth increased by 4 or .09% and other decreased by 2 or .045%. This is consistent with prior planning years for the make up of Sussex County.

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

The overall use of Station House Adjustments in Sussex County (through diversion program data) has decreased but slightly over time. The largest change was among the white population however the white population represents 92% of the county make up. There is an increase in the black and hispanic youth population however this may attributed to the increase in black and hispanic youth residing in Sussex County from 2018 to 2022, where the white youth population has declined.

FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION UNITS

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

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

The FCIU caseload in 2022 has increased from 2021 but has decreased from 2018, overall by -9.8% or 26 cases. The largest caseload was the other category, followed by serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile, then serious threat to the well-being/physical safety of juvenile, truancy, disorderly/petty disorderly persons offense diverted to FCIU, and lastly there were no juveniles with an unauthorized absence for more than 24 hours.

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

The highest percentage change was an increase in other category of 152%, or 114 cases. Following highest is a 100% decrease (although only by 2 cases from 2018 and one case from 2021) to zero on unauthorized absence for maore than 24 hours, then a decrease in serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile of -82.2% or by 105 cases. The next decrease is in Truancy at -62.5% or by 10 cases. Followed by a decrease of -59.0% or 23 cases in serious threat to the well-being/physical safety of juvenile, and lastly a -.4% decrease in disorderly/petty disorderly persons offense diverted to FCIU.

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

The overall caseload in 2022 illustrates a decrease by -9.8%, however a significant increase in the other category. Other category can be but not limited to, mental health, behavioral health, substance use, or none. As just stated the there was a significant increase in utilizing the other category from 2018 to 2022, however a significant decrease in serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile. Overall the total caseload from 2018 to 2022 was minimal.

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

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

The overall petitions filed between 2018 and 2022 are minimal. There was only two petitions filed for 2022, one for juvenile/family crisis and one for an out of home placement.

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

The highest percent change in Petition filed were equal at 100%. In 2018, there were no petitions filed, in 2021 there were 3, and in 2022 there were both 1 for juvenile/family crisis and 1 for out of home placement. As Sussex County would like to have no petitions filed for either category, the number filed in 2022 is still incredibly low for a total of 2, 4 less than 2021.

10. Using the answers to Questions 8-9, what are the most significant findings related to your county's overall FCIU filed petitions and FCIU petitions filed by category in 2022? What are the most significant findings about how the FCIU petitions filed has changed since 2018?

Since 2018, there was a decrease of 4 petitions filed to 2022. The FCIU petitions filed are at a minimal, this may be in part due to the county having a combined unit with Children's Mobile Response and Stabilization Services (MRSS).

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

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

In 2018, 99.6% or 247 of 248 referrals were made to other outside agencies, with only one referral to a substance abuse program. In 2022, 100% or 119 of the referrals were made to other outside agencies.

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

According to the percent change, there was a -100% decrease in referrals to substance abuse programs (one referral to zero). There was a decrease of -51.8% (or 128 referrals) made to other outside agencies. Lastly, there were no referrals in either year made to DCP&P, having a zero percent change.

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

FCIU continues to utilize other services/agencies to assist the community's families in crisis for on going support. There was a significant decrease in the overall referrals by -52%, from 248 to 119, a decrease of 129 referrals. This may be in part due to the county having a combined unit with Children's Mobile Response and Stabilization Services (MRSS).

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

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

14. Describe the data used to understand the nature and extent of the use of the merged FCIU/mobile response team in your county. Submit a copy of the data in Chapter 11.
The Center for Family Services-Family Intervention Services (CFS) provides the Youth Services Commission with a monthly report breaking out the FCIU referrals, MRSS referrals, the reason for the referrals, the referral source, as well as the Crisis Intervention Unit Monthly Report provided to the AOC.
15. Describe the FCIU/mobile response caseload in 2018 and in 2022, or in the most recent year.
In 2018, MRSS received 305 referrals and 175 FCIU through PerformCare. In 2022, MRSS received 1599 referrals and 216 FCIU through performCare. Although not all PerformCare referrals required a dispatch.
16. Describe the use of FCIU/mobile response by race/ethnicity in 2018 and in 2022, or the most recent year, for each category. Then, calculate the percent change between 2018 and 2022 overall and by category. Rank the categories, beginning with the group that has the highest percent change. Describe the overall change in the use of FCIU/mobile response and the rank order by drawing comparisons between the categories.
In 2022, there were 204 white youth, 49 declined to state, 32 Hispanic, and 3 Black. This is consistent with the race/ethnicity make up of Sussex County.
17. Using the answers to Questions 14-16, what are the most significant findings about your county's overall use of FCIU/mobile response and the use of FCIU/mobile response by race, and by ethnicity in 2022, or the most recent year? How has the use of diversion changed overall and through the lens of race/ethnicity since 2018?
What is most significant for Sussex County as combined units of FCIU and Mobile Response, is the crossover of the two "systems". Families have access to services offered through the Children's System of Care through Mobile Response, hence, the much less frequent need of the formal family court system involvement. Data provided reflects this

comparing the FCIU caseload (2022: 238) to FCIU petitions (2022: 2). The race ethnicity data for 2018 was not available. However when looking at the data for 2021 and 2022, race/ethnicity from one year to the next was mostly consistent with the make up of Sussex County families. White youth had a decrease from 72% to 66%, Black youth had a very slight increase from 6% to 7%, Hispanic youth remained at 10% and those that declined to state increased from 12% to 16%. In 2021, 272 youth were served and in 2022, 308 youth were served.

JUVENILE COURT REFERRALS (NEW FILINGS)

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

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

Please note, the 2022 AOC new filings report from NJ Courts does not have the race/ethnicity broken out correctly. The data provided shows 23 of the 25 new filings to not be indicated and only two of the 25 being of white race. This creates difficulty when comparing 2018 to 2022. Utilizing data from 2018 to 2020, overall there is a significant decrease in new filings from 105 to 32. In 2020, twenty referrals were white, five referrals were black and hispanic each and two were other.

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

The largest change was in the other category at an increase of 1050% or from 2 in 2018 to 23 in 2022. The committee believes the race/ethnicity was not tracked accurately in 2022 as it does not align with all other data in Diversion. The second largest change was in the white category from 20 in 2018, to 2 in 2022 at a decrease of -97.7%. Both black and hispanic categories are at zero in 2022, a difference of 100% from 2018 where there were 9 black youth referred and 7 hispanic youth referred. Again, the committee suggests this data is inaccurate from the AOC.

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

The committee suggests the AOC data is inaccurate and not tracked according to race/ethnicity appropriately in 2022. Summizing overall changes is not possible due to this. However, looking at the totality of the referrals from 2018 to 2022, the overall referrals have decreased significantly from 105 to 25, a -76.2% decrease in referrals.

Disproportionate Minority Contact and Racial And Ethnic Disparities

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

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

Overall there was a -69.5% decrease in the percent of arrests referred to court (105 to 32). For white youth in 2018, there were 87 referrals to court and in 2020 there was 20. For black youth in 2018, there were 9 referrals to court and in 2020 there were 5. For hispanic youth there were 7 referrals to court and in 2020 there were . For other youth there were 2 referrals to court and in 2020 there were 2 again.

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

The percent change overall shows a decrease in juvenile arrests overall of -53.9% and a decrease of -69.5% referrals to court. The largest change is a decrease of white youth referred to court at -77%, followed by a decrease of -44.4% for black youth, then a decrease of -28.6% for hispanic, with other youth remaining the same.

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

The most significant finding is among black youth for both 2018 and 2020. Data shows 100% of black youth arrested, were also referred to court (2018 9/9 and 2020 5/5), disproportionate to white youth in 2018 when 62.1% (140/87) and in 2020 31.7% (63/20) youth were referred to court.

FAMILY COURT DIVERSIONS

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

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

There was a decrease of -92.4% from 2018 to 2022. The largest change was both hispanic and other youth at 100% decrease, or from 3 hispanic and 1 other in 2018 to zero for both in 2022. The second largest was the decrease of -94.2% for white youth, or from 69 in 2018 to 4

in 2022. Last, the black youth had a decrease of -66.7%, 6 youth in 2018 to 2 youth in 2022.

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

There was a decrease of -92.4% from 2018 to 2022. The largest change was both hispanic and other youth at 100% decrease, or from 3 hispanic and 1 other in 2018 to zero for both in 2022. The second largest was the decrease of -94.2% for white youth, or from 69 in 2018 to 4 in 2022. Last, the black youth had a decrease of -66.7%, 6 youth in 2018 to 2 youth in 2022.

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

Overall, the number of youth diverted has decreased from 79 to 6. This is significant.

Disproportionate Minority Contact and Racial and Ethnic Disparities

- **For Questions 27-28, use data from Table 4b (Total Juvenile Cases Diverted Compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity, 2018-2020).**

27. Using the data in Table 4b, describe the percent of arrests diverted from court overall and by category for 2018 and for 2020.

The percent of cases diverted overall there was a decrease of -33.% from 2018 to 2020. The committee suggests this data is inaccurate from the AOC. For example, in the other category there were 2 juvenile arrests in 2020 but 14 cases were diverted, statistically impossible. As well as 5 black youth arrests but 12 cases diverted. The only data to review is the totality of the arrests to diversions in which out of 152 arrests in 2018, 79 cases were diverted or about half at 52%. In 2020 there were 70 arrests and 49 of those were diverted or 70%. Overall arrests decreased but -53.9%, with -38% cases diversion from 2018 to 2020.

28. Using the data in Table 4b, describe the percent change in arrests diverted from court overall. Rank the percent change in arrests referred to court (2018-2020) by category, beginning with the category that has the largest change. Draw comparisons between the categories.

The percent of cases diverted overall there was a decrease of -33.% from 2018 to 2020. The committee suggests this data is inaccurate from the AOC. For example, in the other category there were 2 juvenile arrests in 2020 but 14 cases were diverted, statistically impossible. As well as 5 black youth arrests but 12 cases diverted. The only data to review is the totality of the arrests to diversions in which out of 152 arrests in 2018, 79 cases were diverted or about half at 52%. In 2020 there were 70 arrests and 49 of those were diverted or 70%. Overall arrests decreased but -53.9%, with -38% cases diversion from 2018 to 2020.

29. Using the answers to Questions 27-28, what are the most significant findings related to your county's percent of arrests diverted from court overall and by category for 2020? What are the most significant findings regarding juvenile arrests diverted from family court overall and by category since 2018?

The significant finding was an overall decrease in arrests, and of those arrests 70% were diverted. A decrease of 82 arrests in 2018 to 2020, and an increase in diversions by 30.

IMPLICATIONS FOR DIVERSION PLAN

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

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

Stationhouse adjustment programming works well for Sussex County. There was an increase in black and hispanic youth using stationhouse adjustments but it should be noted there has also been an increase in black and hispanic youth residing in Sussex County. Although the increase is small, as the white youth population continues to be predominant at 92%. The county will continue to review data annually for any discrepancies in the use of stationhouse adjustments for white, black, and hispanic youth, as well as other youth racial/ethnic make ups.

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

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

The race ethnicity data for 2018 was not available. However when looking at the data for 2021 and 2022, race/ethnicity from one year to the next was mostly consistent with the make up of Sussex County families. White youth had a decrease from 72% to 66%, Black youth had a very slight increase from 6% to 7%, Hispanic youth remained at 10% and those that declined to state increased from 12% to 16%. In 2021, 272 youth were served and in 2022, 308 youth were served. FCIU services, merged with MRSS address parent/guardian and juvenile conflict most often, however there is a large number of cases within the other category which the need is not identified. The county will continue to review data annually for any discrepancies in the use of FCIU services for white, black, and hispanic youth, as well as other youth racial/ethnic make ups.

Extent and Nature of Need - Family Court Diversion Program Implications

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

diversion programs as white youth?

The number of youth's cases diverted has decreased from 79 to 6. This is significant for Sussex County. Additionally the the number of arrests has decreased. Of those arrests 70% were diverted. The data supplied through the AOC-FACTS reports is incomplete, making it difficult to adress the true race/ethnic make up. The county will contniue to review data annually for any discrepancies in youth arrests and court diversions for white, black, and hispanic youth, as well as other youth racial/ethnic make ups.

Disproportionate Minority Contact and Racial and Ethnic Disparities

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

The committee will continue to review data annually for any discrepancies of white, black, and hispanic youth, as well as other youth racial/ethnic make ups. The committee will also address with the commission membership the crucial need to track this data accurately and efficiently.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Law Enforcement Station House Adjustment Program Recommendations

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

PJ*	What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
A	Continue to encourage referrals for services from all local and state police departments in lieu of the court formal process Education and Intervention services for youth in need of social skill building, conflict resolution, healthy decision making, inclusion and acceptance, interpersonal skills, substance use services	SHA data, SRO work groups, VVSA reports, JAMS reports, UCR data, 2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/Community) SHA data, SRO work groups, VVSA reports, JAMS reports, UCR data, 2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/Community)	continue collaboration with the school resource officer workgroups and school staff psycho-educational programming to address these problem areas and create positive and appropriate social interactions. Inclusion practices and acceptance within the community and school settings.
C			
D			
E			
F			
G			

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

Comments:

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

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

PJ*	What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
A	FCIU services to address family conflict and encourage family engagement	NJ Courts-Crisis Intervention Unit Reports, FCIU secondary data reports to the SCYSC	Sussex County has a combined MRSS/FCIU unit. It will continue to provide and utilize diversionary programs that include family conflict resolution and encourage positive family engagement.
B			
C			
D			
E			
F			
G			

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

Comments:

Family Court Diversion Program Recommendations

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

PJ*	What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
A	Healthy decision making, social skill building	2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/community), VVSA school reports, JAMS reports, stopbullying.gov, SHA reporting, FCIU reports, UCR arrest data, Annie E Casey Foundation, NJ KidsCount data, community events dialogue	psycho-educational programming to address healthy decision making, interpersonal skill building, conflict resolution, inclusion practices and acceptance
B	conflict resolution, anger and aggression among youth	2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/community), VVSA school reports, JAMS reports, stopbullying.gov, SHA reporting, FCIU reports, UCR arrest data, Annie E Casey Foundation, NJ KidsCount data, community events dialogue	psycho-educational programming to address conflict, anger management techniques, positive communication skills, inclusion practices and acceptance
C	Peer, family, community engagement	2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/community), VVSA school reports, JAMS reports, stopbullying.gov, SHA reporting, FCIU reports, UCR arrest data, Annie E Casey Foundation, NJ KidsCount data, community events dialogue	psycho-educational programming to address problem areas of peer to peer, peer to adult, family conflicts. Positive and appropriate social interactions. Inclusion practices and acceptance
D	substance use services: education and intervention, treatment, aftercare	2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/community), VVSA school reports, JAMS reports, SHA reporting, UCR arrest data, Annie E Casey Foundation, NJ KidsCount data, community events dialogue	substance use services from education to treatment and aftercare
E			
F			
G			

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

Comments:

**DIVERSION
DATA WORKSHEETS**

NATURE & EXTENT OF DIVERTED CASES

FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION UNIT (FCIU)

Table 1. FCIU Caseload by Category, 2018, 2021 and 2022

Categories	2018		2021		2022		% Change in Number of Cases 2018-2022
	Number	% of Total Caseload	Number	% of Total Caseload	Number	% of Total Caseload	
Serious threat to the well-being/physical safety of juvenile	39	14.8%	48	24.7%	16	6.7%	-59.0%
Serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile	131	49.6%	54	27.8%	26	10.9%	-80.2%
Unauthorized absence by a juvenile for more than 24 hours	3	1.1%	1	0.5%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Truancy	16	6.1%	6	3.1%	6	2.5%	-62.5%
Disorderly/Petty Disorderly Persons offense diverted to FCIU	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	100.0%
Other	75	28.4%	85	43.8%	189	79.4%	152.0%
TOTAL CASELOAD	264	100%	194	100%	238	100%	-9.8%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, 2018, 2021 and 2022.

Table 2. FCIU Petitions Filed by Petition Type, 2018, 2021 and 2022

Petition Types	2018		2021		2022		% Change in Number of Petitions Filed 2018-2022
	Number	% of Total Petitions Filed	Number	% of Total Petitions Filed	Number	% of Total Petitions Filed	
Juveniles/Family Crisis	0	0.00	3	50.0%	1	50.0%	100.0%
Out-of-Home	0	0.00	3	50.0%	1	50.0%	100.0%
TOTAL PETITIONS FILED	0	0.00	6	100%	2	100%	200.0%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, 2018, 2021 and 2022.

Table 3a. FCIU Referrals by Referral Type, 2018, 2021 and 2022*

Referrals Types	2018		2021		2022		% Change in Number of Referrals Filed 2018-2022
	Number	% of Total Referrals Filed	Number	% of Total Referrals Filed	Number	% of Total Referrals Filed	
Referrals made to DYFS	0	0.0%	10	6.2%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Referrals made to Substance Abuse Program	1	0.4%	19	11.7%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Referrals made to Other Outside Agencies	247	99.6%	133	82.1%	119	100.0%	-51.8%
TOTAL REFERRALS	248	100%	162	100%	119	100%	-52.0%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System 2018, 2020, and 2022. *multiple referrals for one case can be reported

Table 3b. Total Referrals (New Filings) to Juvenile Court by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 and 2022

Race/Ethnicity	2018		2020		2022		% Change 2018-2022
	Number	% of Total Referrals	Number	% of Total Referrals	Number	% of Total Referrals	
White	87	82.9%	20	62.5%	2	8.0%	-97.7%
Black	9	8.6%	5	15.6%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Hispanic	7	6.7%	5	15.6%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Other*	2	1.9%	2	6.3%	23	92.0%	1050.0%
Total Referrals	105	100.0%	32	100%	25	100%	-76.2%

*See required Data and Methodology

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System 2018 and 2022.

Table 3c. Total Referrals (New Filings) to Juvenile Court compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 and 2020

Race/Ethnicity	2018			2020			% Change 2018-2020
	Juvenile Arrests**	Referrals to Court	% of Arrests Referred to Court	Juvenile Arrests**	Referrals to Court	% of Arrests Referred to Court	
White	140	87	62.1%	63	20	31.7%	-55.0%
Black	9	9	100.0%	5	5	100.0%	-44.4%
Hispanic	21	7	33.3%	13	5	38.5%	-38.1%
Other*	3	2	66.7%	2	2	100.0%	-33.3%
Total	152	105	69.1%	70	32	45.7%	-53.9%

*** See required Data and Methodology

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System 2018 and 2022.

Note: 2020 is the most recent year data is available for juvenile arrests.

Table 4a. Total Juvenile Cases Diverted by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 and 2022

Race/Ethnicity	2018		2020		2022	
	Number	% of Total Cases Diverted	Number	% of Total Cases Diverted	Number	
White	69	87.3%	10	20.4%	4	
Black	6	7.6%	12	24.5%	2	
Hispanic	3	3.8%	13	26.5%	-	
Other*	1	1.3%	14	28.6%	-	
Total Cases	79	100.0%	49	100.0%	6	

*See required Data and Methodology

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System 2018 and 2022.

Table 4b. Total Juvenile Cases Diverted compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 and 2020

Race/Ethnicity	2018			2020			% Change 2018-2020	
	Juvenile Arrests**	Cases Diverted	% of Arrests Diverted	Juvenile Arrests**	Cases Diverted	% of Arrests Diverted	Juvenile Arrests**	Cases Diverted
White	140	69	49.3%	63	10	15.9%	-55.0%	-85.5%
Black	9	6	66.7%	5	12	240.0%	-44.4%	100.0%
Hispanic	21	3	14.3%	13	13	100.0%	-38.1%	333.3%
Other*	3	1	33.3%	2	14	700.0%	-33.3%	1300.0%
Total	152	79	52.0%	70	49	70.0%	-53.9%	-38.0%

*** See required Data and Methodology

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System 2018 and 2020.

DETENTION & DETENTION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

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

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

NATURE & EXTENT OF DETENTION AND DETENTION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM UTILIZATION

JUVENILE DETENTION ADMISSIONS & AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION

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

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

Sussex County had six total admissions to Detention in 2022. All were male. Five were white, and one male was black.

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

There has been an overall decrease by 62.5% from 2018 to 2022, from 16 admissions in 2018 to 6 admissions in 2022. As with an overall decrease in total admissions, this naturally decreases the race/ethnic and gender admissions. The race/ethnicity of white decreased by 37.5%, black decreased by 75%, Hispanic decreased by 100%. The gender also decreased as there were no female admissions in 2022 from three in 2018 and 62.5% decrease in the male admissions.

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

The highest percentage change was a decrease in Hispanic admissions from 4 in 2018 to 0 in 2022, a 100% decrease. The next decrease was Black admissions from 4 in 2018 to 1 in 2022, a 75% decrease. Lastl there was a zero percentage change in white male admissions, steady at 5. In 2018, there were three white female admissions, however, in 2022 there were no female admissions to detention, showing a 100% decrease.

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

Overall, the most significant finding for detention admissions, was the decrease in admissions from 16 in 2018 to 6 in 2022. Sussex County's race/ethnic make up is predominantly white, reflective of the admissions to detention at 84%. With detention admissions being low it is difficult to address the decreases in black and hispanic youth admissions, with one black youth admission at 16%. It is not unusual for there to be very low or no female admissions for Sussex County.

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

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

The total percent change in referrals to court were decreased by -76.2%. The total percent change in detention admissions was decreased by -62.5%. Due to inaccurate data from the AOC on referrals to court by race/ethnicity the committee is unable to compare 2018 to 2020. However, when looking at data for the calendar years 2018 and 2020, it is not unusual for Sussex County to see predominantly white males referred to court and admitted to detention as this reflects the make up of Sussex County. The second largest is that of black males, followed by other youth from the data of 2020 (data included). Overall, in 2018 there were 13 males (5 white, 4 black, 4 hispanic) and 3 white females in detention compared to 2022 with 6 males (5 white, 1 hispanic) and no females. A decrease of 10 youth from 2018 to 2020.

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

The most significant change from 2018 to 2022 was an overall decrease in detention admissions compared to referrals to court, using detention for those needing that level of supervision. Referral to court in general have also significantly decreased from 105 in 2018 to 25 in 2022, or by 80 referrals. The admissions to detention

reflect the race/ethnic make up of Sussex County. The average youth admitted to detention is a white male.

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

7. Using the data in Table 3, describe the overall Average Daily Population (ADP) 2022.
Sussex County's average daily population in detention is reflective of the admissions in 2022, at .6 youth per day (or one youth).
8. Using the data in Table 3, (% Change 2018-2022 column), describe the total change in ADP between 2018 and 2022.
The total change from 2018 to 2022 decreased by 33.3% or from .9 youth per day to .6 youth. This would still constitute one youth on average but with less bed use days within the year.
9. Using the data in Table 3, describe the overall Average Length of Stay (ALOS) 2022.
The average length of stay decreased slightly from 2018 to 2022, from 17.3 to 15, a 13.3% decrease.
10. Using the data in Table 3, (% Change 2018-2022 column), describe the total percent change in ALOS between 2018 and 2022.
The average length of stay decreased slightly from 2018 to 2022, from 17.3 to 15, a 13.3% decrease
11. Using the answers to questions 7-10, what are the most significant findings about overall ADP and ALOS in 2022? What are the most significant findings about the percent change in ADP and in ALOS since 2018?
Although the average daily population has slightly decreased, and reflects a 33.3% decrease it isn't a large impact since it is still reflective of one youth. There was a two day shorter timeframe of which youth remained in detention from 2018 to 2022, moving youth from secure detention to a less restrictive setting.

CHARACTERISTICS OF YOUTH IN DETENTION

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

12. Rank the top three municipalities of residence for youth admitted to detention in 2022, beginning with the municipality with the highest frequency. Name the top three municipalities and describe the number of detained youth and the percent of all detained youth for each municipality within the county.
There were two youth from Newton and 33.3%. There were two youth from Sparta at 33.3%. There were two youth (same youth with two admissions to detention) from Stanhope at 33.3%.
This reflects all detention admissions for 2022.
13. Review the detention admissions by age data. Describe the age range youth admitted to detention by number and percent of total, the average age of detention admission and the median age of detention admission in 2022. Rank each age by percent of total, beginning with the highest percent. Draw comparisons between the categories.

Five admissions were 16 years of age with a 84% total admissions. One admission was 15 years of age with a 16% total. This gives a median age of 15.8 years of age. This is reflective of years past data with ages between 15 through 17. Youth with ages of 11 through 14 should always be considered for least restrictive supervision.

14. Review the Detention Admissions by Most Serious Current Offense data for 2022 (frequency and percent). Rank the offenses beginning with the offense that has the highest number/percent of total. Draw comparisons between the categories.

Sussex County's youth admissions by most serious offenses rank the highest of which was Robbery at 33.3% and seconded by Aggravated Assault at 33.3%. Violation of Probation and Violation of Detention Alternatives both rank lowest at 16.7% respectively. Robbery and Aggravated Assault are both considered by the Uniform Crime Report to be violent offenses and as such probable for secure custody to protect against further harm to others. The two violations of services are probable of consistent inability to conform to court orders.

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

Sussex County's youth admissions by most serious offenses rank the highest of which was Robbery at 33.3% and seconded by Aggravated Assault at 33.3%. Violation of Probation and Violation of Detention Alternatives both rank lowest at 16.7% respectively. Robbery and Aggravated Assault are both considered by the Uniform Crime Report to be violent offenses and as such probable for secure custody to protect against further harm to others. The two violations of services are probable of consistent inability to conform to court orders.

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

After reviewing the data and answers to questions 12-15, this is reflective of Sussex County's admissions historically. Robbery and Aggravated Assault are both considered by the Uniform Crime Report to be violent offenses and as such probable for secure custody to protect against further harm to others. The two violations of services are probable of consistent inability to conform to court orders. It should be noted, the youth detained from Sparta were codefendants and the two detained from Newton were also codefendants.

DETENTION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM UTILIZATION AND OUTCOMES

JUVENILE DETENTION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM ADMISSIONS & AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION

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

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

The average daily population in 2022 increased from the prior year by one youth. The average monthly admissions had also increased from the prior year by two youth.

18. Using the data in Table 4, (% Change 2018-2022 column), describe the percent change in the

average daily population of detention alternative programs between 2018 and 2022. Describe the percent change in average monthly admissions between 2018 and 2022.

Although there was an increase in both the daily population and monthly admissions in 2022 from the prior year, from 2018 to 2022 there was a decrease in both the population and admissions.

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

Detention alternative daily population and monthly admissions ebbs and flows through the longer time frames. It should be noted for the average daily population, there was one youth on the detention alternative for a significant amount of time due to the inability to secure a specialized residential placement.

JUVENILE DETENTION ALTERNATIVE AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY

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

20. Using the data in Table 5, describe the ALOS in detention alternative programs overall and by race/ethnicity in 2022.

Forty-six days were spent of detention alternatives by white youth, 55 days were spent by black youth, and 80 days were spent by hispanic youth. Overall, the average length of stay was 57.9 days.

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

The highest percent change was that of black youth at a 27.9% increase in length of stay. There was a decrease of 12.3% for hispanic youth, and a 9% increase by white youth. Overall, there was an increase in the length of stay from 2018 to 2022 by 2.5%. This is a minimal increase.

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

Overall, the average length of stay is at 57.9 days. This is a positive illustration of detention alternatives involvement under the 60 day benchmark. There is only a slight difference in the ALOS from 2018 to 2022. The 27.9% increase in ALOS for black youth awaiting residential placement.

DETENTION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM UTILIZATION & OUTCOMES

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

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

Successful completions for 2022 was 79%. This is an increase of 1.5% from 2018.

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

There were no new charges for 2022. This was a decrease of 100% from 2018.

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

There was an increase of 21% of violations/non compliance in 2022. This was an 8.2% increase since 2018.

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

In 2022, there were no new charges by youth being supervised by detention alternatives, with the exception of technical violation/non compliance of three youth or 21%. It should be noted, the table referenced utilizes percentages, opposed the raw numbers. A 21% increase in non compliance reflects 3 youth. In 2018, there were a greater number of admissions on to detention alternatives, where in percentage form it would reflect more youth in violation.

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

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

The Sussex County Detention Alternatives program is 100% funded by the county and not through any JJC funding. JAMS data entry not required.

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

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

Yes, Sussex County utilizes youth tracking forms for all youth admitted in to the Youth Shelter (delinquency docket), Juvenile Detention Center, and Detention Alternatives. The racial and ethnic make up of the youth are reflective of the county population. Due to recent changes in juvenile laws, there's a significant decrease in formal court involvement, therefore a decrease in secure detention and formal supervision, such as detention alternatives. There is a significant increase in the police's use of curbsides and station house adjustments.

IMPLICATIONS FOR JUVENILE DETENTION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS PLAN

Extent and Nature of Need- Detention Utilization

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

Secure Detention continues to be reserved for youth who can be a danger to self or others, consistent non compliance with court orders, and for the older aged youth. Unless there is a special circumstance, youth typically spend the least amount of time possible in secure care.

Extent and Nature of Need- Detention Alternative Programs

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

Detention Alternatives are positive community based supervision programs for youth under formal court involvement. Although a few youth may not be able to conform to the supervision and rules of detention alternatives, consequently violating, most do well.

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

Collectively, this data continues to be consistent with the racial/ethnic make up of Sussex County.

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

PJ*	What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
A	Healthy decision making, social skill building	2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/community), VVSA school reports, JAMS reports, stopbullying.gov, SHA reporting, FCIU reports, UCR arrest data, Annie E Casey Foundation, NJ KidsCount data, community events dialogue, SCDA census data, JJC and JDAI data	psycho-educational programming to address healthy decision making, interpersonal skill building, conflict resolution, inclusion practices and acceptance, within the community and in a school setting
B	conflict resolution, anger and aggression among youth	2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/community), VVSA school reports, JAMS reports, stopbullying.gov, SHA reporting, FCIU reports, UCR arrest data, Annie E Casey Foundation, NJ KidsCount data, community events dialogue, SCDA census data, JJC and JDAI data	psycho-educational programming to address healthy decision making, interpersonal skill building, conflict resolution, inclusion practices and acceptance, within the community and in a school setting
C	Peer, family, community engagement	2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/community), VVSA school reports, JAMS reports, stopbullying.gov, SHA reporting, FCIU reports, UCR arrest data, Annie E Casey Foundation, NJ KidsCount data, community events dialogue, SCDA census data, JJC and JDAI data	psycho-educational programming to address healthy decision making, interpersonal skill building, conflict resolution, inclusion practices and acceptance, within the community and in a school setting
D	substance use services: education, assessment and treatment	2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/community), VVSA school reports, JAMS reports, SHA reporting, UCR arrest data, Annie E Casey Foundation, NJ KidsCount data, community events dialogue, SCDA census data, JJC and JDAI data	substance use services from early education and intervention, assessments, and treatment services
E			
F			

G

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

Comments:

30. In reviewing all the above analysis questions, what recommendations or strategies would your county make with regards to Juvenile Detention policy and practice through the lens of race and ethnicity? What recommendations or strategies would your county consider ensuring similar outcomes for similarly situated youth?
 As Sussex County does not have a significant and diverse racial/ethnic make up, programming has always and will continue to be culturally focused to address the disproportionate, racial, and ethnic disparities. All awarded programming will require its staff to address racial and ethnic disparities and be proficient in cultural competency. The SCYSC will continue to educate and encourage stakeholders to view cases through the lens of race and ethnicity.

Comments:

DETENTION DATA WORKSHEETS

JUVENILE DETENTION

Table 1. Juvenile Detention Admission by Race and Gender, 2018, 2021 and 2022.

Race	2018			2021			2022			% Change in Admissions by Race and Gender 2018-2022		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
	White	5	3	8	1	0	1	5	0	5	0.0%	-100.0%
Black	4	0	4	2	0	2	1	0	1	-75.0%	0.0%	-75.0%
Hispanic	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	-100.0%	0.0%	-100.0%
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total Admissions	13	3	16	3	0	3	6	0	6	-53.8%	-100.0%	-62.5%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission: New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDJI) Annual Data Report, 2018, 2021 and 2022.

Table 2. Juvenile Detention Admissions Compared to Referrals to Court by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 and 2022

Race/Ethnicity	2018				2022				% Change 2018-2022			
	Referrals To Court	Detention Admissions	% of Referrals Admitted to Detention	Referrals To Court	Detention Admissions	% of Referrals Admitted to Detention	Referrals To Court	Detention Admissions	Referrals To Court	Detention Admissions	Referrals To Court	Detention Admissions
	White	87	8.00	0.09	2.00	5.00	250.0%	-97.7%	-37.5%	-97.7%	-37.5%	-37.5%
Black	9	4.00	0.44	0.00	1.00	0.0%	-100.0%	-75.0%	-100.0%	-75.0%	-75.0%	
Hispanic	7	4.00	0.57	0.00	0.00	0.0%	-100.0%	-100.0%	-100.0%	-100.0%	-100.0%	
Other*	2	0.00	0.00	23.00	0.00	0.0%	1050.0%	0.0%	1050.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Total	105	16	15.2%	2.5	6	24.0%	-76.2%	-62.5%	-76.2%	-62.5%	-62.5%	

Source: JJC: New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDJI) Annual Data Report, 2018 and 2022.

Table 3. Juvenile Detention Population, 2018, 2021 and 2022

Categories	2018	2021	2022	% Change 2018-2022
Average Length of Stay	17.3	2	15	-13.3%
Average Daily Population	0.9	0.9	0.6	-33.3%

Source: JJC: New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDJI) Annual Data Report, 2018, 2021 and 2022.

DETENTION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS

Table 4. Juvenile Detention Alternative Program Population, 2018, 2021 and 2022

Categories	2018	2021	2022	% Change 2018-2022
Average Daily Population	5.3	1.6	2.6	-50.9%
Average Monthly Admissions	4.3	0.4	1.7	-60.5%

Source: JJC: New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDJI) Annual Data Report, 2018, 2021 and 2022.

Table 5. Juvenile Detention Alternative ALOS by Race/Ethnicity, 2018, 2021 and 2022

Race	2018	2021	2022	% Change in LOS by Race/Ethnicity 2018-2022
White	42	182	46	9.0%
Black	43	36	55	27.9%
Hispanic	92		80	-12.3%
Other	0.00	0.00	0.00	#DIV/0!
Total ALOS	177	218	181	2.5%

Source: JJC: New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDJI) Annual Data Report, 2018, 2021 and 2022.

Table 6. Juvenile Detention Alternative Program Outcomes, 2018, 2021 and 2022

Outcomes	2018	2021	2022	% Change 2018-2022
Successful Completion	77.80%	100%	79%	1.5%
New Charges	2.80%	0	0	-100.0%
Violation/Non-Compliance	19.40%	0	21%	8.2%

Source: JJC: New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) Annual Data Report, 2018, 2021 and 2022.

DISPOSITION ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

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

NATURE & EXTENT OF THE DISPOSED POPULATION

JUVENILES ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT

- For Questions 1-2, use Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender 2018 and 2022.
1. Using the data in Table 1, describe the total number of young people adjudicated delinquent and the number and percent of total of young people adjudicated by gender in 2022.
There were 19 male youth adjudicated delinquent in 2022 and no females adjudicated delinquent. The overall number of juveniles adjudicated in 2022 were 19. This was a decrease of -42.4% from 2018 to 2022.
 2. Using the data in Table 1 (% Change in Juveniles Adjudicated by Gender 2018-2022 column), describe the percent change in adjudications overall. Rank the percent change in adjudications by gender. Describe changes in adjudications by gender since 2018.
There was a decrease of -100% in females and -24% in males. Overall there was a decrease of -42.4% adjudications from 2018.
 3. Using the answers in questions 1-2, what are the most significant findings about adjudications and adjudications by gender in 2022? What are the most significant findings about changes in adjudications overall and changes in adjudications by gender since 2018?
Males are predominantly adjudicated delinquent. The significant change was the decrease in female adjudications from 2018, at 8, to 2022 at zero. Overall adjudications have decreased from 2018 to 2022 from 33 to 19, or a difference of 14 youth.
- For Questions 3-5, use Table 2: Juvenile Cases Adjudicated Delinquent with Probation and Incarceration Dispositions 2018 and 2022.
4. Using the data in Table 2, describe the number of adjudicated juvenile cases by probation and

incarceration category and in total for 2022.

There were 35 youth adjudicated delinquent with Probation in 2018 and 6 in 2022. This is a decrease of -82.9% total adjudications with Probation. There were no JJC commitments or short term commitments in either 2018 or 2022. This is typical for Sussex County.

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

There was a decrease of -82.9% change overall in dispositions from 2018 to 2022. The highest percent change is Probation at -82.9%. There were no percent changes for either JJC Commitments or Short term commitments.

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

The most significant finding is the decrease in dispositions overall from 2018 to 2022, from 35 to 6, or a decrease in 29 adjudications. All of which were adjudications at the lowest level of juveniles in need of court supervision.

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

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

The total number of adjudicated juveniles in 2022 was 17 youth. The race/ethnicity category for 2022 as previously discussed earlier in analysis questions is inaccurate from the data given by the AOC. However, should the other category also reflect not indicated, one can assume adjudications are predominantly white males, using data only from 2018 and 2020.

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

Adjudications by race/ethnicity has relatively remained consistent from 2018 to 2020 and years beyond from using other data sets (included). From 2018 at 12.1% hispanic to 2020 with no hispanic youth with a slight increase in the other category to 9.1%.

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

Adjudications by race/ethnicity have remained consistent from 2018 to 2022. The significant finding is the overall decrease in adjudications from 2018 to 2022 from 33 to 17 or a decrease of -48% (16 youth).

➤ **For Questions 10-13, use Table 4: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent Compared to Juvenile**

Arrests by Race/Ethnicity 2018 and 2020.

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

Of the 70 juvenile arrests in 2020, 11 were adjudicated delinquent. Of those 63 white youth were arrested but only 9 were adjudicated. Five black youth were arrested but only one adjudicated. Thirteen hispanic youth were arrested but no youth were adjudicated. Two other youth were arrested but one was adjudicated.

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

The total percent change in juvenile arrests since 2020 was decreased by -53.9%. The largest decrease were with white youth at -55%, followed by black youth at -44.4%. Hispanic youth decreased by -38.1% and lastly, Other youth decreased by -33.3%. Juvenile arrests have decreased from 152 in 2018 to 70 in 2020, or by 82 arrests.

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

The total percent change in adjudications has decreased by -66.7%. The largest decrease were with hispanic youth at -100%, however there was a 100% increase in other youth (1), followed by white youth at -66.7%. Black youth decreased by -50%. Juveniles adjudicated delinquent decreased from 33 in 2018 to 11 in 2020. or by 22 adjudications.

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

The most significant findings of 2020, were total number of adjudicated youth were only 15.7%, or 11 youth compared to arrests of 70 youth. Across all race/ethnicities there were decreases in adjudications compared to arrests. From 63 white youth arrested, only 9 were adjudicated. From 5 black youth arrested, only 1 was adjudicated. From 13 hispanic youth arrested, no youth were adjudicated. Lastly, 2 other youth were arrested, one was adjudicated. From 2018, this is a decrease of -53.9% in juvenile arrests, and a decrease of -66.7% in adjudications. While the adjudications in comparison to arrests were higher from 2018, the total number of arrests have decreased from 2018 to 2020. All race/ethnicities decreased with more than 50%, with the exception of other youth (from 2 to 1 in 2020 compared to 2018 which was 3 to 0)

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

14. Using the data from Table 5, describe the total number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent, the number of juveniles adjudicated by age and the percent of juveniles adjudicated by age in 2022.
The total number of youth adjudicated delinquent in 2022 were 17. Of those adjudicated delinquent, 0% were aged 6-10, one was aged 11-12, 4 were aged 13-14, 11 were aged 15-16, 1 was aged 17, and no one was aged 18 and over.
15. Using the data from Table 5 (% Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age 2018-2022 column), rank the percent change in juveniles adjudicated by age, beginning with the category that has the highest change. Describe how juveniles adjudicated delinquent by age has changed since 2018.
The highest category change were youth aged 11-12 at an increase of 100% (1 youth from 0). Followed by a decrease of -90.9% youth aged 17 (from 11 to 1). Next, was a decrease in youth aged 13-14 at -33.3% (from 6 to 4). Lastly, there was a decrease of -31.3% youth aged 15-16 (from 16 to 11). There were no youth aged 6-10, nor 17 and over for both years 2018 and 2022.
16. Using the answers to questions 14-15, what are the most significant findings about juveniles adjudicated by age in 2022? What are the most significant findings in the percent change in juveniles adjudicated delinquent by age since 2018?
The most significant finding were the increases in the younger youth adjudications, ages ranging from 11 to 14. There was a large decrease though in the older youth ages 15 to 17. There was a decrease of -48.5% overall for youth adjudications since 2018 to 2022.

PROBATION PLACEMENTS

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

17. Using the data from Table 6, describe the total number of juvenile probation placements, the number of juvenile probation placements, by race/ethnicity and the percent of total probation placements by race/ethnicity in 2022.
The total number of probation placements of 2022 were 12. Two youth or 16.7% were white, 1 youth or 8.3% were black, no youth were hispanic, and 9 youth or 75% were other.
18. Using the data from Table 6 (% Change in Probation Placements 2018-2022 column), rank the categories by race/ethnicity beginning with the category that has the most change. Describe how probation placements have changed since 2018.
The most change were in the other category at an increase of 900%. The next highest change were the hispanic youth at a decrease of -100%, followed by a decrease of -92.6% of white youth, and lastly a 50% decrease in black youth. Overall this is a decrease in Probation placements of -63.6%, or by 21 youth from 2018 to 2022
19. Using the answers to questions 17-18, what are the most significant findings about probation placements by race/ethnicity in 2022? What are the most significant findings about the change in probation placements since 2018?
The most significant findings about Probation placements in 2022 were the decrease in white youth

and increase in other youth. The committee suggests this data to not be accurate from the AOC-FACTS system data as it does not reflect the make up of Sussex County. Overall the change in Probation placements from 2018 to 2022 illustrates a decrease from 33 to 12 youth adjudicated.

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

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

The total number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent in 2022 were 17, where 12 were placed on Probation. Of the adjudications, three were white, one was black, two were hispanic, and 11 were other. The committee suggests this data to not be accurate from the AOC-FACTS system data as it does not reflect the make up of Sussex County. From 2018 to 2022 there was a decrease by -48.5% juveniles adjudicated delinquent, with an overall decrease of -63.6%.

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

The highest change would be the 1100% increase in the other category or by 11 youth from 2018 to 2022. Followed by a decrease of white youth at -88.9% or by 25 youth. Then both hispanic and black youth have a decrease of -50%, or by one black youth and two hispanic youth from 2018 to 2022. The committee suggests this data to not be accurate from the AOC-FACTS system data as it does not reflect the make up of Sussex County.

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

The highest change in juvenile probation placements were among the other youth at 900% or by 9 youth. Followed by a decrease of the hispanic youth at -100% or from 4 to zero. Then a decrease of white youth at -92.6% or by 25 youth. Lastly a decrease of black youth by one for a -50% decrease. Overall since 2018, juvenile probation placements have decreased by -63.6% or by 16 youth. The committee suggests this data to not be accurate from the AOC-FACTS system data as it does not reflect the make up of Sussex County.

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

In 2018, all juveniles, 100% adjudicated delinquent regardless of race/ethnicity were placed on Probation. In 2022, only 12 of 17 were placed on Probation, only 70.6%. There is also a significant decrease in adjudications from 2018 to 2022 of more than half from 33 to 12. The committee suggests this data to not be accurate from the AOC-FACTS system data as it does not reflect the make up of Sussex County. Analyzing

race ethnicity data is not possible.

SECURE PLACEMENTS

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

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

The total number of juveniles securely placed in 2022 were 6. Of those, five were white at 83.3% and one was black at 16.7%.

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

The highest change was a decrease in the hispanic youth since 2018, with 4 youth in 2018 to no youth in 2022. The second highest change was black youth at a decrease of -75%, from 4 to one. Lastly there was a decrease of -37.5% white youth, from 8 to 5 youth. There were no other youth in 2018 to 2022.

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

Secure placements overall have decreased from 16 in 2018 to 6 in 2022, for a decrease of -62.5%. The race/ethnic make up of this data is reflective of the make up of Sussex County.

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

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

The total number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent in 2022 were 11, with 6 secure placements, at 54.5% or a little more than half. Of the 9 white youth adjudicated, five went to secure placement. Of the one black youth, one went to secure placement. Of one other adjudicated youth, this youth did not go to placement.

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

According to the data supplied, the highest change would be a -100% decrease in hispanic youth, however there is an increase of 100% with the other youth. There was a -66.7% decrease among white youth followed by a decrease of -50% among the black youth. Overall, there is a decrease of 66.7%.

29. Using Table 9 (% Change 2018-2022), rank the percent change in secure placements by race/ethnicity

category, beginning with the category that has the highest change. Describe the changes in juveniles securely placed by race/ethnicity since 2018.

According to the data supplied, the highest change for secure placements was among the hispanic youth at a decrease of -100%. The next highest was among the black youth of a decrease of -75% followed by a decrease of -37.5% among the white youth. There was no other youth in secure placement in 2018 or 2022.

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

The most significant finding is the decrease in adjudications from 33 to 11 and of those a decrease in secure placements from 16 to 6 from 2018 to 2022. Of the youth adjudicated and in need of secure placement was slightly over half both in numbers and percentage. Once again, the data from AOC-FACTS is not accurate for 2018 pertaining to race/ethnicity as well as incorrect adjudications to secure placements among the black youth. In table 9, juveniles adjudicated delinquent for black youth is two, however the juveniles in need of secure placements are four...

JAMS DISPOSITION PROGRAM INFORMATION 2022

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

31. Looking at each disposition program, describe disposition program intakes by program in 2022. There were 15 males and no females in disposition programs in 2022.

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

The average age for program intakes was 15.5. There were 15 males and no females in dispositional programs. Of these males, 7 were white, 3 were black, and 5 were hispanic.

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

The highest problem area in 2022 was behavior and personality at 60 times, followed by family circumstances and parenting at 35 times, then it was peer relations at 27 times. The fourth ranking was education at 16 times, substance abuse was fifth at 12 times, and lastly were vocational skills/unemployment at 6 times, and attitudes/orientation at the bottom with 3 times.

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

The highest total of service interventions provided were anger management training, decision

making skills, and life skills all at 10. Followed by interpersonal skills at 7 and urine monitoring at 6. There were 5 substance use evaluations provided, 3 case management, 2 for group counseling, substance abuse treatment and vocational training. Intensive substance use treatment, individual counseling, and cultural enrichment all needed as well.

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

The highest service interventions needed in 2022 were anger management, decision making skills, and life skills all at 10. Followed by interpersonal skills at 7, and urine monitoring at 6. There were 5 substance use evaluations needed, 3 needing case management, and counseling, substance use treatment, and vocational training all at 2. Lastly, individual counseling, cultural enrichment, and intensive substance use treatment all at one.

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

The significant finding was the decrease in in program intakes at the disposition area of the continuum, however the service needs remain unchanged, including all parts of the continuum. Race/ethnicity of its participants are split between white and minority youth in disposition. A closer look at this dynamic would be beneficial.

OTHER DATA

➤ Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need

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

Yes, additional data was used. There were no significant changes from 2018 through 2022 with the exception of substance abuse services falling slightly from number three highest to number five. This may be in part to the recent increase in the lack of perception of harm among youth and family members using substances. This is illustrated throughout recent years with the decline in the use of service funding for higher level of care in substance use. Funding has been predominantly used for Prevention and Diversion or the early education and intervention strategies. Overall less youth are rising to the level of court involved. The make up of Sussex County is predominantly white which is mirrored throughout the planning process. At this time there is no significant disparities in the racial/ethnic contacts, but will be continued to be watched.

IMPLICATIONS FOR COMMUNITY-BASED DISPOSITION PROGRAMS PLAN

Extent and Nature of Need: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent

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

The adjudicated youth population is male, white, and younger since 2018 to 2022, although significantly less in adjudications compared to arrests from 2018 to 2022. Disposition programming has become secondary to Prevention and Diversion programming.

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

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

The most significant findings about Probation placements in 2022 were the decrease in white youth and increase in other youth. In 2018, all juveniles, 100% adjudicated delinquent regardless of race/ethnicity were placed on Probation. In 2022, only 12 of 17 were placed on Probation, only 70.6%. There is also a significant decrease in adjudications from 2018 to 2022 of more than half from 33 to 12. The committee suggests this data to not be accurate from the AOC-FACTS system data as it does not reflect the make up of Sussex County. Overall the change in Probation placements from 2018 to 2022 illustrates a decrease from 33 to 12 youth adjudicated. Disposition programming has become secondary to Prevention and Diversion programming.

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

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

Secure placements overall have decreased from 16 in 2018 to 6 in 2022, for a decrease of -62.5%. The race/ethnic make up of this data is reflective of the make up of Sussex County. According to the data supplied, the highest change for secure placements was among the hispanic youth at a decrease of -100%. The next highest was among the black youth of a decrease of -75% followed by a decrease of -37.5% among the white youth. There was no other youth in secure placement in 2018 or 2022.

Extent and Nature of Need: Other County Data

41. Review the answers to question 37, what are the most significant findings overall, through the lens of racial and ethnic disparities and through the lens of disproportionate minority contact? How does this

information inform the need for disposition programs in your county?

Sussex County overall is predominantly white. There are no significant disparities through the lens of racial and ethnicity of its youth, nor through the lens of disproportionate minority contact. The committee continues to review this through the annual planning process and through annual program monitorings. Overall, dispositions have decreased significantly within the recent years.

Problem Areas and Funded Disposition Programs in 2022

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

For the county's disposition programs, younger white male youth are in need of services in the areas of positive changes in behavior/personality, as well as improvement in family circumstances and skill sets while also addressing positive peer relations. Current programs address these intervention needs throughout the continuum, not just Disposition. Disposition programming continues to be a need for Sussex County, but for those youth involved in court formal supervision and services, possibly a more intense level of service would be beneficial.

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

PJ*	What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
A	Healthy decision making, social skill building	2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/community), VVSA school reports, JAMS reports, SHA reporting, FCIU reports, UCR arrest data, Annie E Casey Foundation, NJ KidsCount data, JDAI data, SCDA data	psycho-educational programming to address healthy decision making, interpersonal skill building, conflict resolution, inclusion practices and acceptance
B	conflict resolution, anger and aggression among youth	2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/community), VVSA school reports, JAMS reports, SHA reporting, FCIU reports, UCR arrest data, Annie E Casey Foundation, NJ KidsCount data, JDAI data, SCDA data	psycho-educational programming to address conflict, anger management techniques, positive communication skills, inclusion practices and acceptance.
C	Peer, family, community engagement	2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/community), VVSA school reports, JAMS reports, SHA reporting, FCIU reports, UCR arrest data, Annie E Casey Foundation, NJ KidsCount data, JDAI data, SCDA data	psycho-educational programming to address problem areas of peer to peer, peer to adult, family conflicts. Positive and appropriate social interactions. Inclusion practices and acceptance.
D	substance use services	2023 Youth Surveys (SBYSP/community), VVSA school reports, JAMS reports, SHA reporting, FCIU reports, UCR arrest data, Annie E Casey Foundation, NJ KidsCount data, JDAI data, SCDA data	substance use services from early education to all levels of treatment and aftercare
E			
F			
G			

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

Comments:

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

Comments: The committee will continue to review data annually for any discrepancies of white, black, and hispanic youth, as well as other youth racial/ethnic make ups. The committee will also address with commission membership the crucial need to track this data accurately and efficiently.

DISPOSITION DATA WORKSHEETS

Table 1: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender, 2018 and 2022

Gender	2018		2022		% Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender 2018-2022
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Male	25	75.8%	19	100.0%	-24.0%
Female	8	24.2%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Total Juveniles	33	100%	19	100%	-42.4%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2018 and 2022

Table 2: Juvenile Cases Adjudicated Delinquent with Probation & Incarceration Dispositions, 2018 and 2022

Disposition	2018		2022		% Change in Dispositions 2018-2022
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
01 - JJC Committed	0		0		0.0%
02 - Short-Term Commitment	0		0		0.0%
03 - 14 - Probation*	35		6		-82.9%
Total	35		6		-82.9%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2018 and 2022

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 3: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race, 2018 and 2022

Race	2018		2020		2022	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
White	27	81.8%	9	81.8%	3	81.8%
Black	2	6.1%	1	9.1%	1	9.1%
Hispanic	4	12.1%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%
Other *	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	11	9.1%
Total	33	100.0%	11	100.0%	17	100.0%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2018 and 2022

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 4. Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 and 2020

Race/Ethnicity	2018				2020				% Change 2018-2020	
	Juvenile Arrests**	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	% of Arrest Adjudicated Delinquent	Juvenile Arrests**	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	% of Arrest Adjudicated Delinquent	Juvenile Arrests**	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Juvenile Arrests**	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent
White	140	27	19.3%	63	9	14.3%	-55.0%	-66.7%	-55.0%	-66.7%
Black	9	2	22.2%	5	1	20.0%	-44.4%	-50.0%	-44.4%	-50.0%
Hispanic	21	4	19.0%	13	0	0.0%	-38.1%	-100.0%	-38.1%	-100.0%
Other*	3	0	0.0%	2	1	50.0%	-33.3%	100.0%	-33.3%	100.0%
Total	152	33	21.7%	70	11	15.7%	-53.9%	-66.7%	-53.9%	-66.7%

Source: New Jersey State Police, 2018 and 2020
Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2018 and 2020

** See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 5: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age, 2018 and 2022

Age Group	2018		2022		% Change in Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age 2018-2022
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
6 - 10	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
11 - 12	0	0.0%	1	5.9%	100.0%
13 - 14	6	18.2%	4	23.5%	-33.3%
15 - 16	16	48.5%	11	64.7%	-31.3%
17	11	33.3%	1	5.9%	-90.9%
18 and over*	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	33	100%	17	100%	-48.5%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2018 and 2022

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 6: Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 and 2022

Race/Ethnicity	2018		2022		% Change in Probation Placements, 2018-2022
	Number	% of Total Probation Placements	Number	% of Total Probation Placements	
White	27	81.8%	2	16.7%	-92.6%
Black	2	6.1%	1	8.3%	-50.0%
Hispanic	4	12.1%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Other *	0	0.0%	9	75.0%	900.0%
Total	33	100.0%	12	100.0%	-63.6%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 and 2022

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 7: Juvenile Probation Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 and 2022

Race/Ethnicity	2018				2022				% Change 2018-2022	
	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Probation Placements	% of Adjudicated Juveniles placed on Probation	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Probation Placements	% of Adjudicated Juveniles placed on Probation	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Probation Placements	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Probation Placements
White	27	27	100.0%	3	2	66.7%	88.9%	92.6%	-88.9%	-92.6%
Black	2	2	100.0%	1	1	100.0%	-50.0%	-50.0%	-50.0%	-50.0%
Hispanic	4	4	100.0%	2	0	0.0%	-50.0%	-100.0%	-50.0%	-100.0%
Other*	0	0	0.0%	11	9	81.8%	1100.0%	900.0%	1100.0%	900.0%
Total	33	33	100.0%	17	12	70.6%	-48.5%	-63.6%	-48.5%	-63.6%

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2018 and 2022
 Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 and 2022

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 8: Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 and 2022

Race/Ethnicity	2018		2022		% Change in Secure Placements 2018-2022
	Number	% of Total Secure Placements	Number	% of Total Secure Placements	
White	8	50.0%	5	83.3%	-37.5%
Black	4	25.0%	1	16.7%	-75.0%
Hispanic	4	25.0%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Other *	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	16	100.0%	6	100.0%	-62.5%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 and 2022

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 9. Secure Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent, by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 and 2022

Race/Ethnicity	2018				2022				% Change 2018-2022
	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Secure Placements	% of Adjudications resulted in Secure Confinement	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Secure Placements	% of Adjudications resulted in Secure Confinement	Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent	Secure Placements	
White	27	8	29.6%	9	5	55.6%	-66.7%	-37.5%	
Black	2	4	200.0%	1	1	100.0%	-50.0%	-75.0%	
Hispanic	4	4	100.0%	0	0	#DIV/0!	-100.0%	-100.0%	
Other*	0	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	
Total	33	16	48.5%	11	6	54.5%	-66.7%	-62.5%	

Source: Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS), 2018 and 2022
 Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 and 2022

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Juvenile Automated Management System (JAMS) - Disposition Programs

Table 10. Ranking of Problem Areas, 2018 and 2022

Rank	2018			2022		
	Problem Area	Total	Rank	Problem Area	Total	Rank
1	Personality/behavior	104	1	Personality/behavior	60	60
2	Family Circ/parenting	105	2	Family Circ/parenting	35	35
3	Substance Abuse	70	3	Peer relations	27	27
4	Per Relations	51	4	Educaton	16	16
5	Education	36	5	Substance Abuse	12	12
6	Vocational Skills/Unem	31	6	Vocational skills/Unem	6	6
7	Attitudes/orientation	20	7	Attitudes/orientation	3	3
8	medical problems	6	8			
9	Teen pregnancy/parent	1	9			
10			10			

REENTRY ANALYSIS QUESTIONS

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

NATURE & EXTENT OF REENTRY POPULATION

JUVENILE PROBATIONERS ADMITTED TO JJC RESIDENTIAL

1. Using the data in Table 1 (Juvenile Probationers Admitted to JJC Residential by Race/Ethnicity 2018-2022), describe the total number of youth admitted as a probationer to JJC residential, the number of youth admitted by race/ethnicity and % of total for each category in 2022.
Sussex County has had no Probationers admitted to JJC Residential for 2018 and 2022.
2. Using the data in Table 1 (% Change in Juvenile Probationers Admitted to JJC Residential by Race/Ethnicity, 2018-2022 column). Describe the total percent change, then rank the categories by percent change, starting with the category that has the highest percent change. Describe the rank order by drawing comparisons between the categories. Describe trends by indicating whether any change has occurred, the direction of any change and the size of any change.
Sussex County has had no Probationers admitted to JJC Residential for 2018 and 2022.
3. Using the information in Questions 1-2, what does this information tell you about the Juvenile Probationers Admitted in the year 2022? How has the total number of juvenile probationers admitted to JJC residential programs changed since 2018? How has probationer admissions by race/ethnicity changed since 2018?
Sussex County has had no Probationers admitted to JJC Residential for 2018 and 2022.

JUVENILES RELEASED TO PROBATION REENTRY SUPERVISION

4. Using the data in Table 2 (Juvenile Probationers Released by Type, 2018-2022), describe the total number of juvenile probationers released from a residential program in 2022.
N/A: No Probationers in 2022.
5. Using the data in Table 3 (Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential Programs by Race and Gender) describe total released, releases by race/ethnicity category and releases by gender in 2022.
N/A: No Probationers in 2022.

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

N/A: No Probationers in 2018 and 2022.

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

N/A: No Probationers in 2018 and 2022.

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

N/A: No Probationers in 2018 and 2022.

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

N/A: No Probationers in 2018 and 2022.

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

N/A: No Probationers in 2018 and 2022.

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

N/A: No Probationers in 2018 and 2022.

COMMITTED JUVENILES TO THE JJC

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

There were no youth admitted in 2018 and 2022 from Sussex County.

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

There were no youth admitted in 2018 and 2022 from Sussex County.

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

There were no youth admitted in 2018 and 2022 from Sussex County.

COMMITTED JUVENILES RELEASED FROM THE JJC

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

There were no youth released to parole supervision in 2018 and 2022 from Sussex County.

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

There were no youth released in 2018 and 2022 from Sussex County.

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

There were no youth released in 2018 and 2022 from Sussex County.

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

There were no youth released in 2018 and 2022 from Sussex County.

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

There were no youth released in 2018 and 2022 from Sussex County.

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

There were no youth released in 2018 and 2022 from Sussex County.

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

There were no youth released in 2018 and 2022 from Sussex County.

22. Using the data in Table 12 (% Change in Offenses of Committed Juveniles by Type, 2018-2022 column), rank the categories by percent change, beginning with the category that has the highest change. Describe the rank order by drawing comparisons between the categories.
There were no youth released in 2018 and 2022 from Sussex County.

23. Using the data in Table 13, (Committed Juveniles with a Sex Offense Charge in their History, 2018-2022), describe the number of committed juveniles who had a sex offense change in their history in 2018 and in 2022. Using the percent change column, describe the percent change in committed juveniles who had a sex offense charge in their history.
There were no youth released in 2018 and 2022 from Sussex County.

24. Using the answers to questions 15-23, what are your most significant findings about committed juveniles released from JJC?
There were no youth released in 2018 and 2022 from Sussex County.

JUVENILE AUTOMATED MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JAMS): REENTRY PROGRAMMING

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

25. Looking at each reentry program, describe reentry program intakes by program in 2022.
Sussex County does not have any re-entry programs because the county has not had youth committed to any JJC program in recent years. There is no data to review.

26. Looking at each reentry program, describe reentry program intakes by gender, race and age by in 2022.
Sussex County does not have any re-entry programs because the county has not had youth committed to any JJC program in recent years. There is no data to review.

27. Using Table 14, look at the ranking of problem areas in 2022, describe the problem areas identified in your county starting with the problem area that has the highest total.
Sussex County does not have any re-entry programs because the county has not had youth committed to any JJC program in recent years. There is no data to review.

28. Using Table 15, look at the ranking of service interventions provided in 2022, describe the service interventions identified in your county starting with the service intervention category that has the highest total.
Sussex County does not have any re-entry programs because the county has not had youth committed to any JJC program in recent years. There is no data to review.

29. Using Table 16, look at the ranking of service interventions needed in 2022, describe the service interventions needed in your county starting with the services needed category that has the highest total.
Sussex County does not have any re-entry programs because the county has not had youth

) committed to any JJC program in recent years. There is no data to review.

30. Using the answers to questions 25-29, what are the most significant findings about program intakes by gender, race, and age and by problem areas, service interventions identified, and service interventions needed in 2022?

Sussex County does not have any re-entry programs because the county has not had youth committed to any JJC program in recent years. There is no data to review.

OTHER DATA

➤ Other Data Regarding Extent and Nature of Need

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

There continues to be no need for re-entry programs in Sussex County. In the event a youth becomes in need for re-entry programming, it will be case managed by the multi-disciplinary team.

IMPLICATIONS FOR REENTRY PLAN

Extent and Nature of Need- Juvenile Probationers

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

There continues to be no need for re-entry programs in Sussex County. In the event a youth becomes in need for re-entry programming, it will be case managed by the MDT.

Extent and Nature of Need-Committed Youth

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

There continues to be no need for re-entry programs in Sussex County. In the event a youth becomes in need for re-entry programming, it will be case managed by the MDT.

Extent and Nature of Need: Other County Data

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

There continues to be no need for re-entry programs in Sussex County. In the event a youth becomes in need for re-entry programming, it will be case managed by the MDT.

Programming Findings

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

There continues to be no need for re-entry programs in Sussex County. In the event a youth becomes in need for re-entry programming, it will be case managed by the MDT.

Reentry Racial and Ethnic Disparities Policy Recommendations

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

There continues to be no need for re-entry programs in Sussex County. In the event a youth becomes in need for re-entry programming, it will be case managed by the MDT.

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

PJ*	What is the problem or county trend to be addressed?	Cite the data that indicates the problem or trend	How will the CYSC address the problem or county trend?
A	There are no needs/service gaps to address	There is no data due to no youth commitments	In the event of re-entry, providers will be identified on a case by case basis through case management of the MDT.
B			
C			
D			
E			
F			
G			

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

Comments:

REENTRY DATA WORKSHEETS

PROBATIONERS

Table 1: Juvenile Probationers Admitted to JJC Residential by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 & 2022

Race/Ethnicity	2018		2022		% Change in Probationers Admitted, 2018-2022
	Number	% of Total Probationers Admitted to JJC	Number	% of Total Probationers Admitted to JJC	
White	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other *	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 & 2022

* See Required Data & Methodology Section

Table 2: Juvenile Probationers Released by Program Type, 2018 & 2022

Program Type	2018		2022		% Change in Released by Program Type 2018-2022
	Number	Number	Number	Number	
Residential	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 & 2022

Table 3: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential by Race and Gender, 2018 & 2022

Race	2018			2022			% Change in Probationers Released by Race and Gender 2018-2022		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
White	0		0	0		0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black	0		0	0		0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic	0		0	0		0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other	0		0	0		0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Releases	0	0	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 & 2022

Table 4: Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential by Age, 2018 & 2022

Age	2018		2022		% Change in Release by Age 2018-2022
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
14 and under	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
15 - 16	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
17 - 18	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
19 and over	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Table 5: Offenses of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers by Type, 2018 & 2022

Type	2018		2022		% Change in Offenses by Type 2018-2022
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Persons	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Weapons	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Property	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
CDS	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Public Order	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
VOP	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 & 2022

Table 6: Juvenile Probationers Released from Pinelands, 2018 & 2022

Program Type	2018		2022		% Change in Probationers Release from Specialized Programs 2018-2022
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Pinelands	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 & 2022

* See Required Data & Methodology

COMMITTED JUVENILES

Table 7: Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC by Race/Ethnicity, 2018 & 2022

Race/Ethnicity	2018		2022		% Change in Committed Juveniles Committed, 2018-2022
	Number	% of Total Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC	Number	% of Total Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC	
White	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 & 2022

Table 8: Committed Juveniles Released to Juvenile Parole Supervision, 2018 & 2022

Released to Parole Supervision*	2018		2022		% Change in 2018-2022
	Number	Number	Number	Number	
	0				#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 & 2022

* See Required Data & Methodology

Table 9: Average Length of Stay (LOS) of Committed Juveniles Released, 2018 & 2022

Average LOS in Months	2018		2022		% Change in Average Length of Stay 2018-2022
	Number	Number	Number	Number	
	0		0		#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 & 2022

Table 10: Committed Juveniles Released by Race and Gender, 2018 & 2022

Race	2018				2022				% Change in Committed Juveniles Released by Race and Gender 2018-2022				
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Total
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number
White	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Releases	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 & 2022

Table 11: Committed Juveniles Released by Age, 2018 & 2022

Age	2018		2022		% Change in Release by Age 2018-2022
	% of Total		% of Total		
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
14 and under	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
15 - 16	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
17 - 18	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
19 and over	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Releases	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 & 2022

Table 12: Offenses of Committed Juveniles admitted to the JJC by Type, 2018 & 2022

Type	2018		2022		% Change in MSCO by Type 2018-2022
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
Persons	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Weapons	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Property	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
CDS	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Public Order	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
VOP	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	0	#DIV/0!	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 & 2022

Table 13: Committed Juveniles admitted to the JJC with a Sex Offense Charge in their Court History, 2018 & 2022

	2018	2022	% Change in Sex Offense History 2018-2022
Sex Offense*	0	0	#DIV/0!

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 & 2022

* Sex Required Data & Methodology

Juvenile Automated Management System (JAMS) - Reentry Program

Table 14. Ranking of Problem Areas, 2018 and 2022

Rank	2018		2022	
	Problem Area	Total	Rank	Problem Area
1	n/a		1	n/a
2			2	
3			3	
4			4	
5			5	
6			6	
7			7	
8			8	
9			9	
10			10	

Table 15. Ranking of Service Intervention Provided, 2018 and 2022

Rank	2018		2022	
	Service Intervention Provided	Total	Rank	Service Intervention Provided
1	n/a		1	n/a
2			2	
3			3	
4			4	
5			5	
6			6	
7			7	
8			8	
9			9	
10			10	

Table 16. Ranking of Service Intervention Needed, 2018 and 2022

Rank	2018		2022	
	Service Intervention Needed	Total	Rank	Service Intervention Needed
1	n/a		1	n/a
2			2	
3			3	
4			4	
5			5	
6			6	
7			7	
8			8	
9			9	
10			10	
				Total

VISION

Sussex County

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

PREVENTION

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

PREVENTION				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by the YSC County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	Psycho-education services: anger management, conflict resolution, healthy decision making, skill building programs (underfunded for future need)	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Family/Peer/Community Engagement	Yes	No	Yes
3	Substance Use Education and Treatment Services- Education and Early Intervention	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Bullying/Suicide Education	No	No	Yes
5	Mental Health Counseling services	Yes	No	Yes

DIVERSION

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

LAW ENFORCEMENT				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by the YSC County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	Station House Adjustment Program to include family/peer/community engagement	No	No	Yes
2	Psycho-education services: anger management, conflict resolution, healthy decision making, skill building programs (underfunded for future need)	Yes	Yes	Yes
3	Substance Use Education and Treatment Services-OP, IOP, In-patient, Aftercare (all levels of care)	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Bullying/Suicide Education	No	No	Yes
5	Mental Health Counseling services	Yes	No	Yes

FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION UNIT (FCIU)				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by the YSC County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	FCIU/MRSS (joint unit with Center for Family Services CFS) Family conflict and family engagement services	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Bullying/Suicide Education	No	No	Yes
3	Mental Health Counseling services	Yes	No	Yes
4				
5				

FAMILY COURT (DIVERSION)				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by the YSC County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	JCC referrals to existing JCC diversion programs	Yes	Yes	No
2	Psycho-education services: anger management, conflict resolution, healthy decision making, skill building programs (underfunded for future need)	Yes	Yes	Yes
3	Substance Use Education and Treatment Services-OP, IOP, In-patient, Aftercare (all levels of care)	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Mental Health Counseling services	Yes	No	Yes
5				

DETENTION

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

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

DETENTION				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by the YSC County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	Morris County Juvenile Detention Center: county shared service agreement	Yes	Yes	No
2	on site at JDC: educational programming to discuss substance use, conflict management, healthy decision making, skill building	No	No	Yes
3				
4				
5				

DETENTION ALTERNATIVES

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

DETENTION ALTERNATIVES				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by the YSC County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	Sussex County Home Detention Program (electronic monitoring-case management)	Yes	Yes	No
2	Sussex County Home Supervision Program (intense supervision-case management)	Yes	Yes	No
3	Psycho-education services: anger management, conflict resolution, healthy decision making, skill building programs (underfunded for future need)	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Substance Use Education and Treatment Services-OP, IOP, In-patient, Aftercare (all levels of care)	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	Mental Health Counseling services	Yes	No	Yes

DISPOSITION

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

DISPOSITION				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by the YSC County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	Sussex County Detention Alternatives	Yes	Yes	No
2	Psycho-education services: anger management, conflict resolution, healthy decision making, skill building programs (underfunded for future need)	Yes	Yes	Yes
3	Substance Use Education and Treatment Services-OP, IOP, In-patient, Aftercare (all levels of care)	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Mental Health Counseling services	Yes	No	Yes
5	Sussex County Probation Department MCJDC: county shared service agreement	Yes	Yes	No

REENTRY

For the purposes of this plan, the use of the term Reentry only applies to committed youth paroled from a Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC) facility and supervised by the JJC's Office of Juvenile Parole and Transitional Services and to juveniles disposed to a JJC program as a condition of probation and supervised by the Department of Probation. Reentry is a mechanism for providing additional support during this transitional period in order to foster the successful reintegration of juveniles into their communities. Given this goal, Reentry programs developed through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing services to youth, regardless of their age, that address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

REENTRY				
Rank Order	Type of Program and/or Service Need	Program / Service Currently Exists	Program / Service Currently Funded by the YSC County	Program / Service is not meeting need therefore is a Gap
1	Psycho-education services: anger management, conflict resolution, healthy decision making, skill building programs (underfunded for future need)	Yes	Yes	No
2	Substance Use Education and Treatment Services-OP, IOP, In-patient, Aftercare (all levels of care)	Yes	Yes	No
3	Mental Health Counseling services	Yes	No	No
4				
5				

2024-2026 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

DATA CHECKLIST

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

- Total County population and County youth population (under 18) by gender, race and ethnicity. *OJJDP Easy Access to juvenile population ojjdp.ojp.gov*
- Juvenile arrests by offense category. *NISP*
- Juvenile arrests by race and ethnicity *↓*
- Total incidents of violence, vandalism, weapons, and substance abuse. *re. doe. state.nj.us/download*
- Total Enrollment. *NSDOE*
- Total Dropouts. *NSDOE*
- Community Indicators of Children at Risk: Welfare; Food Stamps; the number of proven cases of child abuse and/or neglect; births to teens. *cesey/kidscounts datacenter.kidscounts.org*

DIVERSION

- FCIU Caseload by Category *AOC*
- FCIU Petitions Filed by Petition Type *AOC*
- FCIU Referrals by Referral Type *AOC-FACTS*
- Juvenile Court Referral (New Filings) *AOC-FACTS*
- Juveniles Cases Diverted by Race/Ethnicity *AOC-FACTS*

DETENTION

DETENTION

- Juvenile Detention Admissions by Race/Ethnicity and Gender *JDAI Annual report*
- Average Length of Stay in detention. *JDAI Annual report*
- Average Daily Population in detention *JDAI Annual report*
- Number of referrals to juvenile court (new complaints docketed) by race/ethnicity. *ACC-FACTS*
- Most serious current offense for juveniles admitted to detention, by type and by degree (see note below under Sources). *JJC*
- Municipality of residence for juveniles admitted to detention (see note below under Sources). *JJC*
- Age of juveniles admitted to detention (see note below under Sources). *JJC*

DETENTION ALTERNATIVE PROGRAMS

- Average Daily Population in detention *JDAI Annual report*
- Average Monthly Admission *JDAI Annual report*
- Average Length of Stay by Race/Ethnicity *JDAI Annual report*
- Program Outcomes *JDAI Annual report*

DISPOSITION

- Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender *ACC-FACTS*
- Juvenile Cases Adjudicated Delinquent with Probation & Incarceration Dispositions
- Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity *ACC-FACTS / JJC*
- Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age *ACC-FACTS*

- Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity *ACC-FACTS/JJC*
- Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity *ACC-FACTS/JJC*
- Secure Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity *ACC-FACTS
JJC*
- JAMS data Intakes by gender, race/ethnicity, age, problem areas, service interventions needed, and service interventions provided. *JAMS*

REENTRY

PROBATIONERS

- Juvenile Probationers Admitted to JJC Residential by Race/Ethnicity *JJC*
- Juvenile Probationers Released by Program Type
- Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Race and Gender
- Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential & Day Programs by Age
- Offenses of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers by Type
- Juvenile Probationers Released from Pinelands Programs

COMMITTED JUVENILES

- Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC by Race/Ethnicity *JJC*
- Committed Juveniles Released to Juvenile Parole Supervision,
- Average Length of Stay (LOS) of Committed Juveniles Released
- Committed Juveniles Released by Race and Gender
- Committed Juveniles Released by Age
- Offenses of Committed Juveniles admitted to the JJC by Type

- Committed Juveniles with a Sex Offense Charge in their Court History
- JAMS data Intakes by gender, race/ethnicity, age, problem areas, service interventions needed, and service interventions provided.

Additional Data List

Sussex County JJC funding program chart

2023 Student survey summary from School Based Youth Services at Sussex Technical School

2022 FCIU monthly statistical reports

2021-2022 FCIU Youth Served reports

2014-2020 Sussex County Prosecutor's Office Station House Adjustment quarterly data

2018-2022 SCYSC monthly program/agency statistics

2018-2020 SC Detention Alternatives census and data

2022 County Fiscal reports

2023 Youth Feedback survey

2020-2025 County Municipal Alliance Plan and program summaries

2018-2022 Sussex County JAMS Intakes/Completions/Problem Areas Reports

School Resource Officer focus group

Interagency focus group

NJPN.org

Youth.gov

Stopbullying.gov

Acnj.org

2023 County Outreach/Recruitment/One to One Informational Events

- 3/29 Game of Life-student event at Sussex Technical School
- 4/15 DASI Clothesline Event
- 4/27 Project Self Sufficiency-Family Exposition
- 5/25 Hopatcong Community Information Night
- 6/02 Newton Schools Community Information Night
- 8/01 National Night Out-Franklin Township
- 8/04-8/12 NJ State Fair/Sussex County Farm and Horse Show: Kids Day
- 9/17 Sussex County Day
- 10/05 Project Self Sufficiency/MHA Family Health Fair
- 11/06 Lenape Valley High School-Municipal Alliance Vaping Program

NJ Department of Education VVSA report, SARs, and Raw Data

2018-2020 Easy Access to Juvenile populations