



Community Based Responses to Adolescent Domestic Battery: Innovative Practices from Illinois Models for Change Demonstration Sites

Facilitator: Lisa Jacobs (Illinois Models for Change)

Panelists: Jeff Gress (Peoria County), Heidi Mueller (Cook County)

ModelsforChange

Systems Reform in Juvenile Justice



- Initially funded by John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
- Ongoing support from Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission (SAG)
- 3 Demonstration Sites in Illinois: **Cook, DuPage, and Peoria** Counties
- Microcosm of the nation
 - Urban, rural, suburban; diverse ethnic/racial and socioeconomic populations; diverse juvenile court systems



This Presentation Will Cover:

1. Prevalence of adolescent DB and complex characteristics of this population
2. State of the field
3. Improved policy, practice and programming in 3 Illinois MfC Demonstration Sites
4. How can this information be applied in your jurisdiction?

Prevalence and Characteristics



I. System Contact

- Up to 18% of juvenile arrests for violent crimes related to family violence (OJJDP 1998)
 - In 2007, 12% of juvenile court cases in Pima County, Arizona for domestic battery alone.
- Peoria County Patterns
 - In 2005 65 youth were detained and by 2008 there were 121
 - In 2007 there were 107 youth detained of which 43 were female and by 2008 there were 121 of which 58 were female

Prevalence and Characteristics



II. System Penetration

- More likely to be detained, even if eligible for release
 - Cook County 2009: 43% of overrides due to domestic conflict. Largest single cause.
 - DuPage County 2006 through 2008: Average override rate for DB-charged youth 55% vs 29% for non-DB charged youth
- Disproportionate affect on youth of color; girls (Cook)
 - Over 90% (163 of 180) of DB overrides youth of color
 - Over 25% (43 of 180) girls; DB override rate 59% for girls vs. 38% for boys

Prevalence and Characteristics



III. Reentry and Re-arrest

- Difficulty with successful reentry
 - Patterns for DB-charged girls returning from IDJJ
- Earlier and more frequent re-arrest
 - Pima County, AZ 2007: 54% of first-time **DB** offenders vs. 32% of first-time **non-DB** offenders rearrested within 1 year
 - DuPage: At 6 month follow-up, 25% of DB-charged youth rearrested vs. 15% for all other juvenile offenders

Prevalence and Characteristics



IV. Youth and Family Characteristics

- **National Institute of Justice 2006:**
 - Mental Illness present in 64% of offenders
 - More than 50% of offenders were victims or witnessed domestic violence
 - Parental substance abuse and/or criminal history present in 40 to 65% of cases
- **Cook County 2010-2011**
 - Child welfare (IDCFS) history in over 30% of cases (mostly neglect findings)



State of the Field

Overview

- Lack of developmentally appropriate strategies
- Lack of differentiation between different types of domestic conflict and different family dynamics
- Lack of assessment and screening tools



State of the Field

I. Resource Scan (YOS)

- Scan of nationwide adolescent DB strategies
 - Adolescent DB Courts (NY, FLA, CA)
 - Pima County, AZ
- Step Up Curriculum
 - Cognitive/behavioral group curriculum
 - Youth and caregiver-specific curricula
 - Being used in King County (Seattle), Lucas County (Toledo), DuPage, and Peoria

State of the Field



II. Understanding the Population (Peoria)

■ Initial Advocate Community perspectives

- Working with perpetrators
- Working with whole family system
- Adolescent vs. adult differences

■ Moving toward consensus

- Collaboration and dialogue with stakeholders
- Recognizing different types of adolescent DB incidents



State of the Field

III. Trajectories Model (DuPage)

- 4 incident types, or “trajectories”
 - Single Incident
 - Defensive Incident
 - Acute/Developmental Domestic Battery
 - Chronic Domestic Battery
- Trajectory informs response

Illinois Demonstration Sites Improved Responses



Demonstration Site	Peoria (Children's Home Association of IL)	Cook (Youth Outreach Services)	DuPage (Juvenile Probation Dept.)
Launch Date	March 2010	September 2010	January 2010
Program Components	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crisis Intervention • Safety Planning • Mental Health Screening • Temporary Respite Placement • Follow-up Services • Parent, child and sibling Step Up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crisis Intervention • Safety Planning • Risk/needs screening and assessment • Temporary Respite Placement • Therapeutic Intervention Services • Court Diversion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Court Diversion • Safety Planning • Parent and child Step Up
Referrals (thru March 2011)	33 (29 non-DCFS wards) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13 Crisis Referrals • 16 Law Enforcement Referrals 	26 (23 non wards) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11 Crisis Referrals • 12 Law Enforcement Referrals 	219 juvenile DB cases <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 51 Referred to Step Up Program

Illinois Demonstration Sites Improved Responses



Comprehensive Program Model

1. Informal Referral
2. 24/7 Crisis Intervention
3. Screening and Assessment
4. Safety Planning
5. Alternative Placement Options
6. Court/System Diversion (detention is last resort)
7. Menu of Therapeutic Interventions
 - Provide therapeutic interventions or provide linkage
8. Youth and Family/Parent Engagement

Illinois Demonstration Sites Improved Responses



Next Steps

- Embedding changes in policy and practice
- Sustaining programs through new and existing resources
- Expanding continuum of interventions
- Ongoing data sharing and evaluation
- Using Federal funds to support work
- Development of written materials



Applying this information in your
jurisdiction

Questions and Discussion