

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

2024 - 2026
Comprehensive County Youth Services Planning Guidelines

General Instructions

- County Youth Services Commission and its subcommittees must review data provided and any other data to make informed decisions on how funding may be used to address the causes and correlates of delinquency. As a result of the data analysis, counties will make recommendations for services and sanctions for youth and families.
- **All forms within the guidelines are required to be submitted.** The enclosed forms cannot be re-typed or re-formatted in any way.
- Counties may use additional data to support their plans. If a County chooses to use additional data, this data must be appended to Section 11.
- The Comprehensive County Youth Services (CCYS) Plan is to be electronically submitted to the Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC) by December 15, 2023.

**1. JUVENILE JUSTICE COMMISSION
FUNDING SOURCES**

**2. COUNTY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE
& PLANNING BODIES**

3. PLANNING PROCESS

**4. CONTINUUM OF
PROGRAMS & EXISTING SERVICES**

5. DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

**6. DIVERSION
(Law Enforcement, FCIU, &
Family Court)**

7. DETENTION

8. DISPOSITION

9. REENTRY

10. VISION

ATTACHMENTS
(e.g., Additional data, copy of survey,
etc.)

Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC) Funding Sources
Local Level Funding Administered by the JJC

State/Community Partnership Program

The State/Community Partnership Grant Program (Partnership Program) was established within the Juvenile Justice Commission to support, with grants allocated by a formula to Counties through County Youth Services Commissions, sanctions and services for juveniles adjudicated or charged as delinquent and programs for the prevention of juvenile delinquency (N.J.S.A. 52:17B-179).

The goals of the Partnership Program are to: (1) encourage the development of sanctions and services for juveniles adjudicated and charged as delinquent and programs for the prevention of juvenile delinquency that protect the public, ensure accountability and foster rehabilitation; (2) increase the range of sanctions for juveniles adjudicated delinquent; (3) reduce overcrowding in state juvenile institutions and other facilities to ensure adequate bed space for serious, violent and repetitive offenders; (4) reduce overcrowding in County detention facilities; (5) provide greater access to community-based sanctions and services for minority and female offenders; (6) expand programs designed to prevent juvenile delinquency; and (7) promote public safety by reducing recidivism.

Partnership funds are awarded to the Counties by the JJC upon approval of County Comprehensive Youth Services Plans. County Youth Services Commissions administer the Partnership Program on behalf of County governments.

Family Court Services Program

Effective December 31, 1983 legislation was passed to establish in each county one or more juvenile-family crisis intervention units. Each unit could operate as a part of the court intake service, or where provided for by the county, through any other appropriate office or private service pursuant to an agreement with the Administrative Office of the Courts, provided that all such units were subject to the Rules of Court.

In 1986, legislation was passed which provided funds to the Department of Human Services for allocation to the Counties to support programs and services for juveniles involved with or at risk of involvement with the Family Court. The appropriation was directed to two program areas: Juvenile Family Crisis Intervention Units (JFCIU's) and the development of community-based services and programs to serve Family Court clients. When the Juvenile Justice Commission was established in 1995, the funds which supported the Family Court Services Program were moved to the JJC 's budget and are administered in coordination with the guidelines of the State/Community Partnership Program.

On January 1, 2006 Family Crisis Intervention Units that were staffed by the Judiciary were transferred to non Judiciary entities. Allocations for those counties were determined and an agreement was signed between the Judiciary, the JJC and the Department of Human Services. The JJC accepted the agreed upon funding allocation for each in-court Family Crisis Intervention Unit and included this amount in that county's Family Court Services allocation. These funds are administered in coordination with the guidelines of the State Community Partnership Program established pursuant to N.J.S.A. 52:17B-179. Entities selected by each county's planning process to serve as the Family Crisis Intervention Unit must execute an agreement with the Administrative Office of the Courts pursuant to N.J.S.A. 2A:4A-76. The entity must agree to provide services consistent with the Family Crisis Intervention Unit manual approved by the New Jersey Judiciary Judicial Council. Program services must be provided in coordination with the Mobile Response and Stabilization Services in each county as contracted by the NJ Department of Human Services, Division of Child Behavioral Health Services, Office of Children's Services.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)

Formula Grant Program

Congress enacted the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act (Pub. L. No. 93-415, 34 U.S.C. §11101 et seq.) in 1974, reauthorized in 2002. This landmark legislation established the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to support local and state efforts to prevent delinquency and improve the juvenile justice system. In December 2018, the Juvenile Justice Reform Act (JJRA) of 2018 was signed into law,

reauthorizing and substantially amending the JJDP Act. The amendments made by the JJRA become effective October 1, 2019. The Act provides funding to states to implement the Formula Grants Program.

Formula grants are awarded to states on the basis of relative population under the age of 18 for the purpose of meeting the Act's mandates and to improve the State's juvenile justice system. It is required that two-thirds of Formula Grant funds be passed through to the locals, with one-third available for State level initiatives.

The Act requires that states, through their State Advisory Group (SAG) submit a comprehensive plan for juvenile justice every three years and updates to that plan annually. The Plan includes an summary of the state's juvenile justice system, an analysis of juvenile crime statistics and an assessment of the needs of its juveniles. Based on the plan, funding is then prioritized and allocated among thirty-four Standard Program Areas. Formula Grants Program Areas are located at <https://www.nttac.org/index.cfm?event=fgaps>.

Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) Innovations

JDAI strives to create more effective and efficient processes surrounding the use of juvenile detention. To help jurisdictions accomplish this goal, JDAI provides a framework for conducting a thorough, data-driven examination of the detention system, and for using that information to develop and implement strategies for system improvement.

The purpose of JDAI Innovations Funding is to provide an additional resource and support to those JDAI sites that have demonstrated an active commitment to the implementation of the eight JDAI Core Strategies. Funds are used in furtherance of data driven policies and practices that are clearly consistent with the eight JDAI Core Strategies.

1. Collaboration

Key juvenile justice stakeholders coordinate detention reform activities and conduct joint planning and policymaking under a formal governance structure. They work together to identify detention bottlenecks and problems; to develop common understandings and

solutions; to generate support for proposed reforms and routinely monitor reform progress.

2. Data Driven Decisions

JDAI depends upon objective data analysis to guide detention reform planning and policy development. Data on detention population, utilization and operations is collected to provide a portrait of who is being detained and why, as well as suggesting what points in the process may need attention. As a results-based initiative, JDAI establishes and tracks performance measures. All data is disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender to monitor disparities in the system.

3. Objectives Admissions Criteria and Instruments

Detention admissions policies and practices must distinguish between the youth who are likely to flee or commit new crimes and those who are not. JDAI sites develop Risk Assessment Instruments to screen for individual risk using reliable, standardized techniques. Absent an objective approach, high-risk offenders may be released and low-risk offenders detained.

4. Non-Secure Alternatives to Detention

New or enhanced non-secure alternatives to detention programs increase the options available for arrested youth yet ensure that juveniles are held accountable for their behavior and the community is protected. Pre-trial detention alternative programs target only the youth who would otherwise be detained.

5. Case Processing Reforms

Modifications of juvenile court procedures accelerate the movement of delinquency cases, streamline case processing and reduce unnecessary delay. Case processing reforms are introduced to expedite the flow of cases through the system. These changes reduce length of stay in custody, expand the availability of non-secure program slots and ensure that interventions with youth are timely and appropriate.

6. Special Detention Cases

Special strategies are necessary for handling difficult populations of youth who are detained unnecessarily. The data analysis directs the site to the cases or cluster of

cases in need of special attention. They may include children detained on warrants, children detained for probation violations, or children detained pending dispositional placement. Addressing these cases can have immediate and significant impact on reducing detention populations.

7. Reducing Racial Disparities

Reducing racial disparities requires specific strategies aimed at eliminating bias and ensuring a level playing field for youth of color. Ongoing objective data analysis is critical. Racial disparities are the most stubborn aspect of detention reform. Real lasting change in this arena requires determined leadership and targeted policies and programming.

8. Conditions of Confinement

Reducing overcrowding in detention can immediately improve conditions. To monitor conditions of confinement in secure detention centers and to identify problems that need correction, JDAI sites establish "self-inspection" teams of local volunteers. These self-inspection teams are trained in a rigorous methodology and ambitious standards that carefully examine all aspects of facility policies, practices and programs. The teams then prepare comprehensive reports on their findings and monitor implementation of corrective action plans.

Restorative and Transformative Justice for Youths and Communities Pilot Program

The Restorative and Transformative Justice for Youths and Communities Pilot Program, P.L. 2021, c.196 (Pilot Program) creates a two-year Pilot Program to develop an innovative restorative and transformative continuum of care in the municipalities of Camden, Newark, Paterson, and Trenton. The Pilot Program is intended to help prevent young people in New Jersey from entering the youth justice system and to support young people being released from a Juvenile Justice Commission (Commission) facility. The Pilot Program will greatly enhance the funding initiatives currently in place to serve youth in their communities. Pursuant to P.L. 2021, c.196 each of the four identified municipalities shall have a restorative justice hub that will provide community-based enhanced diversion and reentry

wraparound services. Counties must actively engage communities and properly fund services to divert youth from formal justice system involvement and reintegrate youth back into their communities successfully.

The goals, as identified in P.L. 2021, c.196, are as follows:

1. To increase participation in education, vocational programming, and employment. Youth participants in the Pilot Program shall receive academic support, depending on personal development goals, and shall be connected to secondary schools, alternative schools, vocational schools, apprenticeship programs and colleges and universities. The program shall collaborate with local community college's admissions and academic support programs, and offer workshops that include financial aid planning. Participants seeking employment shall be linked to vocational or job readiness training. The selected partner-providers participating in the Pilot Program shall be trained in and utilize evidence-based and evidence-informed practices with respect to the provision of their respective services;
2. To increase participation in mental health and well-being programming. The program shall employ trauma-informed practices and connect youth to licensed outpatient mental health care facilities and professionals. The program shall create safe, caring environments to address physical health, mental health and substance use disorder conditions and facilitate healing for youth, families, and communities.
3. To decrease incidents of harmful and unlawful behavior. The program shall work with youth to comply with their probation or parole plan, as applicable. Moreover, the program shall employ trauma-informed practices, violence reduction, and peacemaking supports and tools to address harmful and unlawful behavior;
4. To have restorative justice hubs establish working relationships with local law enforcement agencies, courts, prosecutors, and defense attorneys to support the diversion of youth away from arrests and prosecution and towards participation in restorative justice services provided in the hubs;

5. To improve the socioemotional and behavioral responses of youth within communities through the use of more appropriate, and less punitive, interventions, thereby establishing more restorative interventions; and
6. To increase program participation rates in other restorative and transformative justice programs in the municipalities in which the Pilot Program is established.

DEFINITION & RATIONALE

General Statement:

This section defines and describes each decision-making point on the youth justice continuum. Planners should review and consider these definitions as part of the planning process.

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. For the purposes of this plan, *primary delinquency prevention programs* are those directed at the entire juvenile population in a targeted area like a specific school, neighborhood or town/community where delinquency risk factors are prevalent. *Secondary delinquency prevention programs* are those directed at specific youth who are at higher risk of involvement in the juvenile justice system than the general population, based on exhibited behaviors associated with delinquency. Given this goal, delinquency prevention programs that are developed annually through the comprehensive planning process must serve a clearly identified target population of at-risk youth and services must address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

Delinquency prevention data describe trends in juvenile delinquency and in factors that reflect the causes and correlates of delinquent activity. By understanding the nature and extent of delinquent behavior and the factors associated with involvement in delinquency, counties can better identify the content and scope of prevention programs needed. This information will help counties make informed decisions regarding the allocation of resources to delinquency prevention programming.

The Delinquency prevention data required for the Comprehensive Plan is meant to become the foundation for prevention program planning. However, it should be noted that the typical prevention planning process requires an in-depth analysis of communities, families, peer associations, and education factors that identify problem areas in a specific school, neighborhood, or town/community in the County.

This Comprehensive Plan requires only a small portion of the data that could potentially inform the need for delinquency prevention programming. Counties are encouraged to utilize additional local data in the planning process.

DIVERSION

Diversion is a broad term referring to “exit ramps” that move young people away from the juvenile legal system, offering alternatives to arrest and alternatives to prosecution. The goal of diversion programming is to target the underlying problems that led to the alleged delinquency behavior in the first place. By addressing the root causes of community instability diversion programs help improve long-term community safety. 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 developing diversion programs that include strategies to address the issues leading to delinquency, including restorative strategies for mitigating harm and increasing healing.

Diversion Process

In New Jersey, juveniles are dealt with informally through one or more of the following: Law Enforcement Station House Adjustments (Attorney General Directive 2020-12), Family Crisis Intervention Units (FCIU), Family Court Juvenile Conference Committees, or Family Court Intake Service Conferences.

Diversion Programs

Diversion programs are the activities young people are required to perform to avoid a formal arrest or to avoid a formal prosecution. Diversion programs may be operated by a law enforcement agency, the court, or by a contracted service provider.

The diversion data describe trends in the extent and nature of cases diverted in your county. This information will help counties begin to make informed decisions regarding the allocation of resources to diversion programming. When reviewing these data, note any differences in the use of diversion by race. Planning should include ways to level the playing field so that all youth, regardless of race, have an equal opportunity for diversion. The Comprehensive Plan requires only a small portion of the data that could potentially be collected at the County or municipal level.

DETENTION

The detention decision making point includes 1) police referral for detention, 2) court remands to detention, and 3) the issuance of warrants requiring detention placement/due to technical violations.

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

The statutory detention criteria require a finding that the young person poses 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).” Counties may plan to use a limited amount of funding to support court ordered evaluations for adjudicated youth who reside in the detention center, only when all other resources are exhausted.

Detention alternative programs provide community supervision to juveniles who would otherwise be placed in a secure detention facility, while awaiting final disposition of their case. Detention alternative programs expand the continuum of programming options for Family Intake decisionmakers and for the court. Detention alternative programs are not to be provided in the detention center. The programs are designed to link to the middle category of the detention screening tool. They provide short-term (30 – 60 days) community supervision to ensure that youth remain arrest free and attend court hearings until the final disposition of their case. As such, these programs help to safely reduce the detention population and eliminate the trauma of secure

detention placement on young people, particularly youth of color.

Detention data describe the number of juveniles placed in detention, the characteristics of detained juveniles, and the types of alleged charges/technical violations for which they are detained. By understanding the use of secure detention and the characteristics of the detained population, planners can better identify the continuum of detention alternative programs needed in their counties. As such, counties will be better equipped to make informed decisions regarding the allocation of resources to detention alternative programs.

DISPOSITION

Disposition is the phase of the juvenile justice system that occurs after a young person is adjudicated delinquent. At this decision point, young people are ordered by the court to comply with specific sanctions, supervision, and services as a consequence for their delinquent behavior. In New Jersey, the range of dispositions available to the court includes but is 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 disposition program. The structure of these programs are varied, 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 incentives, sanctions, supervision, and services that are aligned with rehabilitation, so that young people are better off for having the programming experience.

When determining the appropriate disposition in each case, the court faces the complex task of considering multiple goals, including promoting public safety, ensuring offender accountability, and providing juveniles with opportunities for personal growth and skill development through rehabilitative efforts. By developing and enhancing local disposition programs, counties can center young people's well-being by providing the court with the range of options that matches best their supervision and service needs. Research and experience indicate that well developed community-based disposition programs can effectively reduce the likelihood of continued delinquency, improving the lives of the youth they serve, and improve the quality and safety of the local community and its citizens.

The disposition data provided describe the number of youth adjudicated delinquent and disposed by the court, as well as the characteristics of these juveniles that reflect the causes and correlates of delinquent activity. By understanding the nature and extent of the juvenile population facing disposition and the factors associated with involvement in delinquency, planners can better identify the content and scope of Dispositional Option Programs needed in their counties. As such, counties will be better equipped to make informed decisions regarding the allocation of resources to disposition programs.

REENTRY

In the juvenile justice system reentry generally refers to the period of community-based supervision and services that follows a juvenile's release from a secure facility, residential program, or other structured dispositional placement.

However, for the purposes of this application, 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 Juvenile Probation Division. Reentry is a transitional period where young people need additional support to foster their successful reintegration home. Given this goal, reentry programs developed through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing supports and services to youth, regardless of their age, that address the common issues young people face when returning home. .

By developing reentry services that compliment the supervision provided by the JJC and Probation, counties can increase the likelihood that juveniles returning to their communities will reintegrate successfully. This type of cooperative effort in the delivery of reentry services and supervision improves each youth's chance of becoming productive, law-abiding citizens, which in turn enhances the safety and quality of the local communities in which these juveniles reside.

The reentry data provided describe the number of committed youth and probationers returning to the community from JJC facilities and programs, as well as the demographic and offense characteristics of these juveniles that reflect the causes and correlates of delinquent activity. By understanding the nature and extent of the population released to Reentry and the factors associated with involvement in delinquency, planners can better identify the content and scope of Reentry services and programs needed in their counties. As such, counties will be better equipped to make informed decisions regarding the allocation of resources to Reentry services.

PLANNING BODIES

Provide a current list of members and their designees with corresponding Positions/Representatives who are minimally required by the rules and regulations of each planning body except for the Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement. Based upon a person's responsibility within the County, they may be listed more than once.

Instructions

1. Insert the race/ethnicity and name of the person who corresponds with the Position/Representative identified on the form.
2. Enter the race/ethnicity, name, and position/representative of any additional members of your committee. Also place an X under the planning body that they represent.
3. If a required person has a designee, include their designee's name in parenthesis. For example, John Smith (Jane Carter).
4. If a required position/representative is vacant, submit a current copy of the letter requesting their participation.

Planning Bodies

CYSC – County Youth Services Commission

CJJSI – County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement

No	Race/ Ethnicity*	Name & Designee	Position/Representative	CYSC	CJJSI
1	White	Samuel Williams	Youth Services Commission Administrator	X	X
2		Vacant (letter attached)	Presiding Judge – Family Part of the Superior Court	X	
3	Black	Shane’t Bowe	Family Division Manager (or Assistant Family Division Manager)	X	X
4	White	Hollee Ceulers	Chief Probation Officer	X	X
5	White Black	Joseph Sileo (Donna Pearson)	Highest elected official of County government (e.g., Freeholder/ County Executive)	X	
6	Black White White	Jennifer Webb-McRae (Kevin Guinan) (Danielle Pennino)	County Prosecutor	X	X
7	White	Sophia Waldstein	County Public Defender	X	X
8	White White	Mary Broglin (Lisa Felix)	County DCP&P District Manager	X	
9	White	Melissa Niles	County Mental Health Administrator	X	X
10	White	Robert Bumpus	County Superintendent of Schools	X	
11	White Hispanic	Dina Rossi (Anthony Bermudez)	Superintendent of the County Vocational School	X	
12	White	Melissa Niles	County Human Services Department Director	X	X
13	White	Mike Dindak	Youth Shelter Director	X	
14	Black	Veronica Surrency	Youth Detention Center Director	X	X
15	White White	Ashley Lasoski (Christine Graves)	Juvenile Family Crisis Intervention Unit - Director	X	
16	White	Robert Austino (Jennifer Negron)	President – Juvenile Officers Association or other law enforcement representative who works primarily with youth/Police	X	
17	White	Melissa Niles	County Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Director	X	X
18	Hispanic Hispanic	Michelle Slaney-Mills (Joeny Mendez)	Workforce Investment Board Representative	X	

* Race/Ethnicity: White, Black, Hispanic or Other (Other represents Native American, Alaskan Native and Asian or Pacific Islander).

Planning Bodies

CYSC – County Youth Services Commission

CJJSI – County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement

No	Race/ Ethnicity*	Name & Designee	Position/Representative	CYSC	CJJSI
19	White	Mary Ann Hamidy	Business Representative	X	X
20	Black	Spencer Young	Court Liaison - Juvenile Justice Commission	X	
23			Juvenile Judge – Family Part of the Superior Court		X
24	White	Jason Corter	Trial Court Administrator – Family Part of the Superior Court		X
25	Black	Shane’t Bowe	Family Division Manager – Family Part of the Superior Court	X	X
26	Black	Gina Blevins	JJC JDAI Detention Specialist		X
27	White	Sophia Waldstein	County Public Defender’s Office	X	X
28	Black White White	Jennifer Webb-McRae (Kevin Guinan) (Danielle Pennino)	County Prosecutor’s Office	X	X
29	White	Hollee Ceulers	Probation Division	X	X
30	Black	James Sampson	Private/ Non-profit organization	X	X
31		Vacant	Parents of youth in the juvenile justice system	X	
32		Vacant	Youth member	X	
33	Black	Tracey Wells-Huggins	Organization that works on the behalf of parents/families/youth	X	X
34		Vacant	Education Sector	X	
35	White	Elizabeth Thomas	Advocacy group	X	
36	Hispanic	Victor Jimenez	Clergy	X	

* Race/Ethnicity: White, Black, Hispanic or Other (Other represents Native American, Alaskan Native and Asian or Pacific Islander).

Planning Bodies

CYSC – County Youth Services Commission

CJJSI – County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement

No	Race/ Ethnicity*	Name & Designee	Position/Representative	CYSC	CJJSI
37		Vacant	Family Law Practitioner	X	
38		Vacant	Representation from AOC’s Supreme Court Committee on Diversity, Inclusion, and Community Engagement committee	X	
39		Vacant	Civic Organization	X	
40		Vacant	Municipal Youth Services Commission	X	
41	White	Tracy Swan	Individual with knowledge, experience, or interest in local youth, the local community, or the juvenile justice system	X	X
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					
47					
48					
49					
50					
Total Number of Members				25	15

* Race/Ethnicity: White, Black, Hispanic or Other (Other represents Native American, Alaskan Native and Asian or Pacific Islander).

COUNTY YOUTH SERVICES COMMISSION

PLANNING

Cumberland County

Instructions

This section will allow you to describe to the public your county's planning process regarding identifying the needs of youth in your county. Your answers to each of the following questions should describe your county's planning *process*, **not the results/outcome** of the planning process. Answer all questions using this form.

Planning Process

1. Briefly describe your county's YSC planning process for determining funding decisions. Include the work of the CYSC, its subcommittees and other collaborations. Also include any key factors like trends or funding levels that may have impacted the YSC's thoughts and conversations around youth services in the county.

The planning process begins in its earliest stage with the YSC Planning and Budgeting Committee evaluating current program performance, effectiveness, and funding balances. This helps the group stay informed throughout the year. The committee seeks to engage the YSC membership and interested parties by soliciting for local trends and data if supplementation is needed. The YSC meetings have been used as a planning platform because many key members and parties are in the room together for discussion. There is also cross-over and collaboration with groups such as the County HSAC and CIACC, along with the Cumberland County Positive Youth Development Coalition where regular review of trends and follow-up discussion take place. After this collaboration and research occurs, a suggestion or motion is brought to the full YSC by the committee for discussion and in many cases a vote if action is determined to be necessary. A key factor/issue in 2023 has been underspent funding levels for detention and disposition programming. Through the process described above, it has been determined that referrals for some of these programs are down due to low numbers in Probation and Family Court, whereas the need in prevention and diversion programming has increased because many youth are now falling into those continuums instead. This has led to YSC budget modifications in 2023 where funds have been shifted towards prevention and diversion because of the identified need. This has been taken into consideration during the Comprehensive Planning process as well.

2. How does the CYSC stay informed of best practices or evidence-based programming for serving youth? Does the CYSC mandate that funded programs implement best practice and or evidence-based programming? Please describe CYSC efforts to ensure funded programs follow best practices or evidence-based programming, if applicable.

There are many resources regarding evidence-based practices that are made available by local vendors, County youth councils, coalitions and workgroups, and JAMS outcome reports. There are online resources such as CrimeSolutions.gov that are utilized for analysis. Presenters on

these topics are sought out to offer presentations during YSC council and committee meetings as well.

- As a JDAI site, list topics and discussion points that were shared between the Youth Services Commission and the County Council on Juvenile Justice System Improvement and any activities that helped to facilitate the completion of this Comprehensive Plan.

The YSC Administrator reports the activities of both groups during the respective meetings. Several members also serve on the CJJSI and YSC. During the current planning process, it was determined that a goal of the innovations planning group is to add an additional program to the innovations funding while also continuing the Probation Enrichment and Transportation program. Because of the collaboration between both the YSC and innovations planning groups on the topic of detention alternatives, it was decided that both programs would be able to move forward. This is thanks to the agreement of the YSC to supplemently fund the PET program in addition to the innovations funding. This collaboration and discussion will lead to the continuation of an important program, as well as the addition of a new initiative in the county.

- Describe efforts made by the YSC to seek additional funding to supplement the funding received through the JJC. Complete the below chart to show what funding the YSC has reviewed as a potential funding opportunity.

Date	Grantor and Name	Eligible	Applied	Approved or Denied	Comments
6/1/2019	OVC FY 2019 Enhancing Community Responses to the Opioid Crisis: Serving Our Youngest Crime Victims	Yes	No	n/a	County did not apply but forwarded to YSC membership
9/14/2023	Site Support and Technical Assistance from Annie E. Casey Foundation	Yes	No	N/A	Notice of funding was received too close to the deadline for submission but it will be looked into for a 2024 opportunity.

Community Participation

The work of the Youth Services Commission impacts youth, families, and communities. It is therefore critical that the Youth Service Commission’s planning include participation by and input from youth, families, and the community.

1. Describe what the county has done or will do to increase public awareness about the Youth Services Commission. For example, describe any materials that have been distributed through marketing or advertising campaigns or any “community forums” or “open houses” that have been held to educate the community about the YSCs purpose and role. Indicate when these activities occurred and/or when they will occur.

The YSC notifies the public of meetings by publishing the dates, times and locations annually in local newspapers and the county website. The YSC also maintains a large distribution list of interested parties comprised of a variety of youth serving entities as well as members of the general public that are emailed regular meeting reminders along with other important YSC related activities. A YSC program guide was created in 2023 for distribution throughout the county as a way to provide outreach and education regarding the YSC and it's funded programs. An information packet has also been created in 2023 so new members and other community members can learn more about the Cumberland YSC. The Administrator and YSC members attend various community events (e.g. national night out, back to school nights, resource fairs, etc.) in order to meet youth and families where they are at and begin to build personal connections while also explaining the role, purpose and offerings of the YSC. There has been continued discussion during YSC meetings by the membership regarding future outreach opportunities and how awareness can be brought to all areas of the County.

2. Describe what the county has done or will do to increase participation on the YSC by youth, families, and the community, including people impacted by the youth legal system. Such efforts might include, for example, researching the best times and locations for public attendance and adjusting meetings accordingly; publicizing the meetings in a way that is more accessible to the community (beyond posting on county’s website and in county buildings); having YSC committee members serve as liaisons to community groups so they can report back to the YSC; and creating subcommittees on youth, families and/or community engagement that include representatives from each of these groups and that meet at a time convenient to these members.

In 2023, the YSC meeting time was moved from 10am to 3pm in order to allow an opportunity for youth and families to attend after school or work. Meetings have also moved to in-person with a virtual/dial-in option available. These accommodations attempt to make meetings more accessible for youth and families. The Cumberland CIACC has a youth and family subcommittee that reports at meetings for community members, this information is also brought to the YSC when applicable. Meeting notices and YSC information are sent regularly to many youth and family serving agencies throughout the county, with the goal of reaching the communities they work with and already have existing relationships with.

3. Describe how the county has or will ensure youth, families, and community members, including people impacted by the youth legal system participate in the development of the YSC’s comprehensive plan.

Connecting at community events (e.g. national night out, back to school nights, resource fairs, etc.) in order to meet youth and families where they're at and survey/solicit for their input is one way the YSC will elavate the youth and family voice. Another way is through the YSC members connecting with communties they work in eveyrday and explaining the YSC, it's role, and the importance of community input to the plan.

4. Describe youth, family, and community membership on the current YSC, including people impacted by the youth legal system. If there are no members who fit this category or if membership is limited, what steps will be taken to increase their membership?

The YSC has somewhat "rebuilt" it's membership in 2023 to ensure that all required parties are at the table and the most dedicated of individuals serve. Members heavily involved with youth and parent advocacy have joined the YSC and this will be used to continue to seek ways to gain youth and family membership through the communities served.

5. Additional Comments:

CONTINUUM OF PROGRAMS & EXISITING SERVICES

Existing Continuum of Program & Services should include those funded through the Juvenile Justice Commission (e.g., State/Community Partnership & Family Court, Title II, and Innovations) and all other programs/services (**regardless of JJC funding source**) that are considered to be a part of the county's continuum.

Instructions

1. List all 2023 Youth Services Commission funded programs and/or services.
2. List all non YSC funded programs and/or services, your county considers a part of its Continuum regardless of its funding source.
3. Indicate the annual level of service in parenthesis (if known).
4. Indicate the funding source in parenthesis (if known).

**CY 2023 Existing Services
Continuum of Programs & Existing Services
County of Cumberland**

Delinquency Prevention Programs

Name/LOS/Funding Source

1. Wawa SYEP / 150 slots / SCP
2. Euphoria Youth Center / 60 unduplicated youth / SCP and FC
3. See attachment: Cumberland HSAC funded programs
4. See attachment: Summer in Cumberland Guide

Law Enforcement Diversion Programs

Name/LOS/Funding Source

1. Drug and Alcohol Services, First Step Clinic / 75 Evals, 400 hrs of treatment 300 urine screens / SCP
2. Individual Mentoring / 20 slots / SCP
3. In-Home Counseling / 19 slots / SCP
4. Sexting Intervention / 12 slots / SCP
5. Station House Adjustment Program. Vineland, Millville, Bridgeton PD's & Cumberland Sheriff's Dept.
6. Chaplaincy Program

Family Crisis Intervention Unit

Name/LOS/Funding Source

1. Drug and Alcohol Services, First Step Clinic / 75 Evals, 400 hrs of treatment 300 urine screens / SCP
2. Individual Mentoring / 20 slots / SCP
3. In-Home Counseling / 19 slots / SCP
4. Sexting Intervention / 12 slots / SCP
5. Station House Adjustment Program. Vineland, Millville, Bridgeton PD's & Cumberland Sheriff's Dept.
6. Chaplaincy Program

Family Court Diversion Programs

Name/LOS/Funding Source

1. Drug and Alcohol Services, First Step Clinic / 75 Evals, 400 hrs of treatment 300 urine screens / SCP
2. Individual Mentoring / 20 slots / SCP
3. In-Home Counseling / 18 slots / SCP
4. Sexting Intervention / 12 slots / SCP
5. Station House Adjustment Program. Vineland, Millville, Bridgeton PD's & Cumberland Sheriff's Dept.
6. Chaplaincy Program

**Detention Alternative Programs
(Pre-Adjudicated Youth)**

Name/LOS/Funding Source

1. In-Home Detention Program / 6 slots / FC
2. Electronic Monitoring Program / 20 slots / Cumberland County
3. Ranch Hope Shelter Beds / 2 slots per month / Cumberland County

**Community Based Disposition Options
(Post-Adjudicated Youth)**

Name/LOS/Funding Source

1. Probation Enrichment & Transportation with Life Skills / JDAI
2. Individual Mentoring / 20 / SCP
3. In-Home Counseling / 48 slots / FC
4. Drug and Alcohol Services, First Step Clinic / 75 Evals, 400 hrs of treatment
300 urine screens / SCP
5. Cognitive Skills / 30 slots / FC
6. Sex Offender Services / 3 unduplicated youth / SCP

Re-Entry Programs

Name/LOS/Funding Source

1. Drug & Alcohol Services, First Step Clinic
2. PerformCare, CSOC

Comments:

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION

- Definition & Rationale
- Required Data & Methodology
- Data Worksheets
- Analysis Questions

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION DEFINITION & RATIONALE

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. For the purposes of this plan, *primary delinquency prevention programs* are those directed at the entire juvenile population in a targeted area like a specific school, neighborhood or town/community where delinquency risk factors are prevalent. *Secondary delinquency prevention programs* are those directed at specific youth who are at higher risk of involvement in the juvenile justice system than the general population, based on exhibited behaviors associated with delinquency. Given this goal, delinquency prevention programs that are developed annually through the comprehensive planning process must serve a clearly identified target population of at-risk youth and services must address the known causes and correlates of delinquency.

Delinquency prevention data describe trends in juvenile delinquency and in factors that reflect the causes and correlates of delinquent activity. By understanding the nature and extent of delinquent behavior and the factors associated with involvement in delinquency, counties can better identify the content and scope of prevention programs needed. This information will help counties make informed decisions regarding the allocation of resources to delinquency prevention programming.

The Delinquency prevention data required for the Comprehensive Plan is meant to become the foundation for prevention program planning. However, it should be noted that the typical prevention planning process requires an in-depth analysis of communities, families, peer associations, and education factors that identify problem areas in a specific school, neighborhood, or town/community in the County.

This Comprehensive Plan requires only a small portion of the data that could potentially inform the need for delinquency prevention programming. Counties are encouraged to utilize additional local data in the planning process.

DELINQUENCY PREVENTION REQUIRED DATA & METHODOLOGY

- All data are county-specific unless otherwise indicated.
- Round all percentages to one decimal place.
- Cells in the data tables are identified with a letter/number combination, where the letter identifies the column and the number identifies the row (e.g., A1 = Column A, Row 1).

DEMOGRAPHICS

Required Data	Total County youth population (under 18) by gender for calendar years 2018, 2019 and 2020. Total County youth population (under 18) by race and ethnicity for calendar years 2018 and 2020.
Source	OJJDP Easy Access to Juvenile Populations – County Comparison. https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/statistical-briefing-book/data-analysis-tools/ezapop/county-comparisons
Methods	<p><u>Table 1. County Youth Population (under 18) by Gender</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Number (Columns B, D, F).</i> For years 2018, 2019 and 2020 insert the number of male youth and the number of female youth under 18. ➤ <i>Percent of Total Population (Columns C, E, G).</i> Calculate the percent of the County's youth population that was male and the percent that was female. To obtain the percent, divide the number of youth of each gender by the total youth population (under 18) and multiply by 100 using Formula 1. ➤ <i>Percent Change (Columns H/I).</i> Calculate the percent change in the male youth population, the female youth population, and the County's total youth population between 2018, 2019, and 2020 using Formula 2. <p><u>Formula 1.</u></p> $\frac{\text{Number of Males in 2018 (B10)}}{\text{Total Population in 2018 (B12)}} = \underline{\quad} \times 100 = \% \text{ Male in 2018 (C10)}$ <p><u>Formula 2.</u></p> $\frac{\text{Most Recent Year \# (2020) – Prior Year \# (2018)}}{\text{Prior Year \# (2018)}} = \underline{\quad} \times 100 = \% \text{ Change 2018-2020}$
Data Checks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In Table 1, the figures in Row 1 and Row 2 should add up to the figure in Row 3 for each of the three years (but not for percent change). For example, A1 (number of males) + A2 (number of females) = A3 (total youth population), and B1 (% male) + B2 (% female) = 100% (total population).

Methods | Table 2. Total County Youth Population (under 18) by Race

- *Number (Columns B/C and E/F).* Insert the number of youth by race for each year. *Note: For “Other”, add Asian and American Indian then insert the total number of these youth for each year. Hispanic youth is not captured within each race category because Hispanic is identified as an ethnic origin not a Race. As a result, Hispanic is not a race category and will be analyzed independently unless otherwise indicated.
- *Percent of Total County Youth Population (Columns D and G).* Calculate the percent of the County’s total youth population for each year using Formula 1.
- *Percent Change (Columns H/I).* Calculate the County’s percent change in the youth population by Race, and the County’s percent change in the total youth population between 2018 and 2020 for each race using Formula 2.

Methods | Table 3. Total County Youth Population (under 18) by Ethnicity

- *Number (Columns B/C and E/F).* Insert the number of youth by ethnicity for each year.
- *Percent of Total Population (Columns D and G).* Calculate the percent of the County’s total youth population for each year using Formula 1.
- *Percent Change (Columns H/I).* Calculate the percent change in the youth population by Ethnicity and the County’s total youth population between 2018 and 2020 using Formula 2.

Data Checks | ➤ In Table 3, the figures in Rows 1 and 2 should add up to the figure in Row 3 for each of the year (but not for percent change). For example, A1 (Hispanic) + A2 (Non Hispanic) = A3 (total youth population), and B1 (Hispanic) + B2 (Non Hispanic) = 100% (total youth population).

NATURE & EXTENT OF DELINQUENCY

JUVENILE ARRESTS

Required Data	Juvenile arrests by offense category for calendar years 2018, 2019 and 2020.																
Source	New Jersey State Police (these data are provided by the JJC).																
Methods	<p><i>Table 4. County Juvenile Arrests by Offense Category</i></p> <p>➤ <i>Number (Columns B, E, H).</i> Add the number of arrests in the UCR categories listed below to obtain the number of juvenile arrests in each offense category. Add and insert the results for each year. Insert your County’s total number of juvenile arrests for 2018 (A8), 2019 (D8), and 2020 (G8).</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><u>Offense Category</u></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><u>Add these UCR Categories</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Violent</td> <td>Murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, manslaughter, simple assault.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Weapons</td> <td>Weapons only.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Property</td> <td>Burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, forgery & counterfeiting, fraud, embezzlement, stolen property, criminal/malicious mischief.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Drug/Alcohol</td> <td>Drug abuse violations, driving under the influence, liquor laws.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Special Needs</td> <td>Arson, prostitution and commercialized vice, sex offenses (except forcible rape & prostitution), offenses against family and children.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Public Order & Status Offenses</td> <td>Gambling, disorderly conduct, vagrancy, curfew & loitering law violations, and runaways.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All Other Offenses</td> <td>All other offenses (except traffic).</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>➤ <i>Percent of All Juvenile Arrests (Columns B, E, H).</i> Calculate the percentage of the County’s total juvenile arrests for each offense category for each year. To obtain the percent, divide the number of arrests in each offense category by the total number of juvenile arrests and multiply by 100. Formula 3 is an example of how to calculate the percent of the County’s total juvenile arrests for violent offenses in 2018.</p> <p><u>Formula 3.</u></p> $\frac{\text{Number Violent Offense Arrests 2018 (A1)}}{\text{Grand Total Juvenile Arrests 2018 (A8)}} = \underline{\hspace{1cm}} \times 100 = \% \text{Violent 2018 (B1)}$	<u>Offense Category</u>	<u>Add these UCR Categories</u>	Violent	Murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, manslaughter, simple assault.	Weapons	Weapons only.	Property	Burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, forgery & counterfeiting, fraud, embezzlement, stolen property, criminal/malicious mischief.	Drug/Alcohol	Drug abuse violations, driving under the influence, liquor laws.	Special Needs	Arson, prostitution and commercialized vice, sex offenses (except forcible rape & prostitution), offenses against family and children.	Public Order & Status Offenses	Gambling, disorderly conduct, vagrancy, curfew & loitering law violations, and runaways.	All Other Offenses	All other offenses (except traffic).
<u>Offense Category</u>	<u>Add these UCR Categories</u>																
Violent	Murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, manslaughter, simple assault.																
Weapons	Weapons only.																
Property	Burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, forgery & counterfeiting, fraud, embezzlement, stolen property, criminal/malicious mischief.																
Drug/Alcohol	Drug abuse violations, driving under the influence, liquor laws.																
Special Needs	Arson, prostitution and commercialized vice, sex offenses (except forcible rape & prostitution), offenses against family and children.																
Public Order & Status Offenses	Gambling, disorderly conduct, vagrancy, curfew & loitering law violations, and runaways.																
All Other Offenses	All other offenses (except traffic).																

- *Rate Per 1,000 Youth (Columns C, F, I).* Calculate the arrest rate per 1,000 youth for each offense category and the County’s total juvenile arrest rate for each year. To obtain the rate per 1,000 youth, divide the number of juvenile arrests by the total County youth population (under 18) and multiply by 1,000. Formula 4 is an example of how to calculate the violent offenses arrest rate per 1,000 youth for 2018. For an arrest rate in any given offense category substitute the violent offenses arrests number used in Formula 4 with another offense category (e.g., weapons, property, etc.).

Formula 4.

$$\frac{\text{Number of Violent Offenses Arrests 2018 (A1)}}{\text{Grand Total Youth Population 2018 (Table 2, A3)}} = \frac{\quad}{\quad} \times 1,000 = \text{Violent Arrest Rate 2018 (C1)}$$

- *Percent Change (Column J).* Calculate the percent change in each offense category and the County’s total juvenile arrests between 2018 and 2020 using Formula 2.

Data Checks

- In Table 4, the figures in Rows 1 through 7 should add up to the figure in Row 8 (Grand Total of Juvenile Arrests) for each of the three years (but not for percent change). For example, A1 (#violent) + A2 (#weapons) + A3 (#property) + A4 (#drug/alcohol) + A5 (#special needs) + A6 (#public order & status) + A7 (#all other) = A8 (total juvenile arrests).

Required Data

Juvenile Arrests by Race and Ethnicity for calendar years 2018, 2019 and 2020.

Source

New Jersey State Police (these data are provided by the JJC).

Methods

Table 5. Total County Youth Population compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race

- *Total County Youth Population (Columns A, and D).* Insert your County’s total youth population by Race for 2018 and 2020. Note: For “OTHER”, add American Indian and Asian, then enter the total number of these youth for each year.
- *Juvenile Arrests (Columns B and E).* Insert the number of juvenile arrests by race for each year.
- *Percent of Youth Population Arrested (Columns C and F).* Calculate the percent of the total county youth population that were arrested by Race for each year. To obtain the percent for each race, divide the number of arrests by the youth population number for that race and multiply by 100. Formula 5 is an example of how to calculate the percent of the white youth population arrested in 2018.

Formula 5.

$$\frac{\text{White Juvenile Arrests 2018 (B1)}}{\text{White Youth Population 2018 (A1)}} = \frac{\quad}{\quad} \times 100 = \% \text{ of White Youth Arrested (C1)}$$

Methods
(cont.)

- *Percent Change (Columns G and H).* Calculate the percent change for the County’s total youth population by Race and the County’s juvenile arrests between 2018 and 2020 using Formula 2.

Table 6. Total County Youth Population compared to Juvenile Arrests by Ethnicity

- *Total County Youth Population (Columns A and D).* Insert your County’s total youth population by Ethnicity for 2018 and 2020.
- *Juvenile Arrests (Columns B and E).* Insert the number of juvenile arrests by ethnicity for each year.
- *Percent of Youth Population Arrested (Columns C and F).* Calculate the percent of the county total youth population that were arrested by Ethnicity for each year using Formula 5.
- *Percent Change (Columns G and H).* Calculate the percent change for the County’s total youth population by Ethnicity and the County’s juvenile arrests between 2018 and 2020 using Formula 2.

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

Required Data | Total incidents of violence, vandalism, weapons, and substance abuse 2017-2018 and 2021-2022.

Source | New Jersey Department of Education: New Jersey School Performance Report located at <https://rc.doe.state.nj.us/download>.

Methods | Table 7. Violence, Vandalism, Weapons, and Substances in County Schools

- *Number (Columns A, C).* For *academic year 2021-2022*, enter the number of incidents under each category of violence, vandalism, weapons, and substances in column A. For *academic year 2021-2022*, insert the total number of incidents of violence, vandalism, weapons, and substances in column C.
- *Percent of Total Incidences (Columns B, D).* Calculate the percent of the total incidences for each year. To obtain the percent, divide the number of incidents by the total school based incidences and multiply by 100 using Formula 1.
- *Percent Change (Column C).* Calculate the percent change using Formula 2.

NATURE & EXTENT OF COMMUNITY FACTORS THAT PUT YOUTH AT RISK

ENROLLMENT IN AND DROPOUTS FROM COUNTY SCHOOLS

Required Data*	Total Enrollment, 2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022. Total Dropouts, 2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022.
Source	New Jersey Department of Education: New Jersey School Performance Report located at https://rc.doe.state.nj.us/download .
Methods	<p><i>Table 8. Enrollment in and Dropouts from County Schools</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Insert the total enrollment in and the total dropouts from County schools for each academic year listed. ➤ <i>Percent Change (Column E)</i>. Calculate the percent change for which data are available using Formula 2.

COMMUNITY INDICATORS OF CHILDREN AT RISK

Required Data*	Children Receiving TANF (Welfare), 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022. Children receiving NJ SNAP (formerly food stamps), 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022. Child abuse/neglect substantiations, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021. Birth to adolescents (ages 10-19), 2018, 2019, 2020.
Source	Annie E. Casey Foundation, Kids Count Data Center located at https://datacenter.kidscount.org/data#NJ/5/0/char/0 .
Methods	<p><i>Table 9. Community Indicators of Children at Risk</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Number (Columns A-G)</i>. Insert the number of County children receiving Welfare; the number receiving Food Stamps; the number of proven cases of child abuse and/or neglect; and the number of births to teens for each year indicated. ➤ <i>Percent Change (Column H)</i>. Calculate the percent change over for which data are available for each indicator using Formula 2.

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 male youth population decreased by 1.7% from 18,270 in 2018 to 17,962 in 2020.

The female youth population decreased by 1.8% from 17,938 in 2018 to 17,620 in 2020.

The total youth population decreased by 1.7% from 36,208 in 2018 to 38,582 in 2020.

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.

The White youth population decreased by 2.5% from 25,068 in 2018 to 24,453 in 2020.

The Black youth population decreased by 0.6% from 9,736 in 2018 to 9,673 in 2020.

The Other youth populations increased by 3.7% from 1,404 in 2018 to 1,456 in 2020.

Rank 1 - Other youth populations

Rank 2 - White population

Rank 3 - Black youth population

Changes have been small in size for all three categories. Other youth populations is ranked first because it saw the largest percentage change and because it is the only category that saw an increase in population.

White population was ranked second because it saw the next largest percentage change was the largest percentage change that resulted in a decrease in population. Black population ranked third because it was the smallest percentage change and decreased by less than a percentage point.

While White and Black populations have trended towards a decrease from 2018-2020, Other populations have larger percentage increase than that of the decrease for the White and Black populations.

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 increased by 0.1% from 16,608 in 2018 to 16,632 in 2020.

The Non-Hispanic youth population decreased by 3.3% from 19,600 in 2018 to 18,950 in 2020.

Rank 1 - Non-Hispanic populations

Rank 2 - Hispanic populations

Changes have been small in size for both categories. Non-Hispanic populations ranked first because it saw the largest percentage change, which was a decrease in population. Hispanic populations ranked second because it was changed by only a 0.1% increase.

Both populations have held steady with other youth demographics in the county because populations have either decreased or trended very slightly towards an increase from 2018 to 2020.

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?

Data for youth populations in Cumberland County have trended towards a decrease in population, with the only increase being in the Hispanic and Other youth populations, which were very small increases.

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.

Juvenile arrests have decreased in all offense categories by 39.1% from 422 in 2018 to 257 in 2020.

The percent of juvenile arrests for Violent Offenses increased by 1.6% from 2018 to 2020.

The percent of juvenile arrests for Weapons Offenses decreased by 2.7% from 2018 to 2020.

The percent of juvenile arrests for Property Offenses increased by 4.3% from 2018 to 2020.

The percent of juvenile arrests for Drug/Alcohol Offenses increased by 3.2% from 2018 to 2020.

The percent of juvenile arrests for Special Needs Offenses decreased by 2.2% from 2018 to 2020.

The percent of juvenile arrests for Public Order & Status Offenses decreased by 8.4% from 2018 to 2020.

The percent of juvenile arrests for All Other Offenses increased by 4.3% from 2018 to 2020.

The arrest rate per 1,000 youth decreased by 4.5 from 11.7 in 2018 to 7.2 in 2020.

The arrest rate per 1,000 youth for Violent Offenses decreased by 0.64 from 2018 to 2020.

The arrest rate per 1,000 youth for Weapons Offenses decreased by 0.5 from 2018 to 2020.

The arrest rate per 1,000 youth for Property Offenses decreased by 0.6 from 2018 to 2020.

The arrest rate per 1,000 youth for Drug/Alcohol Offenses decreased by 0.6 from 2018 to 2020.
 The arrest rate per 1,000 youth for Public Order & Status Offenses decreased by 1.4 from 2018 to 2020.
 The arrest rate per 1,000 youth for All Other Offenses decreased by 0.3 from 2018 to 2020.

Overall, youth arrests have decreased largely from 2018 to 2020. All juvenile arrest rates and percentage of arrests have moderately decreased from 2018 to 2020, with the exception of percentage of arrests for Violent, Property and Drug/Alcohol Offenses which have small increases from 2018 to 2020.

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.

Rank 1 - Property Offenses - 67
 Rank 2 - Drug/Alcohol Offenses - 55
 Rank 3 - Violent Offenses - 49
 Rank 4 - All Other Offenses - 47
 Rank 5 - Public Order & Status Offenses - 23
 Rank 6 - Weapons Offenses - 10
 Rank 7 - Special Needs Offenses - 6

Four of the top five categories are related to non-violent offenses and/or victimless (e.g. property, alcohol/drugs, public order). Violent, Weapons and Special Needs Offenses have all decreased from 2018 to 2020 and average a lower ranking in 2020.

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.

Rank 1 - Public Order & Status Offenses, decreased by 68.5%.
 Rank 2 - Special Needs Offenses, decreased by 68.4%.
 Rank 3 - Weapons Offenses, decreased by 64.3%.
 Rank 4 - Violent Offenses, decreased by 33.8%.
 Rank 5 - Drug/Alcohol Offenses, decreased by 28.6%.
 Rank 6 - Property Offenses, decreased by 27.2%.
 Rank 7 - All Other Offenses, decreased by 20.3%.

Three out of the top four categories are considered violent offenses with victims involved. All have largely decreased from 2018 to 2020.

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?

Total arrests have largely decreased for all categories. The most common arrest categories in 2020 (excluding Violent Offenses) are related to non-violent offenses and/or victimless (e.g. property, alcohol/drugs, public order). Violent, Weapons and Special Needs Offenses have all largely decreased from 2018 to 2020.

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.

White youth population was 24,453, 117 arrests, 0.5% of the population.

Black youth population was 9,673, 139 arrests, 1.4% of the population.

Other youth populations was 1,456, 1 arrest, 0.1% of the population.

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.

White youth arrests were 333, 1.3% of the population in 2018. In 2020, arrests were 117, 0.5% of the population.

Black youth arrests were 298, 3.1% of the population in 2018. In 2020, arrests were 139, 1.7% of the population.

Other youth arrests were 1, 0.1% of the population in 2018. In 2020, arrests were 1, 0.1% of the population.

All youth arrests and arrest rates have largely decreased for all races except Other youth populations, which remained the same.

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.

Rank 1 - White youth population decreased by 2.5% from 2018 to 2020 and arrests decreased by 64.9% in that time.

Rank 2 - Black youth population decreased by 0.6% from 2018 to 2020 and arrests decreased by 53.4% in that time.

Rank 3 - Other youth populations increased by 3.7% from 2018 to 2020, and arrests did not change in that time.

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.

Hispanic youth population was 16,632, 84 arrests, 0.5% of the population.

Non-Hispanic youth population was 18,950, 173 arrests, 0.9% of the population

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.

Hispanic youth arrests were 229, 1.4% of the population in 2018. In 2020, arrests were 84, 0.5% of the population.

Non-Hispanic youth arrests were 372, 1.9% of the population in 2018. In 2020, arrests were 173, 0.9% of the population.

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.

Rank 1 - Non-Hispanic youth population decreased by 3.3% from 2018 to 2020 and arrests decreased by 53.5% in that time.

Rank 2 - Hispanic youth population increased by 0.1% from 2018 to 2020 and arrests decreased by 63.3% in that time.

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?

Arrests of Other youth populations did not change 2018 to 2020.

Arrests of the White youth population decreased by 64.9% from 2018 to 2020.

Arrests of the Black youth population decreased by 53.4% from 2018 to 2020.

Arrests of the Hispanic youth population decreased by 63.3% from 2018 to 2020.

Arrests of the Non-Hispanic youth population decreased by 53.5% from 2018 to 2020.

Total juvenile arrests decreased by 59.3% from 2018 to 2020.

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-based incidents has increased by 30.4% from 939 in 2017-2018 to 1,224 in 2021-2022.

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.

Rank 1 - Incidents of Violence, 823.

Rank 2 - Incidents of Substances, 245.

Rank 3 - Incidents of Vandalism, 87.

Rank 4 - Incidents of Weapons, 69.

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.

Rank 1 - Incidents of Substances, increased by 195.2%.

Rank 2 - Incidents of Weapons, increased by 91.7%.

Rank 3 - Incidents of Violence, increased by 14.3%.

Rank 3 - Incidents of Vandalism, decreased by 13%.

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?

School-based incidents have largely increased from 2017-18 to 2021-22. There is a 30.45 increase in Incidents of Substances and Weapons in 2021-2022. There has been shift from a large number of incidents related to Violence and Vandalism in 2017-2018 to now a large number of incidents related to Substances and Violence in 2021-2022.

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.

2019-2020 enrollment totaled 28,106 and dropout rates averaged 1.48 per school.

2020-2021 enrollment totaled 26,890 and dropout rates averaged 1.2 per school.

2021-2022 enrollment totaled 27,304 and dropout rates averaged 2.32 per school.

While enrollment has decreased each year there, has been an overall increase in dropout rates from 2019-2020 to 2021-2022.

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.

- Rank 1 - Children receiving TANF (Welfare), 594 in 2022. Decrease of 43% from 2018.
- Rank 2 - Child abuse/neglect substantiations, 3,359 in 2021. Decrease of 11% from 2018.
- Rank 3 - Children receiving NJ SNAP, 12,987 in 2022. Decrease of 3% from 2018.
- Rank 4 - Births to adolescents (ages 10-19), 122 in 2020. Decrease of 1% from 2018.

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?

The Municiple Alliance Plan addresses the following domains: Community Environment, Family Environment, Drug and Alcohol Misuse, and School Environment. The YSC Administrator is a member of the County Alliance Steering Committee and YSC program information is shared with the Alliance Coordinator. The County Alliance Strategic Plan is addressing substance abuse prevention programming in Bridgeton, Millville, Vineland, and 11 other townships.

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?

Although enrollment has had a small decrease from 2017-2022 and dropout rates have had a small increase, the indicators of Children at risk (e.g. TANF, abuse neglect substantiations, NJ SNAP, Births to adolescents) have all seen a moderate to large decreases. This demonstrates how the nature of community factors change over time, while one decreases, the other increases.

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?

The 2020 County HSAC Needs Assessment has been reviewed and based on interviews and focus groups within the assessment, two priority areas emerged that are risk factors for youth. These being Community Safety (including afterschool care) and Mental Health Services (including mentoring). It would be reasonable for the YSC to continue to build and expand on prevention programming that has already been implemented. An expansion of services that include third spaces, employment, training and mentoring could all have a positive impact for youth in the prevention continuum.

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	Lack of Mentoring / Life Skills / Community Recreation Programs and Safe Spaces / Employment and Training.	While juvenile arrests decreased by 59.3% from 2018 to 2020, the number of incidents reported in schools of substances, weapons and violence have largely increased (35.5%) from 2017-2018 to 2021-2022. This indicates that while youth are not being arrested as often, there is a large need for community-based prevention programming.	Community-based programming that addresses the underlying causes of violence and substance use by providing youth with education, mentoring, positive role models, safe spaces (third spaces), and employment and training opportunities.
B			
C			
D			
E			
F			
G			

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

Comments:

DIVERSION

(Law Enforcement, Family Crisis Intervention Unit, and Family Court)

- Definition & Rationale
- Required Data & Methodology
- Data Worksheets
- Analysis Questions

DIVERSION DEFINITION & RATIONALE

Diversion is a broad term referring to “exit ramps” that move young people away from the juvenile legal system, offering alternatives to arrest and alternatives to prosecution. The goal of diversion programming is to target the underlying problems that led to the alleged delinquency behavior in the first place. By addressing the root causes of community instability diversion programs help improve long-term community safety. 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 developing diversion programs that include strategies to address the issues leading to delinquency, including restorative strategies for mitigating harm and increasing healing.

Diversion Process

In New Jersey, juveniles are dealt with informally through one or more of the following: Law Enforcement Station House Adjustments (Attorney General Directive 2020-12), Family Crisis Intervention Units (FCIU), Family Court Juvenile Conference Committees, or Family Court Intake Service Conferences.

Diversion Programs

Diversion programs are the activities young people are required to perform to avoid a formal arrest or to avoid a formal prosecution. Diversion programs may be operated by a law enforcement agency, the court, or by a contracted service provider.

The diversion data describe trends in the extent and nature of cases diverted in your county. This information will help counties begin to make informed decisions regarding the allocation of resources to diversion programming. When reviewing these data, note any differences in the use of diversion by race. Planning should include ways to level the playing field so that all youth, regardless of race, have an equal opportunity for diversion. The Comprehensive Plan requires only a small portion of the data that could potentially be collected at the County or municipal level.

**DIVERSION
REQUIRED DATA & METHODOLOGY**

- All data are county-specific unless otherwise indicated.
- Round all percentages to one decimal place.
- Cells in the data tables are identified with a letter/number combination, where the letter identifies the column and the number identifies the row (e.g., A1 = Column A, Row 1).

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Required Data	Law Enforcement Station House Adjustment Data for calendar years 2018, and 2022 or most recent data available.
Source	Local police departments
Methods	Counties to reach out to municipal police departments for Station House Adjustment data.

FAMILY CRISIS INTERVENTION UNIT (FCIU)

Required Data	Total FCIU cases by category, petitions filed, and referral types for calendar years 2018, 2021, and 2022.
Source	Administrative Office of the Courts, 2018, 2021, and 2022 (JJC will provide these data to the Counties).
Methods	<p><u>Table 1. FCIU Caseload by Category</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Number (Columns B, D, F).</i> Insert the number of cases that comprised each category of the County’s FCIU caseload and the total number of cases for each year. ➤ <i>Percent of Total Caseload (Columns C, E, G).</i> Calculate each category’s percent of the County’s total FCIU cases for each year. To obtain the percent, divide the number of cases in each category by the total caseload and multiply by 100 (use Formula 1). <p><u>Formula 1.</u></p> $\frac{\text{Number Caseload by Category 2018 (A1)}}{\text{Total Caseload 2018 (A6)}} = \text{---} \times 100 = \text{\% of Total Caseload (B1)}$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Percent Change (Columns H&I).</i> Calculate the percent change in each category and the County’s total FCIU cases between 2018 and 2022 (use Formula 2).

Methods
(cont.)

Formula 2.

$$\frac{\text{Most Recent Year \# (2022)} - \text{Prior Year \# (2018)}}{\text{Prior Year \# (2018)}} = \underline{\quad} \times 100 = \text{\% Change 2018-2022}$$

Table 2. FCIU Petitions Filed by Petition Type

- *Number (Columns B, D, F).* Insert the number of cases that comprised each petition type and the total number of petitions filed for each year.
- *Percent of Total Petitions Filed (Columns C, E, G).* Calculate the percent of the petitions filed, for the types of petitions that can be filed, for each year. To obtain the percent, divide the number of petitions filed by the County’s total petitions filed and multiply by 100 (use Formula 1).
- *Percent Change (Columns H&I).* Calculate the percent change in the two types of petitions indicated and the County’s total petitions filed between 2018 and 2022 (use Formula 2).

Table 3a. FCIU Referrals by Referral type

- *Number (Columns A, C, E).* Insert the number of cases that comprised each referral type and the total number of petitions filed for each year.

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

- *Referrals to Court (Columns B&C and E&F).* Insert the number of referrals to court by race for each year.
- *Percent of Change (Columns H and I).* Calculate the percent change by Race for each year. To obtain the percent for each race, between 2018 and 2022 use Formula 2).

Table 3c. Total Referrals (New Filings) to Juvenile Court compared to Juvenile Arrest by Race/Ethnicity.

- *Total Juvenile Arrest (Columns B, and E).* Insert your County's total arrest by Race for 2018 and 2020. Note: For "OTHER", add American Indian and Asian, then enter the total number of these youth for each year.
- *Referrals to Court (Columns C and F).* Insert the number of referrals to court by race for each year.
- *Percent of Change (Columns C and F).* Calculate the percent of arrest referred to court by Race for each year. To obtain the percent for each race, divide the number of arrests by the referrals to court for that race and multiply by 100. Formula 1 is an example of how to calculate the percent of the white youth population arrested in 2018.
- *Percent of Change (Columns H and I).* Calculate the percent change by Race for each year. To obtain the percent for each race, between 2018 and 2022 use Formula 2).

Data Checks

- In *Table 1*, the figures in Row 1 through Row 6 should add up to the figure in Row 7 for each of the three years (but not for percent change). In *Table 3*, the figures in Row 1 and Row 2 should add up to the figure in Row 3 for each of the three years (but not for percent change). In *Table 4*, the figures in Row 1 through Row 3 should add up to the figure in Row 4 for each of the three years (but not for percent change).
- For example, *Table 2*, A1 (juveniles/family crisis) + A2 (out-of-home) = A3 (total petitions filed), and B1 (% juveniles/family crisis) + B2 (% out-of-home) = 100% (total petitions filed).

Counties with merged FCIU and Mobile response Units should reach out to their respective providers and request below data for calendar years 2018 and 2022.

- Total number of cases
- Total number of cases by race/ethnicity

If this data is not available, when completing the Diversion Analysis Question's section Family Crisis Intervention/Mobile Response Merged Units state the reason why.

FAMILY COURT

Required Data	Total juveniles diverted from Family Court for calendar years 2018 and 2022.
Source	Administrative Office of the Courts, 2018 and 2022 (JJC will provide data to the Counties).
Methods	<p><u>Table 4a. Total Juvenile Cases Diverted by Race/Ethnicity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Number (Columns B, C).</i> Insert the total number of juveniles diverted for each year. ➤ <i>Percent Change (Columns H&I).</i> Calculate the percent change in the County’s total juveniles diverted between 2018 and 2022 (use Formula 2). <p><u>Table 4b. Total Juvenile Cases Diverted compared to Juvenile Arrest by Race/Ethnicity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Juvenile Arrest (Columns B and E).</i> Insert the number of juvenile arrests for 2018 and 2022. *Note for “Other”, add Asian Pacific Islander, American Indian, Alaskan Native and Other, then insert the total number of these youth for each year. ➤ <i>Cases Diverted (Columns C and F).</i> Insert the number of referrals to Juvenile Court for each race/ethnicity for 2018 and 2022. ➤ <i>Percent of Arrest Diverted (Columns D and G).</i> Calculate the percent of arrest to referrals to court by race/ethnicity for each year using Formula 2. ➤ <i>Percent Change (Column H, I).</i> Calculate the percent change for juvenile arrest and cases diverted f between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 1.

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.
FCIU Caseload, FCIU Petitions, FCIU Referrals data from the Administrative Office of the Courts.
Total Juvenile Cases diverted and Juvenile arrests from the Administrative Office of the Courts.
2. Describe the use of stationhouse adjustments by police in 2018 and in 2022 or in the most recent year.
Overall stationhouse adjustments in the county were 106 in 2018 and 229 in 2022.
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.
*county police departments do not collect information on Race and Ethnicity for Stationhouse adjustments so an accurate percentage cannot be given.
Stationhouse adjustments increased by 116% from 106 in 2018 to 229 in 2022.
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 use of stationhouse adjustments by law enforcement largely increased from 2018 to 2022 in the county.

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.

Serious threat to the wellbeing/physical safety of juvenile decreased by 92% from 263 in 2018 to 21 in 2022.

Serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile decreased by 26% from 146 in 2018 to 108 in 2022.

Unauthorized absence by a juvenile for more than 24 hours remained the same in 2018 and 2022 with 10.

Truancy increased by 112% from 25 in 2018 to 53 in 2022.

Disorderly/Petty Disorderly Persons offense diverted to FCIU increased by 3,500% from 1 in 2018 to 36 in 2022.

Other categories decreased by 94.7% from 606 in 2018 to 32 in 2022.

Total FCIU caseload decreased by 75.3% from 1,051 in 2018 to 260 in 2022.

2022 Ranks-

Rank 1 - Serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile, 108 cases.

Rank 2 - Truancy, 53 cases.

Rank 3 - Disorderly/Petty Disorderly Persons offense diverted to FCIU, 36 cases.

Rank 4 - Other cases, 32 cases

Rank 5 - Serious threat to the wellbeing/physical safety of juvenile, 21 cases.

Rank 6 - Unauthorized absence by a juvenile for more than 24 hours, 10 cases.

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.

Rank 1 - Disorderly/Petty Disorderly Persons offense diverted to FCIU largely increased by 3,500%.

Rank 2 - Truancy largely increased by 112%.

Rank 3 - Other cases largely decreased by 94.7%.

Rank 4 - Serious threat to the wellbeing/physical safety of juvenile largely decreased by 92%.

Rank 5 - Serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile moderately decreased by 26%.

Rank 6 - Unauthorized absence by a juvenile for more than 24 hours did not change.

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 has largely decreased from 2018 to 2022 but some categories have seen still seen large increases in cases.

Serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile is by far the most prevalent issue and

only saw a moderate decrease from 2018 to 2022. Truancy is the second most prevalent issue and saw a large increase from 2018 to 2022. Disorderly/Petty Disorderly Persons offense diverted to FCIU astronomically increased from 1 in 2018 to 36 in 2022.

➤ **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.

Overall petitions filed increased by 25% from 4 in 2018 to 5 in 2022.

Juvenile/Family Crisis petitions increased from 0 in 2018 to 2 in 2022.

Out-of-Home petitions decreased from 4 in 2018 to 3 in 2022.

2022 Ranks-

Rank 1 - Out-of-Home petitions 3.

Rank 2 - Juvenile/Family Crisis petitions 4.

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.

Rank 1 - Juvenile/Family Crisis petitions increased from 0 in 2018 to 2 in 2020.

Rank 2 - Out-of-Home petitions decreased by 25%.

Small change occurred as Juvenile/Family Crisis petitions gained 2 cases in 2022 and Out-of-Home petitions lost 1 case in 2022.

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?

Overall, petitions filed increased by 1 from 2018 to 2022.

There has been a small change with Juvenile/Family Crisis petitions increasing and Out-of-Home petitions decreasing.

➤ **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.

Total FCIU referrals decreased by 80.9% from 585 in 2018 to 112 in 2022.

Referrals made to DYFS (DCP&P) decreased by 66.7% from 36 in 2018 to 12 in 2022.
 Referrals made to Substance Abuse Programs increased by 500% from 1 in 2018 to 6 in 2022.
 Referrals made to Other Outside Agencies decreased by 82.8% from 548 in 2018 to 94 in 2022.

2022 Rank -

Rank 1 - Referrals made to Other Outside Agencies, 94 referrals.

Rank 2 - Referrals made to DYFS (DCP&P), 12 referrals.

Rank 3 - Referrals made to Substance Abuse Programs, 6 referrals.

Referrals made to Other Outside Agencies have a much larger number of referrals and is also a much broader category.

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.
 Total FCIU referrals decreased by 80.9% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 1 - Referrals made to Substance Abuse Programs increased by 500% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 2 - Referrals made to Other Outside Agencies decreased by 82.8% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 3 - Referrals made to DYFS decreased by 66.7% from 2018 to 2022.

All referrals had large changes with DYFS (DCP&P) and Other outside Agencies decreasing significantly.

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?
 Total FCIU referrals had a large decrease from 2018 to 2022. Referrals to Substance Abuse Programs had a large increase and was the only category that had an increase from 2018 to 2022.

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.
 Merged data was not shared by FCIU/Mobile response team provider.

15. Describe the FCIU/mobile response caseload in 2018 and in 2022, or in the most recent year.
Merged data was not shared by FCIU/Mobile response team provider.

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.

Merged data was not shared by FCIU/Mobile response team provider.

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?

Merged data was not shared by FCIU/Mobile response team provider.

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.

Total referrals to Juvenile Court decreased by 95.3% from 253 in 2018 to 12 in 2022.

White youth referrals decreased by 95.2% from 63 in 2018 to 3 in 2022.

Black youth referrals decreased by 98.4% from 126 in 2018 to 2 in 2022.

Hispanic youth referrals decreased by 89.5% from 57 in 2018 to 6 in 2022.

Other youth referrals decreased by 85.7% from 7 in 2018 to 1 in 2022.

2022 Rank -

Rank 1 - Hispanic youth, 6 referrals.

Rank 2 - White youth, 3 referrals.

Rank 3 - Black youth, 2 referrals.

Rank 4 - Other youth, 1 referral.

Hispanic youth ranked first and had two times the number of referrals than any other race.

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.

Total referrals to Juvenile Court decreased by 95.3% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 1 - Black youth referrals decreased by 98.4% from 2018 to 2022.

- Rank 2 - White youth referrals decreased by 95.2% from 2018 to 2022.
 Rank 3 - Hispanic youth referrals decreased by 89.5% from 2018 to 2022.
 Rank 4 - Other youth referrals decreased by 85.7% from 2018 to 2022.

All categories had a large decrease in referrals from 2018 to 2022, with all changes being 85% and over.

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?

All categories had a large decrease in referrals from 2018 to 2022, with all changes being 85% and over. Hispanic youth made up 22.5% of total referrals in 2018 and had an increase to 50% of total referrals in 2022. Black youth made up 49.8% of total referrals in 2018 and had a decrease to 16.7% of total referrals in 2022. White and Other youth had small increases in percent of total 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 arrests referred to court decreased by 30% from 253 in 2018 to 177 in 2020.
 White youth arrests referred to court decreased by 28.6% from 63 in 2018 to 45 in 2020.
 Black youth arrests referred to court decreased by 30.2% from 126 in 2018 to 88 in 2020.
 Hispanic youth arrests referred to court decreased by 28.1% from 57 in 2018 to 41 in 2020.
 Other youth arrests referred to court decreased by 57.1% from 7 in 2018 to 3 in 2020.

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.

Overall arrests referred to court decreased by 30% from 253 in 2018 to 177 in 2020.
 Rank 1 - Other youth arrests referred to court decreased by 57.1% from 2018 to 2020.
 Rank 2 - Black youth arrests referred to court decreased by 30.2% from 2018 to 2020.
 Rank 3 - White youth arrests referred to court decreased by 28.6% from 2018 to 2020.
 Rank 4 - Hispanic youth arrests referred to court decreased by 28.1% from 2018 to 2020.

All categories had a moderate to large percentage decrease from 2018 to 2020. Black, White and Hispanic referrals all dropped at nearly the same rate.

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?

All categories had moderate decreases in referrals from 2018 to 2020, with all changes being between 28.1% and 57.1%. Other youth had the largest decrease in percentage of referrals with a 57.1% decrease from 2018 to 2020. Black, White and Hispanic youth all had a moderate decrease in percentage of referrals from between 28.1% and 30.2%.

Referrals and arrests decreased at nearly the same rate for all categories from 2018 to 2020, while juvenile arrests decreased by 59.3% overall, the percentage of arrests to court only decreased by 30%.

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.

Overall cases diverted decreased by 78.5% from 107 in 2018 to 23 in 2022.
 White youth cases diverted decreased by 76% from 25 in 2018 to 6 in 2022.
 Black youth cases diverted decreased by 69.1% from 55 in 2018 to 17 in 2022.
 Hispanic youth cases diverted decreased by 100% from 25 in 2018 to 0 in 2022.
 Other youth cases diverted decreased by 100% from 2 in 2018 to 0 in 2022.

2022 Rank-

Rank 1 - Hispanic youth cases diverted decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.
 Rank 1 - Other youth cases diverted decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.
 Rank 2 - White youth cases diverted decreased by 78.5% from 2018 to 2022.
 Rank 3 - Black youth cases diverted decreased by 69.1% from 2018 to 2022.

All categories decreased largely from 2018 to 2022 with Hispanic and Other youth decreasing 100% (0 cases diverted), while White and Black youth decreases were less, between 78.5% and 69.1%.

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.

Overall cases diverted decreased by 78.5% from 107 in 2018 to 23 in 2022.

Rank 1 - Hispanic youth cases diverted decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 1 - Other youth cases diverted decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 2 - White youth cases diverted decreased by 78.5% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 3 - Black youth cases diverted decreased by 69.1% from 2018 to 2022.

All categories decreased largely from 2018 to 2022. Hispanic and Other youth had the largest decreases with White and Black youth following by a moderate margin.

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?

Only White and Black youth cases were diverted in 2022. No Hispanic or Other youth cases were diverted in 2022.

All categories decreased largely from 2018 to 2022. Hispanic and Other youth cases diverted decreased at the same rate from 2018 to 2022 and White and Black youth cases diverted decreased at similar rates from 2018 to 2022.

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.

Overall cases diverted was 16.9% in 2018 and 8.9% in 2020.

White youth cases diverted was 7.5% in 2018 and 5.1% in 2020.

Black youth cases diverted was 18.5% in 2018 and 12.2% in 2020.

Hispanic youth cases diverted was 10.9% in 2018 and 0% in 2020.

Other youth cases diverted was 200% in 2018 and 0% in 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.

Overall cases diverted decreased by 78.5% from 2018 to 2020.

Rank 1 - Hispanic youth cases diverted decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2020.

Rank 1 - Other youth cases diverted decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2020.

Rank 2 - White youth cases diverted decreased by 76% from 2018 to 2020.

Rank 3 - Black youth cases diverted decreased by 69.1% from 2018 to 2020.

All categories decreased largely from 2018 to 2020. Hispanic and Other youth cases diverted decreased at the same rate from 2018 to 2020 and White and Black youth cases diverted decreased at similar rates 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?

Only White and Black youth cases were diverted in 2020. No Hispanic or Other youth cases were diverted in 2020.

All categories decreased largely from 2018 to 2020. Hispanic and Other youth cases diverted decreased at the same rate from 2018 to 2020 and White and Black youth cases diverted decreased at similar rates from 2018 to 2020.

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?

The use of stationhouse adjustments by law enforcement increased by 116% from 2018 to 2022. With this rapid expansion, it is crucial for ample availability of suitable programming to be made available in the county as well as awareness of programs to be increased for juvenile officers and police chaplains to make referrals. Information regarding race and stationhouse adjustments are not recorded and are unable to be used with the data. All youth need to be given equal access and opportunity to programs offered for stationhouse adjustments. It is important that programming is offered in all areas of of the county (e.g. rural, urban, etc.) to ensure equal access to all county youth. It will be important to offer transportation opportunities whenever possible as a way to decrease barriers.

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?

Merged data was not shared by FCIU/Mobile response team provider.

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?

Family court diversion referrals decreased by 78.5% from 2018 to 2022. While there is still a need for diversionary programs related to family court referrals, the need has dramitically decreased. Only White and Black youth were referred in 2022. It is important that programming is offered in all areas of of the county (e.g. rural, urban, etc.) to ensure equal access to all county youth. It will be important to offer transportation oppourtintes whenever possible as a way to decrease barriers.

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?

Diversion referrals have changed at very similar rates for youth of all races and ethnicities throughout the county from 2018 to 2022. It is important that programming is offered in all areas of the county (e.g. rural, urban, etc.) to ensure equal access to all county youth. It will be important to offer transportation opportunities whenever possible as a way to decrease barriers.

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	Increased need for programming addressing mentoring, weapons, innapropriate behavior (e.g. sexting, interent safety and substances).	Stationhouse adjustments increased by 116% from 106 in 2018 to 229 in 2022.	Increase juvenile officer and police chaplain awareness of under-utilized existing services as well as continue to offer and expand on mentoring, counseling and educational programming that addresses weapons, sexting and substances. Collaboration with the county Prosecutor's Office, local police departments and various county coalitions are all integral components of increased success of SHA programming.
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 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	Increased need for programming addressing mentoring, weapons, innapropriate behavior (e.g. sexting, interent safety and substances).	Although the county FCIU caseload decreased by 75.3% from 2018 to 2022, there were still 260 youth cases in 2022. The highest number of cases were related to issues regarding Serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile (108 cases), Truancy (53 cases), and Disorderly/Petty Disorderly Persons offense diverted to FCIU (36 cases).	Continue to offer and expand variety of mentoring, counseling and educational programming that addresses weapons, sexting and substances with increased emphasis on family engagement to decrease risk factors for youth.
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	Need for programming addressing mentoring, weapons, innapropriate behavior (e.g. sexting, interent safety and substances).	Although Family Court cases diverted have decreased by 78.5% from 2018 to 2022, there is still a need for diversion programming as 23 youth were diverted in 2022.	Continue to offer and expand variety of mentoring, counseling and educational programming that addresses weapons, sexting and substances with increased emphasis on family engagment.
B			
C			
D			
E			
F			
G			

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

Comments:

DETENTION

- Definition & Rationale
- Required Data & Methodology
- Data Worksheets
- Analysis Questions

DETENTION/DETENTION ALTERNATIVE DEFINITION & RATIONALE

The detention decision making point includes 1) police referral for detention, 2) court remands to detention, and 3) the issuance of warrants requiring detention placement/due to technical violations.

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

The statutory detention criteria require a finding that the young person poses 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).” Counties may plan to use a limited amount of funding to support court ordered evaluations for adjudicated youth who reside in the detention center, only when all other resources are exhausted.

Detention alternative programs provide community supervision to juveniles who would otherwise be placed in a secure detention facility, while awaiting final disposition of their case. Detention alternative programs expand the continuum of programming options for Family Intake decisionmakers and for the court. Detention alternative programs are not to be provided in the detention center. The 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. They provide short-term (30 – 60 days) community supervision to ensure that youth remain arrest free and attend court hearings until the final disposition of their case. As such, these programs help to safely reduce the detention population and eliminate the trauma of secure detention placement on young people, particularly youth of color.

Detention data describe the number of juveniles placed in detention, the characteristics of detained juveniles, and the types of alleged charges/technical violations for which they are detained. By understanding the use of secure detention and the characteristics of the detained population, planners can better identify the continuum of detention alternative programs needed in their counties. As such, counties will be better equipped to make informed decisions regarding the allocation of resources to detention alternative programs.

**DETENTION
REQUIRED DATA & METHODOLOGY**

- All data are county-specific unless otherwise indicated.
- Round all percentages to one decimal place.
- Cells in the data tables are identified with a letter/number combination, where the letter identifies the column and the number identifies the row (e.g., A1 = Column A, Row 1).

DETENTION

Required Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Number of juveniles admitted to the county detention center in 2018, 2021, and 2022, by gender and race/ethnicity. ➤ Number of referrals to juvenile court (new complaints docketed) in 2018, and 2022, by race/ethnicity. ➤ Average daily population in detention in 2018, 2021, and 2022. ➤ Most serious current offense for juveniles admitted to detention in 2018, 2021, and 2022, by type and by degree (see note below under Sources). ➤ Municipality of residence for juveniles admitted to detention in 2018, 2021, and 2022 (see note below under Sources). ➤ Age of juveniles admitted to detention in 2018, 2021, and 2022 (see note below under Sources). ➤ Juveniles admitted to YSC-funded detention alternatives, by gender, race/ethnicity, and age (2018, 2021, 2022), and also problem areas, service interventions needed, and service interventions provided (2018, 2021, and 2022).
Sources	<p>Juvenile Justice Commission: <i>New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) Annual Data Report, 2018 – 2022</i>.</p> <p>Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Case Tracking System.</p> <p>Data collected locally (non-JDAI sites).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ NOTE: The figures should not include youth admitted to commitment program status, in counties where this distinction is applicable. For offense type, use the following categories:

Sources
(Cont.)

- Homicide
- Kidnapping
- Carjacking
- Sex Offense
- Robbery
- Assault
- Arson
- Weapons
- Terroristic Threats
- Eluding
- Burglary
- Theft
- Resisting Arrest/Hindering Apprehension
- CDS/Drug Offenses
- Other Persons Offenses
- Other Property Offenses
- Other Public Order Offenses
- Violation of Probation (VOP)
- Failure to Appear (FTA)
- Violation of a Detention Alternative
- Violation of Other Court Order (VOCO)/
Other Violation

Methods

Table 1. Juvenile Detention Admissions by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

- *Male (Columns B, E, H).* From the JJC “Data for Detention Section of Comprehensive Plan” report, insert the number of male admissions by race for each year.
- *Female (Columns C, F, I).* From the JJC “Data for Detention Section of Comprehensive Plan” report, insert the number of female admissions by race for each year.
- *Total (Columns D, G, J).* Add the number of male and female admissions to get the total number of admissions by race for each year; totals can also be found in the JJC source report provided.
- *Percent Change (Column K, L, M).* Calculate the percent change for each race by gender and the overall total percentage change by race from 2018 to 2022 using Formula 1.

Formula 1.

$$\frac{\text{Most Recent Year \# (2022)} - \text{Prior Year \# (2018)}}{\text{Prior Year \# (2018)}} = \underline{\hspace{1cm}} \times 100 = \text{\% Change}_{2018-2022}$$

Table 2. Juvenile Detention Admissions compared to Referrals to Juvenile Court by Race/Ethnicity

- *Referrals (New Complaints Docketed) to Juvenile Court (Columns B and E).* Using the AOC report provided, insert the number of referrals to juvenile court for 2018 and 2022. *Note for “Other”, add Asian Pacific Islander, American Indian, Alaskan Native and Other, then insert the total number of these youth for each year.
- *Detention Admissions (Columns C and F).* Using the JJC “Data for Detention Section of Comprehensive Plan” report (or referring back to Table 1), insert the number of detention admissions for each race/ethnicity for 2018 and 2022.

Methods
(Cont.)

- *Percent of Referrals (New Complaints Docketed) to Juvenile Court Admitted to Detention (Columns D and G).* Calculate the percent of referrals (new complaints docketed) to juvenile court that were admitted to detention by race/ethnicity for each year using Formula 2.
- *Percent Change (Column H&I and J&K).* Calculate the percent change for referrals (new complaints docketed) to juvenile court and detention admissions between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 1.

Formula 2.

$$\frac{\text{White Juveniles Admitted to Detention 2018 (C1)}}{\text{White Juveniles Referred to Court 2018 (B1)}} = \frac{\quad}{\quad} \times 100 = \% \text{ of Referrals Admitted to Detention (D1)}$$

Table 3. Juvenile Detention Length of Stay, Daily Population and Capacity Utilization

- *Number (Columns A, B).* From the JJC “Data for Detention Section of Comprehensive Plan” report, insert the average daily population in detention for 2018, 2021, and 2022.
- *Percent Change (Column C).* Calculate the percent change in average daily population from 2018 to 2022 using Formula 1.

Detention Alternative Programs (Alternatives to Detention (ATD))

Table 4. Juvenile Detention Alternative Program Population

- *Number (Columns B C).* Insert the average daily population and average monthly admissions for each year.
- *Percent Change (Columns H/I).* Calculate the percent change in the County’s between 2018 and 2022 (use Formula 1).

Table 5. Juvenile Detention Alternatives ALOS by Race/ Ethnicity

- *Number (Columns B C).* Insert the average length of stay by race and ethnicity for each year.
- *Percent Change (Columns H/I).* Calculate the percent change in the County’s between 2018 and 2022 (use Formula 1).

Table 6. Juvenile Detention Alternatives Program Outcomes ALOS by Race/ Ethnicity

- *Number (Columns B C).* Insert the program outcomes for each year.
- *Percent Change (Columns H/I).* Calculate the percent change in the County's between 2018 and 2022 (use Formula 1).

**Data
Checks**

In Table 1, the figures in Row 1 through Row 4 should add up to the figure in Row 5 for each of the three years. For example, A1 (White) + A2 (Black) + A3 (Hispanic) + A4 (Other) = A5 (Total Admissions).

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.

Total detention admissions were 41 in 2022.

White detention admissions were 26 in 2022.

Black detention admissions were 6 in 2022.

Hispanic detention admissions were 9 in 2022.

Other detention admissions were 0 in 2022.

Male detention admissions were 35 in 2022.

Female detention admissions were 6 in 2022.

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.

Total detention admissions decreased by 6.8% from 2018 to 2022.

White detention admissions increased by 1,200% from 2 in 2018 to 26 in 2022.

Black detention admissions decreased by 78.6% from 28 in 2018 to 6 in 2022.

Hispanic detention admissions decreased by 35.7% from 14 in 2018 to 9 in 2022.

Other detention admissions did not change (0) from 2018 to 2022.

Male detention admissions decreased by 16.7% from 42 in 2018 to 35 in 2022.

Female detention admissions increased by 200% from 2 in 2018 to 6 in 2022.

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.

Rank 1 - White male, 900% increase.

Rank 2 - White female, 600% increase.

Rank 3 - Black female, 100% decrease.

Rank 4 - Hispanic female, 100% decrease.

Rank 5 - Black male, 77.8% decrease.

Rank 6 - Hispanic male, 33.8% decrease.

Rank 7 - Other male and female, no change.

White male and female admissions increased largely while all other categories decreased largely.

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?

White detention admissions made up over 63% of total admissions for 2022. All race and gender admissions have decreased largely from 2018 to 2022 with the exception of white male and female admissions which have increased largely.

➤ **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.

Total referrals to court decreased by 95.3% from 2018 to 2022.

Total detention admissions decreased by 6.8% from 2018 to 2022.

Note: gender data was not available.

Rank 1 - Black youth referrals decreased by 98.4% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 2 - White youth referrals decreased by 95.2% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 3 - Hispanic youth referrals decreased by 89.5% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 4 - Other youth referrals decreased by 85.7% from 2018 to 2022.
All category referrals decreased largely from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 1 - White youth detention admissions increased by 1,200% from 2018 to 2022.
Rank 2 - Black youth detention admissions decreased by 78.6% from 2018 to 2022.
Rank 3 - Hispanic youth detention admissions decreased by 35.7% from 2018 to 2022.
Rank 4 - Other youth detention admissions did not change (0) from 2018 to 2022.

White youth admissions increased largely while all other categories decreased largely from 2018 to 2022.

Referrals to court and detention admissions decreased at similar rates for all races except White youth who had a large decrease in referrals to court and a large increase in detention admissions.

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?

White detention admissions made up over 63% of total admissions for 2022. All race and gender admissions have decreased largely from 2018 to 2022 with the exception of white male and female admissions which have increased largely.

Referrals to court were only 12 in 2022. There were more admissions to detention than referrals to court in 2022.

All category referrals to court decreased by 85% or more from 2018 to 2022. Referrals to court largely decreased for all races from 2018 to 2022 and detention admissions largely decreased for all races from 2018 to 2022 except for White youth had an increase in detention admissions by 1,200%.

➤ **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.
The overall average daily population was 7.9 in 2022.
8. Using the data in Table 3, (% Change 2018-2022 column), describe the total change in ADP between 2018 and 2022.
The overall average daily population increased by 88.1% from 2018 to 2022.
9. Using the data in Table 3, describe the overall Average Length of Stay (ALOS) 2022.
The overall average length of stay was 62.9 in 2022.

10. Using the data in Table 3, (% Change 2018-2022 column), describe the total percent change in ALOS between 2018 and 2022.

The overall average length of stay increased by 132.1% from 2018 to 2022.

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?

The overall average length of stay and overall average daily population have increased largely from 2018 to 2022.

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.

Rank 1 - Bridgeton, 17 youth, 41.5% of total detained youth.

Rank 2 - Vineland, 10 youth, 24.4% of total detained youth.

Rank 3 - Millville, 9 youth, 22% of total detained youth.

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.

The average age of detention admission in 2022 was 16.2 and median age was 17.

Rank 1 - 15 years old, 12 admissions, 29.3% of total.

Rank 2 - 16 years old, 11 admissions, 26.8% of total.

Rank 3 - 17 years old, 10 admissions, 24.45 of total.

Rank 4 - 14 years old, 7 admissions, 17.1% of total.

Rank 5 - 18 years old, 1 admission, 2.4% of total.

Ages 15, 16 and 17 made up large portions of the total while ages 14 and 18 made up smaller portions.

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.

Rank 1 - 2-Possession of Firearm, Explosives, or Destructive Device, 9 offenses, 22% of total.

Rank 2 - 1-Robbery, 7 offenses, 17.1% of total.

Rank 3 - Violation of Detention Alternative/Alternative Custody, 6 offenses, 14.6% of total.

Rank 4 - 2-Robbery, 5 offenses, 12.2% of total.

Rank 5 - 1-Murder, Attempted Murder, Conspiracy to Commit Murder, 4 offenses, 9.8% of total.

Rank 6 - Violation of Probation, 3 offenses, 7.3% of total.

Rank 6 - FTA, 3 offenses, 7.3% of total.

Rank 7 - Violation of a Court Order, 2 offenses, 4.9% of total.

Rank 8 - 1-Carjacking, 1 offense, 2.4% of total.

Rank 8 - 3-Terroristic Threats, 1 offense, 2.4% of total.

The majority of Most Current Serious Offenses in 2022 consisted of Weapons, Robbery and Violation of Detention Alternative/Alternative Custody offenses.

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.

Rank 1 - 2nd degree, 14 offenses, 34.1% of total.

Rank 1 - N/A No Delinquency, 14 offenses, 34.1% of total

Rank 2 - 1st degree, 12 offenses, 29.3% of total.

Rank 3 - 3rd degree, 1 offense, 2.4% of total.

1st, 2nd and N/A offenses made up similar portions of the total offense degree percentage. 3rd degree was the outlier with 1 offense in 2022.

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.

The municipality of Bridgeton consisted of the largest number of detention admissions. Ages 15, 16 and 17 made up the large majority of total detention admissions. Weapons, Robbery and Violation of Detention Alternative/Alternative Custody offenses made up the large majority of Most Serious Current Offenses. 1st, 2nd and N/A offenses made up 97.6% of all offenses.

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 overall average daily detention alternative population was 6.5 in 2022.

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.

The overall average daily detention alternative population increased by 1.6% from 2018 to 2022.

The overall average daily admissions increased by 34.6% from 2018 to 2022.

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?

Monthly admissions had a moderate increase in 2022 while average daily population continued to track near the historical average. Monthly admissions have continued to increase since 2018 while average daily population had nearly no change.

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.

The overall average length of stay was 189 in 2022.

White average length of stay was 85 in 2022.

Black average length of stay was 64 in 2022.

Hispanic average length of stay was 40 in 2022

Other average length of stay was 0 in 2022.

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 total average length of stay increased by 134.9% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 1 - White average length of stay increased by 174.8% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 2 - Hispanic average length of stay increased by 136.5% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 3 - Black average length of stay increased by 96% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 4 - Other average length of stay did not change (0) from 2018 to 2022.

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?

White average length of stay was larger than that of all other races in 2022. White average length of stay increased by the largest amount from 2018 to 2022. Hispanic average length of stay increased by the second largest amount from 2018 to 2022 but still ranked behind Black average length of stay in 2022.

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 detention alternative program completions decreased by 3.5% from 75% in 2018 to 72.4% in 2022.

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.

New charge violations to detention alternative programs decreased by 35% from 5% in 2018 to 3.4% in 2022.

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.

Violation/non-compliance of detention alternative programs increased by 4.1% from 20% in 2018 to 24.1% in 2022.

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?

Successful detention alternative program completions decreased from 2018 to 2022 and Violation/non-compliance of detention alternative programs increased from 2018 to 2022.

➤ **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.

There was no Table for Detention Alternative Programs provided. YSAC has provided In-Home Detention programming JAMS reports for 2018 and 2022.

Admissions to the In-Home Detention Program decreased 61.5% from 13 in 2018 to 5 in 2022.

➤ **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?

N/A

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?

All race and gender admissions have decreased largely from 2018 to 2022 with the exception of white male and female admissions. Referrals to court were only 12 in 2022 but there were more admissions to detention than referrals to court in 2022. Referrals to court largely decreased for all races from 2018 to 2022 and detention admissions largely decreased for all races from 2018 to 2022 except for White youth which had an increase in detention admissions.

The overall average length of stay and overall average daily population for detention alternative programs increased largely from 2018 to 2022. Weapons, Robbery and Violation of Detention Alternative/Alternative Custody offenses made up the large majority of Most Serious Current Offenses.

While most admissions to detention have decreased, the data demonstrates a need for alternative programming due to increased daily population and length of stay, as well as Violation of Detention Alternative/Alternative Custody offenses making up a large majority of Most Serious Current Offenses.

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?

Monthly admissions to detention alternative programs had a moderate increase in 2022 while average daily population continued to track near the historical average. White average length of stay increased by the largest amount from 2018 to 2022. Hispanic average length of stay increased by the second largest amount from 2018 to 2022 but still ranked behind Black average length of stay in 2022. Successful detention alternative program completions decreased from 2018 to 2022 and Violation/non-compliance of detention alternative programs increased from 2018 to 2022. Admissions to the In-Home Detention Program decreased 61.5% from 13 in 2018 to 5 in 2022.

There is a need for detention alternative programming that supports youth in successfully completely their requirements. The data demonstrates this need by showing detention alternative admissions increasing, successful completions decreasing, and admissions to the In-Home Detention program decreasing due to not meeting required needs of the youth admitted.

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?

White youth have the largest average length of stay for dentention alternatives and the most detention admissions by a large amount in 2022. Minority dentention admissions decreased significantly from 2018 to 2022 which can be credited to detention alternative programming average length of stay increasing.

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	In-Home Detention and Detention Counseling option for the court to provide an alternative to incarceration for pre-adjudicated/pre-disposed juveniles who would otherwise be placed in a juvenile detention facility. Support and counseling for juveniles placed on In-Home Detention and/or Electronic Monitoring.	Total detention admissions decreased by 6.8% from 2018 to 2022. Black detention admissions decreased by 78.6% and Hispanic detention admissions decreased by 35.7% in that time. Overall average daily detention alternative admissions increased by 34.6% from 2018 to 2022.	Continue to provide an In-Home Detention Alternative program that is also expanded to include youth on Electronic Monitoring. Counseling and supports will assist juveniles and families with improving functioning through individual and family counseling, crisis intervention, aftercare planning and negotiating the education system.
B			
C			
D			
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?

The percentage of white youth admissions to detention increased largely (26) in 2022, while black and hispanic detention admissions decreased moderately (6 and 9 respectively). Black youth no longer remain the group with the greatest number of youth in detention which demonstrates the understanding of In-Home Detention providers to connect with issues of various minority cultures and providing positive role models to the population that is being served. It is important for providers to continue understanding issues relating to cultures of all populations being served.

Comments:

DISPOSITION

- Definition & Rationale
- Required Data & Methodology
- Data Worksheets
- Analysis Questions

DISPOSITION DEFINITION & RATIONALE

Disposition is the phase of the juvenile justice system that occurs after a young person is adjudicated delinquent. At this decision point, young people 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 includes but is 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 disposition program. The structure of these programs are varied, 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 incentives, sanctions, supervision, and services that are aligned with rehabilitation, so that young people are better off for having the programming experience.

When determining the appropriate disposition in each case, the court faces the complex task of considering multiple goals, including promoting public safety, ensuring offender accountability, and providing juveniles with opportunities for personal growth and skill development through rehabilitative efforts. By developing and enhancing local disposition programs, counties can center young people's well-being by providing the court with the range of options that matches best their supervision and service needs. Research and experience indicate that well developed community-based disposition programs can effectively reduce the likelihood of continued delinquency, improving the lives of the youth they serve, and improve the quality and safety of the local community and its citizens.

The disposition data provided describe the number of youth adjudicated delinquent and disposed by the court, as well as the characteristics of these juveniles that reflect the causes and correlates of delinquent activity. By understanding the nature and extent of the juvenile population facing disposition and the factors associated with involvement in delinquency, planners can better identify the content and scope of Dispositional Option Programs needed in their counties. As such, counties will be better equipped to make informed decisions regarding the allocation of resources to disposition programs.

**DISPOSITION
REQUIRED DATA & METHODOLOGY**

- All data are county-specific unless otherwise indicated.
- Round all percentages to one decimal place.
- Cells in the data tables are identified with a letter/number combination, where the letter identifies the column and the number identifies the row (e.g., A1 = Column A, Row 1).

DISPOSITION

Required Data	<p>Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent for calendar years 2018 and 2022 by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender • Lead Disposition • Race / Ethnicity • Age Group • Probation Placements <p>Juvenile arrests by race/ethnicity for calendar years 2018 and 2020.</p> <p>Secure Placements (Youth committed to the JJC) by race/ethnicity for calendar years 2018 and 2022.</p>
Source	<p>Administrative Office of the Courts, Family Automated Tracking System (JJC will provide these data to the Counties).</p> <p>New Jersey State Police (JJC will provide these data to the Counties).</p> <p>Juvenile Justice Commission, Research and Evaluation Unit (JJC will provide these data to the Counties).</p>
Methods	<p><i>Table 1. Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Gender</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Number (Columns B/C and F/G).</i> Insert the number of adjudicated males and females for each year. ➤ <i>Percent of Total (Columns D/E and H/I).</i> Calculate the percent of the total number of juveniles that was male and the percent that was female for each year (use Formula 1). To obtain the percent, divide the number of each gender by the total number of juveniles and multiply by 100. Formula 1 is an example of how to calculate the percent of the total juveniles adjudicated in 2022 that was male.

Methods
(cont.)

Formula 1

$$\frac{\text{Number of Males 2022 (A1)}}{\text{Total Juveniles 2022 (A3)}} = \underline{\quad} \times 100 = \% \text{ of Total (B1)}$$

- Percent Change (Column J). Calculate the percent change for each gender and for the total juveniles between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Formula 2

$$\frac{\text{Most Recent Year \# (2022) - Prior Year \# (2018)}}{\text{Prior Year \# (2018)}} = \frac{\quad}{\quad} \times 100 = \% \text{ Change 2018-2022}$$

Table 2. Juvenile Cases Adjudicated Delinquent with Probation & Incarceration Dispositions

- *Number (Columns B/C/D/E and F/G/H/I).* Insert the total number of juveniles for each year that were disposed to the following dispositions: JJC Committed (refers to those youth that have been incarcerated) and Short-Term Commitments. *For "Probation", add dispositions 03 through 14 (Residential Program JJC, DCF Residential, DMH-H/DHS, Other Residential, Non-Residential Program JJC, DCF Non-Residential, Division of Mental Retardation, Other Remedial Non-Residential, DCF (Unspecified), JJC Incarceration (Suspended), Probation and Probation Suspended) then insert the total number for each year.
- *Percent Change (Column J).* Calculate the percent change in the total number of dispositions by type between 2018 and 2022 and in the total number of disposition types between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Table 3. Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity

- *Number (Columns B/C and F/G).* Insert the number of White, Black, and Hispanic juveniles for each year. *Note: For "Other", add Asian Pacific Island, American Indian, Alaskan Native, and Other, and insert the total number of these juveniles for each year.
- *Percent of Total (Columns D/E and H/I).* Calculate the percent of the total number of juveniles that was male and the percent that was female for each year. To obtain the percent, divide the number of each gender by the total number of juveniles and multiply by 100 (Use Formula 1).
- *Percent Change (Column J).* Calculate the percent change in the number of juveniles from each race and the total number of juveniles between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Table 4. Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent compared to Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity

- *Juvenile Arrests (Columns B and E).* Insert your County’s total number of juvenile arrests by Race/Ethnicity for 2018 and 2020. **Note: The total number for juvenile arrests (A5 and D5) does not include the number of Hispanics because the data identifies Hispanic as an ethnic origin not a Race category.
- *Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent (Columns C and F).* Insert your County’s total number of adjudications by Race/Ethnicity for 2018 and 2020.
- *Percent of Arrests Adjudicated Delinquent (Columns D and G).* Calculate the percent of the arrests adjudicated delinquent by Race/Ethnicity for each year using Formula 3. Formula 3 is an example of how to calculate the percent of white youth population arrested that were adjudicated delinquent.
- *Percent Change (Column H/I and J).* Calculate the percent change in juvenile arrest and juveniles adjudicated delinquency for each Race/Ethnicity between 2018 and 2020 using Formula 2.

Formula 3.

$$\frac{\text{White Juvenile Adjudicated Delinquent 2018 (B1)}}{\text{White Juvenile Arrests 2018 (A1)}} = \text{___} \times 100 = \text{\% of White Youth Arrested Adjudicated Delinquent (C1)}$$

Table 5. Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Age

- *Number (Columns B/C and F/G).* Insert the number of juveniles in each age group in the appropriate cell for each year. *Note: “18 and over” refers to those youth that are in the “out of range” column in the data.
- *Percent of Total (Columns D/E and H/I).* Calculate the percent of the total number of juveniles each year that were in each age group. To obtain the percent, divide the number of juveniles in each age group by the total number and multiply by 100. (Use Formula 1)
- *Percent Change (Column J).* Calculate the percent change in the number of juveniles from each age group and the total number of juveniles between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Methods
(cont.)

Table 6. Probation Placements by Race/Ethnicity

Number (Columns B/C and F/G). Insert the number of juveniles placed on probation by Race/Ethnicity for each year. *Note: For “Other”, add Asian Pacific Islander, American Indian, Alaskan Native and Other, then insert the total number of these youth for each year. Note: Probation Placements refers to youth disposed to a JJC residential community home on Probation.

- *Percent of Total Probation Placements (Columns D/E and H/I).* Calculate the percent of the total number of juveniles placed on probation by Race/Ethnicity for each year using Formula 1.
- *Percent Change (Column J).* Calculate the percent change in the number of juveniles placed on probation by Race/Ethnicity between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Table 7. Juvenile Probation Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity

- *Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent (Columns B and E).* Insert your County’s total number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent by Race/Ethnicity for 2018 and 2022.
- *Probation Placements (Columns C and F).* Insert the number of White, Black, and Hispanic juveniles for each year. *Note: For “Other”, add Asian Pacific Islander, American Indian, Alaskan Native and Other, then insert the total number of these youth for each year.
- *Percent of Adjudicated Placed on Probation (Columns D and G).* Calculate the percent of juveniles adjudicated placed on Probation by Race/Ethnicity for each year using Formula 3.
- *Percent Change (Column H and I).* Calculate the percent change in the number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent and probation placements by race/ethnicity between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Table 8. Secure Placements by Race/Ethnicity

- *Number (Columns B and D).* Insert the number of secure placements by Race/Ethnicity for each year.
- *Percent of Total Secure Placements (Columns C and E).* Calculate the percent of secure placements by Race/Ethnicity for each year using Formula 1.
- *Percent Change (Column F/G).* Calculate the percent change in the number of secure placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Methods
(cont.)

Table 9. Secure Placements compared to Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent by Race/Ethnicity

- *Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent (Columns B and E).* Insert your County’s total number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent by Race/Ethnicity for 2018 and 2022.
- *Secure Placements (Columns C and F).* Insert the number secure placements by Race/Ethnicity for each year.
- *Percent of Adjudications Resulted in Secure Placement (Columns D and G).* Calculate the percent of adjudications that resulted in secure placement by Race/Ethnicity for each year using Formula 3.
- *Percent Change (Column H and I).* Calculate the percent change in the number of juveniles adjudicated delinquent and secure placements by Race/Ethnicity between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Table 10. Ranking of Problem Areas

- *Problem Area (Columns C/D).* Insert the problem areas for each year.

Table 11. Ranking of Service Interventions Needed

- *Service Intervention Needed (Columns C/D).* Insert the service interventions needed for each year.

Table 12. Ranking of Service Interventions Provided

- *Service Intervention Provided (Columns C/D).* Insert the service interventions provided for each year.

Data
Checks

In *Table 1*, the figures in Row 1 and Row 2 should add up to the figure in Row 3 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). In *Table 2*, the figures in Row 1 through Row 3 should add up to the figure in Row 4 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). In *Table 3*, the figures in Row 1 through Row 4 should add up to the figure in Row 5 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). In *Table 4*, the figures in Row 1 through Row 4 should add up to the figure in Row 5 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). The same pattern will occur for Tables 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9.

JUVENILE AUTOMATED MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS (JAMS)

Required Data	<p>Each State Community Partnership funded program collects data regarding each youth in the program. The following data reflects the total population of youth served in Dispositional Option Programs in 2022.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total Intakes by Program Total Intakes by Gender Total Intakes by Race Average Age of Intake Population Problem Areas by Program Service Intervention Provided to Youth Service Intervention Needed but not Available
Source	<p>Juvenile Justice Commission, Juvenile Automated Management System (JAMS)</p>
Methods	<p>➤ Each County Youth Services Commission enters the required data into JAMS. The data is then accessed by the Juvenile Justice Commission for analysis. Once analysis is complete, aggregate data is returned to the County to be included in their Comprehensive County Youth Services Plan. This data will produce a “picture” of youth in Dispositional Option Programs.</p>

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.
 - Total number of youth adjudicated delinquent was 65 in 2022.
 - Total number of Males adjudicated delinquent was 54 and 83.1% of total youth in 2022.
 - Total number of Females adjudicated delinquent was 11 and 16.9% of total youth in 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.
 - Total percentage of youth adjudicated delinquent decreased by 70.3% from 2018 to 2022.

 - Rank 1 - Total percentage of Females adjudicated delinquent decreased by 78% from 2018 to 2022.
 - Rank 2 - Total percentage of Males adjudicated delinquent decreased by 68% from 2018 to 2022.

 - Both Male and Females adjudicated delinquent decreased largely from 2018 to 2022, both genders decreased by 68% or more.

 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?
 - Adjudications have largely decreased from 2018 to 2022. Males were nearly 5 times more likely than females to be adjudicated in 2022.

Male and female adjudications have decreased largely from 2018 to 2022. Female adjudications

decreased slightly more than Males did from 2018 to 2022.

➤ **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.

Youth JJC committed cases were 4 in 2022.

Youth Short-Term committed cases were 1 in 2022.

Probation committed cases were 57 in 2022.

Total number of cases adjudicated delinquent with Probation and Incarcerated Dispositions were 62 in 2022.

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.

Total percentage of youth cases adjudicated delinquent with Probation and Incarcerated Dispositions decreased by 47.5% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 1 - Short-Term committed cases increased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 2 - Probation committed cases decreased by 48.6% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 3 - JJC committed cases decreased by 42.9% from 2018 to 2022.

Adjudications resulting in Probation or incarceration has moderately decreased from 2018 to 2022. Short-Term committed did increase but only by 1 case.

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?

Adjudications resulting in Probation was a much larger portion of total cases than Adjudications resulting in Incarceration in 2022.

Total number of cases adjudicated delinquent with Probation and Incarcerated Dispositions moderately decreased from 2018 to 2022. the only increase was 1 Short-Term Commitment case in 2022 that increased from 0 in 2018.

➤ **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.

Note: A large portion of juvenile race is listed as "not indicated" on FACTS data sheets.

Total adjudicated juveniles by race was 18 in 2022.

White adjudicated juveniles was 3 in 2022.

Black adjudicated juveniles was 4 in 2022.
 Hispanic adjudicated juveniles was 5 in 2022.
 Other adjudicated juveniles was 6 in 2022.

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.

Rank 1 - White adjudicated juveniles increased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 2 - Black adjudicated juveniles increased by 66.7% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 3 - Hispanic adjudicated juveniles increased by 50% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 4 - Other adjudicated juveniles increased by 40% from 2018 to 2022.

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?

Other races were most likely to be adjudicated delinquent in 2022.

All races had small to moderate increases in adjudicated delinquents from 2018 to 2022.

➤ **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.

Note: A large portion of juvenile race is listed as "not indicated" on FACTS data sheets.

Total juvenile arrests were 257 in 2020.

Total White juvenile arrests were 117 in 2020.

Total Black juvenile arrests were 139 in 2020.

Total Hispanic juvenile arrests were 84 in 2020

Total Other juvenile arrests were 1 in 2020.

Total juveniles adjudicated delinquent were 14 in 2020.

Total White juveniles adjudicated delinquent were 2 in 2020.

Total Black juveniles adjudicated delinquent were 3 in 2020.

Total Hispanic juveniles adjudicated delinquent were 4 in 2020.

Total Other juveniles adjudicated delinquent were 5 in 2020.

Total percent of arrestees adjudicated delinquent was 5.4% in 2020.

Total percent of White arrestees adjudicated delinquent was 1.7% in 2020.

Total percent of Black arrestees adjudicated delinquent was 2.2% in 2020.

Total percent of Hispanic arrestees adjudicated delinquent was 4.8% in 2020.

Total percent of Other arrestees adjudicated delinquent was 500% in 2020.

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.

Total juvenile arrests decreased by 59.3% from 2018 to 2020.

Rank 1 - White youth arrests decreased by 64.9% from 2018 to 2020.

Rank 2 - Hispanic youth arrests decreased by 63.3% from 2018 to 2020.

Rank 3 - Black youth arrests decreased by 53.4% from 2018 to 2020.

Rank 4 - Other youth arrests had no change from 2018 to 2020.

All youth arrests by race with the exception of Other youth have decreased largely from 2018 to 2020, with White and Hispanic youth seeing the largest decreases.

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.

Total juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased by 40% from 2018 to 2020.

Rank 1 - White juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased by 100% from 2018 to 2020.

Rank 2 - Black juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased by 50% from 2018 to 2020.

Rank 3 - Hispanic juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased by 33.3%% from 2018 to 2020.

Rank 4 -Other juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased by 25% from 2018 to 2020.

The percent of juveniles adjudicated delinquent has increased for all races from 2018 to 2020, although overall numbers of juveniles adjudicated delinquent remained low.

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 finding s 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?

Out of 257 juvenile arrests in 2020, only 14 were adjudicated delinquent. Black juveniles had the most arrests in 2020 with 139. Hispanic juvenile arrestees were the highest percent to be adjudicated delinquent at 4.8% in 2020.

Total juvenile arrests decreased by 59.3% from 2018 to 2020. White, Black and Hispanic juvenile arrests all decreased by more than 53.4% from 2018 to 2020.

Total juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased by 40% from 2018 to 2020, although the there were only 4 more juveniles adjudicated delinquent in 2020 than in 2018. All races had one more juvenile adjudicated delinquent in 2020 than in 2018.

➤ **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.
- Total juveniles adjudicated delinquent was 65 in 2022.
 - Juveniles adjudicated delinquent from ages 6-10 was 0 in 2022.
 - Juveniles adjudicated delinquent from ages 11-12 was 7 and 10.8% of the total in 2022.
 - Juveniles adjudicated delinquent from ages 13-14 was 17 and 26.2% of the total in 2022.
 - Juveniles adjudicated delinquent from ages 15-16 was 26 and 40% of the total in 2022.
 - Juveniles adjudicated delinquent at age 17 was 15 and 23.1% of the total in 2022.
 - Juveniles adjudicated delinquent at age 18 and over was 0 in 2022.
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.
- Rank 1 - Juveniles adjudicated delinquent from ages 6-10 decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.
 - Rank 2 - Juveniles adjudicated delinquent at age 17 decreased by 75.8% from 2018 to 2022.
 - Rank 3 - Juveniles adjudicated delinquent from ages 15-16 decreased by 68.7% from 2018 to 2022.
 - Rank 4 - Juveniles adjudicated delinquent from ages 11-12 decreased by 56.3% from 2018 to 2022.
 - Rank 5 - Juveniles adjudicated delinquent from ages 13-14 decreased by 48.5% from 2018 to 2022.
 - Rank 6 - Juveniles adjudicated delinquent at age 18 and over did not change from 2018 to 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?
- Juveniles adjudicated delinquent from ages 15-16 make up the largest portion compared to all age groups even though the same group saw a decreased of 68.7% from 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.
- Note: A large portion of juvenile race is listed as "not indicated" on FACTS data sheets.
 - Total juvenile Probation placements were 12 in 2022.
 - White juvenile Probation placements were 2 and 16.7% of the total in 2022.
 - Black juvenile Probation placements were 3 and 25% of the total in 2022.
 - Hispanic juvenile Probation placements were 6 and 50% of the total in 2022.
 - Other juvenile Probation placements were 1 and 8.3% of the total in 2022.
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.

Note: A large portion of juvenile race is listed as "not indicated" on FACTS data sheets.

Rank 1 - Black Probation placements decreased by 96.1% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 2 - White Probation placements decreased by 96.1% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 3 - Hispanic Probation placements decreased by 88.2% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 4 - Other Probation placements decreased by 96.1% from 2018 to 2022.

All Probation placements by race have decreased by 88.2% or more according to available data.

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?

Note: A large portion of juvenile race is listed as "not indicated" on FACTS data sheets.

Overall Probation placements have decreased largely from 2018 to 2022 (by 88.2% or more).

Although Hispanic Probation placements decreased by 88.2% from 2018 to 2022, they still made up 50% of total placements in 2022 (according to available data).

- 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.

Note: A large portion of juvenile race is listed as "not indicated" on FACTS data sheets.

Total juveniles adjudicated delinquent was 18 in 2022.

White juveniles adjudicated delinquent was 3 in 2022.

Black juveniles adjudicated delinquent was 4 in 2022.

Hispanic juveniles adjudicated delinquent was 5 in 2022.

Other juveniles adjudicated delinquent was 6 in 2022.

Total juvenile Probation placements was 12 in 2022.

White juvenile Probation placements was 2 in 2022.

Black juvenile Probation placements was 3 in 2022.

Hispanic juvenile Probation placements was 6 in 2022.

Other juvenile Probation placements was 1 in 2022.

Total percent of adjudicated juveniles placed on Probation was 66.7% in 2022.

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.

Note: A large portion of juvenile race is listed as "not indicated" on FACTS data sheets.

White juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased by 200% from 2018 to 2022.

Black juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Hispanic juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased by 66.7% from 2018 to 2022.

Other juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased by 50% from 2018 to 2022.

Total juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased from 10 in 2018 to 18 in 2022.

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.

Note: A large portion of juvenile race is listed as "not indicated" on FACTS data sheets.

Black juvenile Probation placements decreased by 96.7% from 2018 to 2022.

White juvenile Probation placements decreased by 96.1% from 2018 to 2022.

Hispanic juvenile Probation placements decreased by 88.2% from 2018 to 2022.

Other juvenile Probation placements decreased by 75% from 2018 to 2022.

Total juvenile Probation placements decreased from 198 in 2018 to 12 in 2022.

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?

Note: A large portion of juvenile race is listed as "not indicated" on FACTS data sheets.

Total juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased from 10 in 2018 to 18 in 2022. Other juveniles adjudicated delinquent was the largest portion with 6 in 2022. Total juvenile Probation placements was 12 in 2022.

Total juvenile Probation placements decreased from 198 in 2018 to 12 in 2022.

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.

Total juveniles securely placed was 2 in 2022.

White juveniles securely placed made up 100% of the total, which was 2 in 2022.

Black juveniles securely placed was 0 in 2022.

Hispanic juveniles securely placed was 0 in 2022.

Other juveniles securely placed was 0 in 2022.

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.

White juveniles securely placed increased from 0 in 2018 to 2 in 2022.

Black juveniles securely placed decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Hispanic juveniles securely placed decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Other juveniles securely placed did not change (0) from 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?

Only White juveniles were securely placed in 2022. Total juveniles securely placed decreased by 66.7% from 6 in 2018 to 2 in 2022.

➤ **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.

Note: A large portion of juvenile race is listed as "not indicated" on FACTS data sheets.

Total juveniles adjudicated delinquent was 18 in 2022.

White juveniles adjudicated delinquent was 3 in 2022.

Black juveniles adjudicated delinquent was 4 in 2022.

Hispanic juveniles adjudicated delinquent was 5 in 2022.

Other juveniles adjudicated delinquent was 6 in 2022.

Total juveniles securely placed was 2 in 2022.

White juveniles securely placed was 2 in 2022.

Black juveniles securely placed was 0 in 2022.

Hispanic juveniles securely placed was 0 in 2022.

Other juveniles securely placed was 0 in 2022.

Percent of white adjudications resulting in secure confinement was 66.7% in 2022.

Percent of black adjudications resulting in secure confinement was 0% in 2022.

Percent of hispanic adjudications resulting in secure confinement was 0% in 2022.

Percent of other adjudications resulting in secure confinement was 0% in 2022.

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.

Note: A large portion of juvenile race is listed as "not indicated" on FACTS data sheets.

White juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased by 200% from 2018 to 2022.

Black juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Hispanic juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased by 66.7% from 2018 to 2022.

Other juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased by 50% from 2018 to 2022.

Total juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased from 10 in 2018 to 18 in 2022.

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.

Note: A large portion of juvenile race is listed as "not indicated" on FACTS data sheets.

White juveniles securely placed increased from 0 in 2018 to 2 in 2022.

Black juveniles securely placed decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Hispanic juveniles securely placed decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Other juveniles securely placed did not change (0) from 2018 to 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?

Note: A large portion of juvenile race is listed as "not indicated" on FACTS data sheets.

Total juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased from 10 in 2018 to 18 in 2022. Other juveniles adjudicated delinquent was the largest portion with 6 in 2022. Total juveniles securely placed was 2 in 2022. All races decreased from 2018 to nearly 0 secure placements in 2022.

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.

Intakes for the Cognitive Skills Program was 15 in 2022.

Intakes for the In-Home Counseling Program was 9 in 2022.

Intakes for PASO Sex Offender Services was 2 in 2022.

Intakes for Drug and Alcohol Treatment Services was 12 in 2022.

Intakes for the Individual Mentoring Program was 4 in 2022.

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

Male intakes for dispositional programs was 41 in 2022.

Female intakes for dispositional programs was 1 in 2022.

White intakes for dispositional programs was 10 in 2022.

Black intakes for dispositional programs was 12 in 2022.

Hispanic intakes for dispositional programs was 15 in 2022.

Other intakes for dispositional programs was 4 in 2022.

Average age of intakes was 17.2 in 2022.

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.

Personality/Behavior - 23
 Family Circumstances/Parenting - 21
 Substance abuse - 19
 Education - 14
 Peer Relations - 10
 Attitudes/Orientation - 9
 Teen Pregnancy/Parenting - 2
 Vocational Skills/Employment - 1
 Medical problems - 1
 Other - 1

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.

Counseling/Individual - 18
 Life Skills Training - 17
 Decision Making Skills Training - 12
 Substance Abuse Evaluation - 10
 Urine Monitoring - 10
 Anger Management Training - 7
 Transportation - 6
 Advocacy - 6
 Substance abuse treatment/counseling - 5
 Counseling/Family - 4

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.

Counseling/Individual - 18
 Life Skills Training - 17
 Decision Making Skills Training - 12
 Substance Abuse Evaluation - 10
 Urine Monitoring - 10
 Anger Management Training - 7
 Transportation - 6
 Advocacy - 6
 Substance abuse treatment/counseling - 5
 Counseling/Family - 4

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?

Nearly all intakes were Male juveniles with an average age of 17.2. The majority of problem areas and service interventions revolved around Personality/Behavior, Family Circumstances/Parenting, Substance abuse and Counseling/Individual, Life Skills Training, Decision Making Skills Training respectively.

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?

N/A

IMPLICATIONS FOR COMMUNITY-BASED DISPOSITION PROGRAMS PLAN

Extent and Nature of Need: Juveniles Adjudicated Delinquent

38. Taken together, what do 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?

Adjudications resulting in Probation was a much larger portion of total cases than Adjudications resulting in Incarceration in 2022. The total number of cases adjudicated delinquent with Probation and Incarcerated Dispositions moderately decreased from 2018 to 2022. Total juvenile arrests decreased by 59.3% from 2018 to 2020. White, Black and Hispanic juvenile arrests all decreased by more than 53.4% from 2018 to 2020. Total juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased by only 4 in 2020. Juveniles adjudicated delinquent from ages 15-16 make up the largest portion compared to all age groups even though the same group saw a decreased of 68.7% from 2018 to 2022.

Although current programming is still needed, the data demonstrates that it is needed to a lesser extent due to the large decrease in juveniles on disposition.

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?

Note: A large portion of juvenile race is listed as "not indicated" on FACTS data sheets. All Probation placements have decreased largely from 2018 to 2022 (by 88.2% or more). Although Hispanic Probation placements decreased by 88.2% from 2018 to 2022, they still made up 50% of total placements in 2022 (according to available data). Total juveniles adjudicated delinquent increased from 10 in 2018 to 18 in 2022. Total juvenile Probation placements decreased from 198 in 2018 to 12 in 2022.

According to the available data, Probation placements have largely decreased and therefore current programming does not need to be funded at the level it is now.

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?

Only White juveniles were securely placed in 2022. Total juveniles securely placed decreased by

66.7% from 6 in 2018 to 2 in 2022. Note: A large portion of juvenile race is listed as "not indicated" on FACTS data sheets. White juveniles were the only race securely placed in 2022.

Secure Placements have largely decreased which matches the other Disposition categories in the county. This calls for current programming to be funded at a lower level.

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?

N/A

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?

Nearly all intakes were Male juveniles with an average age of 17.2. The majority of problem areas and service interventions revolved around Personality/Behavior, Family Circumstances/Parenting, Substance abuse and Counseling/Individual, Life Skills Training, Decision Making Skills Training respectively.

While the problem areas and service intervention categories remained nearly identical from 2018 to 2022, the number of cases has largely decreased. This also indicates the need for reduced levels of funding.

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	Individual Mentoring	<p>Among the top 10 Problem areas reported in JAMS for Cumberland County from 2018 to 2022 were: Personality/Behavior, Family Circumstances/Parenting, Substance abuse, Education, Peer Relations, Attitudes/Orientation. Among the top 10 Interventions needed from 2018 to 2022 were: Counseling/Mentoring/Individual, Decision Making Skills Training, and Advocacy.</p>	<p>Individual Mentoring Program that emphasizes matching up youth and mentors along gender, racial and ethnic lines whenever possible in order to provide positive role models.</p>
B	Individual/Family Counseling	<p>Among the top 10 Problem areas reported in JAMS for Cumberland County from 2018 to 2022 were: Personality/Behavior, Family Circumstances/Parenting, Peer Relations, and Attitudes/Orientation. Among the top 10 Interventions needed from 2018 to 2022 were: Counseling/Individual/Family, Decision Making Skills Training, and Anger Management Training.</p>	<p>In-Home Counseling services with anger management, family counseling and education advocacy components.</p>
C	Substance Abuse Evaluation and Treatment	<p>Among the top 10 Problem areas reported in JAMS for Cumberland County from 2018 to 2022 were: Substance abuse, Education, and Attitudes/Orientation. Urine monitoring ranked in the top 10 service interventions provided in 2022. Among the top 10 Interventions needed from 2018 to 2022 were: Substance Abuse Evaluation, Urine Monitoring, and Substance abuse treatment/counseling.</p>	<p>Substance abuse evaluations, testing and treatment.</p>

D	Sex Offender Treatment	Sex Offender Services have averaged 2-3 clients at any given time over the past two years. While Sex Offender Services does not rank among the top 10 problem areas, interventions needed or provided, the extreme nature of the crimes and the lack of any other treatment options available creates a need for these services.	Sex Offender Evaluations and treatment.
E	Cognitive Skills Education	Among the top 10 Problem areas reported in JAMS for Cumberland County from 2018 to 2022 were: Personality/Behavior, Education, Peer Relations, and Attitudes/Orientation. Among the top 10 Interventions needed from 2018 to 2022 were: Life Skills Training and Decision Making Skills Training.	Cognitive Skills Program that provides life skills training and educates youth about the causes and consequences of their actions with particular emphasis on anger management, conflict resolution, negative peer influence, and communication skills.
F	Probation Enrichment and Transportation	Among the top 10 Problem areas reported in JAMS for Cumberland County from 2018 to 2022 were: Personality/Behavior, Education, Peer Relations, and Attitudes/Orientation. Among the top 10 Interventions needed and provided from 2018 to 2022 were: Life Skills Training and Decision Making Skills Training, advocacy, transportation, education.	Probation Enrichment and Transportation Innovations program that provides life skills classes, transportation, enrichment trips, college tours and incentives to youth on Probation.
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:

REENTRY

- Definition & Rationale
- Required Data & Methodology
- Data Worksheets
- Analysis Questions

REENTRY DEFINITION & RATIONALE

In the juvenile justice system reentry generally refers to the period of community-based supervision and services that follows a juvenile's release from a secure facility, residential program, or other structured dispositional placement.

However, for the purposes of this application, 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 Juvenile Probation Division. Reentry is a transitional period where young people need additional support to foster their successful reintegration home. Given this goal, reentry programs developed through the comprehensive planning process should clearly focus on providing supports and services to youth, regardless of their age, that address the common issues young people face when returning home. .

By developing reentry services that compliment the supervision provided by the JJC and Probation, counties can increase the likelihood that juveniles returning to their communities will reintegrate successfully. This type of cooperative effort in the delivery of reentry services and supervision improves each youth's chance of becoming productive, law-abiding citizens, which in turn enhances the safety and quality of the local communities in which these juveniles reside.

The reentry data provided describe the number of committed youth and probationers returning to the community from JJC facilities and programs, as well as the demographic and offense characteristics of these juveniles that reflect the causes and correlates of delinquent activity. By understanding the nature and extent of the population released to Reentry and the factors associated with involvement in delinquency, planners can better identify the content and scope of Reentry services and programs needed in their counties. As such, counties will be better equipped to make informed decisions regarding the allocation of resources to Reentry services.

**REENTRY
REQUIRED DATA & METHODOLOGY**

- All data are county-specific unless otherwise indicated.
- Round all percentages to one decimal place.
- Cells in the data tables are identified with a letter/number combination, where the letter identifies the column and the number identifies the row (e.g., A1 = Column A, Row 1).

JUVENILE PROBATIONERS ADMITTED TO THE JJC

Required Data	<p>“Probationers” refers to youth ordered by the court to attend a JJC residential as a condition of their probation.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Table 1 required data is probationers admitted to JJC Residential Programs</p> <p>Tables 2, 3, 4, and 6 are based on the number of probationers completing a JJC residential in calendar years 2018 and 2022. Required data include probationers released by program type, race, gender and age, and probationers released from Pinelands.</p> <p>Table 5 is based on the number of probationers admitted to JJC residential programs in calendar years 2018 and 2022. Required data include the most severe current offense for residentially placed juvenile probationers by offense type and offense degree. <i>NOTE: Juveniles may have multiple offenses</i></p>
Source	<p>New Jersey Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 and 2022 (JJC will provide these data to the Counties).</p>
Methods	<p><u>Table 1. Juvenile Probationers Admitted to JJC Residential by Race/Ethnicity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Number (Columns B/C and F/G). Insert the number of probationers admitted to the JJC by Race/Ethnicity for each year. ➤ Percent of Total Probationers Admitted to JJC (Columns D/E and H/I). Calculate the percent of the total number of probationers admitted to the JJC by Race/Ethnicity for each year. To obtain the percent, divide the number of probationers admitted for each Race/Ethnicity by the total number of probationers admitted and multiply by 100. Formula 1 is an example of how to calculate the percent of the total number of White probationers admitted in 2018. ➤ Percent Change (Column J). Calculate the percent change in the number of probationers admitted to the JJC between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Methods
(cont.)

Table 2. Juvenile Probationers Released by Program Type

- *Number (Columns B/C and F/G).* Insert the number of probationers released from each type of program in the appropriate cells for each year.
- *Percent Change (Column J).* Calculate the percent change in the number of new probationers released from residential programs, and the total number of probationers released between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Formula 1

$$\frac{\text{Number of White Youth Admitted 2022 (A1)}}{\text{Total Youth Admitted 2022 (A5)}} = \underline{\hspace{1cm}} \times 100 = \% \text{ of Total White Probationer Admitted (B1)}$$

Formula 2

$$\frac{\text{Most Recent Year \# (2022) - Prior Year \# (2018)}}{\text{Prior Year \# (2018)}} = \underline{\hspace{1cm}} \times 100 = \% \text{ Change 2018-2022}$$

Methods
(cont.)

Table 3. Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

- *Males by Race/Ethnicity (Columns B and E).* Insert the number of males of each race/ethnicity released from JJC programs and the total number of males released for each year.
- *Females by Race/Ethnicity (Columns C and F).* Insert the number of females of each race/ethnicity released from JJC programs and the total number of females released for each year.
- *Total by Race/Ethnicity (Columns D and G).* Insert the total number of probationers of each race/ethnicity released from JJC programs in each year, and the grand total of all probationers released in each year (Cells C5 and F5).
- *Percent Change - Males by Race/Ethnicity (Columns H).* Calculate the percent change in the number of males of each race/ethnicity released and the total number of males released between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.
- *Percent Change - Females by Race/Ethnicity (Columns I).* Calculate the percent change in the number of females of each race/ethnicity released and the total number of females released between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.
- *Percent Change - Total by Race/Ethnicity (Columns J).* Calculate the percent change in the total number of probationers of each race/ethnicity between 2018 and 2022, and in the grand total of all probationers released between 2018 and 2022 (Cell I5) using Formula 2.

Table 4. Juvenile Probationers Released from JJC Residential by Age

- *Number (Columns B/C and F/G).* Add the number of probationers ages 14 and under, 15-16, 17-18, and 19 and over, and then insert the number of probationers in each age group in the appropriate cell for each year.
- *Percent of Total (Columns D/E and H/I).* Calculate what percent of the total number of probationers released in each year were in each age group. To obtain the percent, divide the number of probationers in each age group by the total number of probationers released and multiply by 100 (use Formula 1).
- *Percent Change (Column J).* Calculate the percent change in the number of probationers released from each age group and the total number of probationers released between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Methods
(cont.)Table 5. Offenses of Residentially Placed Juvenile Probationers by Type

- *Number (Columns B/C and F/G).* Insert the number of probationers in each year with an Offense of a particular type listed.
- *Percent of Total (Columns D/E and H/I).* Calculate what percent of the total number of probationers with an Offense of a particular type listed. To obtain the percent, divide the number of probationers with a particular offense type by the total number of residentially placed probationers and multiply by 100 (use Formula 1).
- *Percent Change (Column J).* Calculate the percent change in each of the offense types and in the total number of residentially placed probationers between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Table 6. Juvenile Probationers Released from Pinelands

- *Number (Columns B/C/D and E/F/G).* Insert the number of probationers released from Pinelands for each year.
- *Percent Change (Column H/I/J).* Calculate the percent change in the number of probationers released from Pinelands between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Data
Checks

In *Table 1*, the figures in Row 1 through Row 4 should add up to the figure in Row 5 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). In *Table 2*, the figures in Row 1 through Row 2 should add up to the figure in Row 3 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). In *Table 3 and 4*, the figures in Row 1 and Row 4 should add up to the figure in Row 5 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). In *Table 5 and 6*, the figures in Row 1 through Row 6 should add up to the figure in Row 7 for each of the two years (but not for percent change).

For example, *Table 1*, A1 (White) + A2 (Black) + A3 (Hispanic) + A4 (Other) = A5 (Total Admissions).

JUVENILES COMMITTED TO THE JJC

Required Data	<p>“Committed Juveniles” refers to youth committed by the court to the custody of the Juvenile Justice Commission.</p> <p>Table 7 required data is committed juveniles admitted to JJC.</p> <p>Tables 8, 9, and 10 are based on the number of juveniles committed to the custody of the JJC, who in calendar years 2018 and 2022 were either released to a period of parole supervision or recalled to probation. Required data include committed juveniles released by departure type, race, gender, and age, and the average length of stay of committed juveniles.</p> <p>Tables 11, 12 and 13 are based on the number of juveniles committed to the custody of the JJC during calendar years 2018 and 2022. Required data include the committed juveniles by offense type and committed juveniles with a sex offense charge in their history. <i>NOTE: Juveniles may have multiple offenses</i></p>
Source	New Jersey Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 and 2022 (JJC will provide these data to the Counties).
Methods	<p><u>Table 7. Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC by Race/Ethnicity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Number (Columns B/C and F/G).</i> Insert the number of committed juveniles admitted to the JJC by Race/Ethnicity for each year. ➤ <i>Percent of Total Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC (Columns D/E and H/I).</i> Calculate the percent of the total number of committed juveniles admitted to the JJC by Race/Ethnicity for each year using Formula 1. ➤ <i>Percent Change (Column J).</i> Calculate the percent change in the number of committed juveniles admitted to the JJC between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Methods
(cont.)

Table 8. Committed Juveniles Released to Juvenile Parole Supervision

- *Number (Columns B/C and F/G).* Insert the number of committed juveniles released from JJC custody via each departure type in 2018 and 2022.
- *Percent Change (Column J).* Calculate the percent change between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Table 9. Average Length of Stay (LOS) of Committed Juveniles Released

- *Number (Columns B/C/D and E/F/G).* Insert the average length of stay for committed juveniles for each year.
- *Percent Change (Columns H/I/J).* Calculate the percent change in the average length of stay between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Table 10. Committed Juveniles Released by Race/Ethnicity and Gender

- *Males by Race (Columns B and E).* Insert the number of committed males of each race/ethnicity and the total number of males released for each year.
- *Females by Race/Ethnicity (Columns C and F).* Insert the number of committed females of each race/ethnicity and the total number of females released for each year.
- *Total by Race/Ethnicity (Columns D and G).* Insert the total number of committed juveniles of each race/ethnicity released from JJC programs in each year, and the grand total of all committed juveniles released in each year (Cells C5 and F5).
- *Percent Change - Males by Race/Ethnicity (Columns H).* Calculate the percent change in the number of males of each race/ethnicity committed and the total number of males committed between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.
- *Percent Change - Females by Race/Ethnicity (Columns I).* Calculate the percent change in the number of females of each race/ethnicity committed and the total number of females committed between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.
- *Percent Change - Total by Race/Ethnicity (Columns J).* Calculate the percent change in the total number of juveniles committed of each race/ethnicity between 2018 and 2022, and in the grand total of all committed juveniles between 2018 and 2022 (Cell I5) using Formula 2.

Table 11. Committed Juveniles Released by Age

- *Number (Columns B/C and F/G).* Add the number of committed juveniles ages 14 and under, 15-16, 17-18, and 19 and over, and then insert the number of committed youth in each age group in the appropriate cells for each year.
- *Percent of Total (Columns D/E and H/I).* Calculate what percent of the total number of committed juveniles in each year were in each age group. To obtain the percent, divide the number committed juveniles in each age group by the total number of committed juveniles and multiply by 100 (use Formula 1).
- *Percent Change (Column J).* Calculate the percent change in the number of committed juveniles from each age group and the total number of committed juveniles between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

Table 12. Offenses of Committed Juveniles by Type

- *Number (Columns B/C and F/G).* Insert the number of committed juveniles in each year with an offense of the particular type listed.
- *Percent of Total (Columns D/E and H/I).* Calculate what percent of the total number of committed juveniles had an offense of the particular type listed. To obtain the percent, divide the number of committed juveniles with a particular offense type by the total number of committed juveniles and multiply by 100 (use Formula 1).
- *Percent Change (Column J).* Calculate the percent change in each of the offense types and in the total number of committed juveniles between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

NOTE: * Juveniles may have multiple offenses

Table 13. Committed Juveniles with a Sex Offense Charge in their History

- *Number (Columns B/C/D and E/F/G).* Insert the number of committed juveniles with a sex offense charge in the appropriate cell for each year.
- *Percent Change (Column H/I/J).* Calculate the percent change in the number of committed juveniles with a sex offense charge between 2018 and 2022 using Formula 2.

*Please note that the data includes charges that have been sustained, amended or dismissed.

Table 14. Ranking of Problem Areas

➤ *Problem Area (Columns C/D). Insert the problem areas for each year.*

Table 15. Ranking of Service Interventions Needed

➤ *Service Intervention Needed (Columns C/D). Insert the service interventions needed for each year.*

Table 16. Ranking of Service Interventions Provided

➤ *Service Intervention Provided (Columns C/D). Insert the service interventions provided for each year.*

Data Checks

In *Tables 8, 11 and 12* the figures in Row 1 through Row 4 should add up to the figure in Row 5 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). In *Table 9* the figures in Row 1 and Row 2 should add up to the figure in Row 3 for each of the two years (but not for percent change). In *Table 13 and 14*, the figures in Row 1 through Row 6 should add up to the figure in Row 7 for each of the two years (but not for percent change).

For example *Table 8*, A1 (White) + A2 (Black) + A3 (Hispanic) + A4 (Other) = A5 (Total Admissions).

JUVENILE AUTOMATED MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JAMS)

Required Data

Each State Community Partnership funded program collects data regarding each youth in the program. The following required data reflects the total population of youth served in Reentry/Aftercare Programs in 2022:

- Total Intakes by Program
- Total Intakes by Gender
- Total Intakes by Race
- Average Age of Intake Population
- Problem Areas by Program
- Service Intervention Provided to Youth
- Service Intervention Needed for Youth but not Available

Source

Juvenile Justice Commission’s Juvenile Automated Management System (JAMS)

Methods

➤ Each County Youth Services Commission enters the required data into JAMS. The data is then accessed by the Juvenile Justice Commission for analysis. Once analysis is complete, aggregate data is returned to the County to be included in their Comprehensive County Youth Services Plan. This data will produce a “picture” of youth in Reentry/Aftercare Programs.

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.

Total youth admitted as probationer to JJC residential was 3 in 2022.

White youth admitted as probationer to JJC residential was 3 and made up 100% of the total in 2022.

Black youth admitted as probationer to JJC residential was 0 and made up 0% of the total in 2022.

Hispanic youth admitted as probationer to JJC residential was 0 and made up 0% of the total in 2022.

Other youth admitted as probationer to JJC residential was 0 and made up 0% of the total in 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.

Total youth admitted as probationer to JJC residential decreased by 50% from 2018 to 2022.

White youth admitted as probationer to JJC residential increased from 0 in 2018 to 3 in 2022.

Black youth admitted as probationer to JJC residential decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Hispanic youth admitted as probationer to JJC residential decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Other youth admitted as probationer to JJC residential placed did not change (0) from 2018 to 2022.

Only White juveniles were securely placed in 2022. Total juveniles securely placed decreased by 66.7% from 6 in 2018 to 2 in 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?

Only White juveniles were securely placed in 2022. Total juveniles securely placed decreased by 66.7% from 6 in 2018 to 2 in 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.

Total probationers released by a residential program was 3 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.

Total probationers released by a residential program was 3 in 2022.

White probationers released by a residential program was 0 in 2022.

Black probationers released by a residential program was 2 in 2022.

Hispanic probationers released by a residential program was 1 in 2022.

Other probationers released by a residential program was 0 in 2022.

Male probationers released by a residential program was 3 in 2022.

Female probationers released by a residential program was 0 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.

Total probationers released by a residential program decreased by 25% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 1 - White probationers released by a residential program decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 2 - Other probationers released by a residential program decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 3 - Black probationers released by a residential program increased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 4 - Hispanic probationers released by a residential program did not change (1) from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 1 - Male probationers released by a residential program decreased by 25% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 2 - Female probationers released by a residential program did not change (0) from 2018 to 2022.

Very little change occurred form 2018 to 2022. One less White and Other youth were released by a residential program while one more Black youth was released from 2018 to 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.

Total probationers released by a residential program was 3 in 2022.

14 and under probationers released by a residential program was 0 and made up 0% of the total in 2022.

15-16 year old probationers released by a residential program was 2 and made up 66.7% of the total in

2022.

17-18 year old probationers released by a residential program was 1 and made up 33.3% of the total in 2022.

19 and over probationers released by a residential program was 0 and made up 0% of the total in 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.

Persons offenses of residentially placed probationers was 1 and made up 33.3% of the total in 2022.

Weapons offenses of residentially placed probationers was 1 and made up 33.3% of the total in 2022.

Property offenses of residentially placed probationers was 0 and made up 0% of the total in 2022.

CDS offenses of residentially placed probationers was 1 and made up 33.3% of the total in 2022.

Public Order offenses of residentially placed probationers was 0 and made up 0% of the total in 2022.

VOP offenses of residentially placed probationers was 0 and made up 0% of the total in 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.

Rank 1 - Property offenses of residentially placed probationers decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 2 - Public Order offenses of residentially placed probationers decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 3 - VOP offenses of residentially placed probationers decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 4 - Persons offenses of residentially placed probationers decreased by 50% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 5 - Weapons offenses of residentially placed probationers decreased by 50% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 6 - CDS offenses of residentially placed probationers decreased by 50% from 2018 to 2022.

Person, Weapons and CDS offense which all decreased by 50% form 2018 to 2022 were the only offense in 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.

Total probationers released from Pinelands was 0 in 2022.

Total probationers released from Pinelands decreased by 100% from 2018 to 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?

Total probationers released by a residential program was 3 in 2022. Total probationers released by a residential program decreased by 25% from 2018 to 2022. All probationers admitted and released by a residential program from 2018 to 2022 were Male.

COMMITTED JUVENILES TO THE JJC

2024-2026 Comprehensive County YSC Plan

Analysis Questions - Reentry

Page 3 of 10

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.

Total juveniles committed to JJC was 2 in 2022.

White juveniles committed to JJC was 2 and made up 100% of the total in 2022.

Black juveniles committed to JJC was 0 and made up 0% of the total in 2022.

Hispanic juveniles committed to JJC was 0 and made up 0% of the total in 2022.

Other juveniles committed to JJC was 0 and made up 0% of the total in 2022.

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.

Rank 1 - White juveniles committed to JJC increased from 0 in 2018 to 2 in 2022.

Rank 2 - Black juveniles committed to JJC decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 3 - Hispanic juveniles committed to JJC decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 4 - Other juveniles committed to JJC decreased did not change (0) from 2018 to 2022.

Black and Hispanic commitments decreased and White commitments increased from 2018 to 2022.

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

2 juveniles were committed to JJC in 2022. Black and Hispanic commitments decreased and White commitments increased from 2018 to 2022.

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.

Total committed juveniles released to Juvenile Parole Supervision was 7 in 2018 and 1 in 2022.

Total committed juveniles released to Juvenile Parole Supervision decreased by 71.4% from 2018 to 2022.

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.

The average length of stay of committed juveniles released was 12.04 months in 2018 and 7.1 months in 2022.

The average length of stay of committed juveniles released decreased by 41% from 2018 to 2022.

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.

Total committed juveniles released was 1 in 2022.
 White committed juveniles released was 0 in 2022.
 Black committed juveniles released was 1 in 2022.
 Hispanic committed juveniles released was 0 in 2022.
 Other committed juveniles released was 0 in 2022.

Male committed juveniles released was 1 in 2022.
 Female committed juveniles released was 0 in 2022.

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.

Rank 1 - Hispanic committed juveniles released decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.
 Rank 2 - Black committed juveniles released decreased by 80% from 2018 to 2022.
 Rank 3 - White committed juveniles released did not change (0) from 2018 to 2022.
 Rank 4 - Other committed juveniles released did not change (0) from 2018 to 2022.

All categories either decreased by a large percent or were at 0 from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 1 - Male committed juveniles released decreased by 85.7% from 2018 to 2022.
 Rank 2 - Female committed juveniles released did not change (0) from 2018 to 2022.

Males decreased by a large percent and Females were at 0 from 2018 to 2022.

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

Total Juveniles released was 1 in 2022.

- 14 and under released was 0 in 2022.
 15-16 year olds released was 0 in 2022.
 17-18 year olds released was 0 in 2022.
 19 and over released was 1 in 2022.

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.

Rank 1 - 17-18 year olds released decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.
 Rank 2 - 19 and over released decreased by 83.3% from 2018 to 2022.
 Rank 3 - 14 and under released did not change (0) from 2018 to 2022.
 Rank 4 - 15-16 year olds released did not change (0) from 2018 to 2022.

All categories either decreased by a large percent or were at 0 from 2018 to 2022.

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.

Persons offenses of committed juveniles was 1 in 2022.

Weapons offenses of committed juveniles was 0 in 2022.

Property offenses of committed juveniles was 0 in 2022.

CDS offenses of committed juveniles was 0 in 2022.

Public Order offenses of committed juveniles was 0 in 2022.

VOP offenses of committed juveniles was 0 in 2022.

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.

Rank 1 - Property offenses of committed juveniles decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

CDS offenses of committed juveniles decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Public Order offenses of committed decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

VOP offenses of committed juveniles decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

Rank 2 - Persons offenses of committed juveniles did not change (1) from 2018 to 2022.

Weapons offenses of committed juveniles did not change (0) from 2018 to 2022.

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 charge 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.

Committed juveniles with a sex offender charge in their history was 1 in 2018 and 0 in 2022.

Committed juveniles with a sex offender charge in their history decreased by 100% from 2018 to 2022.

24. Using the answers to questions 15-23, what are your most significant findings about committed juveniles released from JJC?

The average length of stay of committed juveniles released decreased by 41% from 2018 to 2022.

Total committed juveniles released to Juvenile Parole Supervision decreased by 71.4% from 2018 to 2022.

All categories were either at 0 or decreased from 2018 to 2022.

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.

There are no YSC re-entry programs in Cumberland County.

26. Looking at each reentry program, describe reentry program intakes by gender, race and age by in 2022.
N/A
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.
N/A
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.
N/A
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.
N/A
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?
N/A

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?
N/A

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.

Total juveniles securely placed decreased by 66.7% from 6 in 2018 to 2 in 2022. Total probationers released by a residential program decreased by 25% from 2018 to 2022. From 2012-2023, the Cumberland YSC did not offer any re-entry programs due to the minimal number of releases occurring each year. In 2018-2022, releases to Probation and Supervision decreased. This indicates a further decreased need for re-entry programming. The Cumberland YSC will continue discussion of individual cases at MDT meetings and continue maintenance of emergent needs funding to cover unexpected but necessary services that are not provided by other sources.

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.

2 juveniles were committed to JJC in 2022. The Cumberland YSC will continue discussion of individual cases at MDT meetings and continue maintenance of emergent needs funding to cover unexpected but necessary services that are not provided by other sources.

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?

N/A.

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 are no YSC re-entry programs in Cumberland County.

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?

The Cumberland YSC will continue discussion of individual cases at MDT meetings and continue maintenance of emergent needs funding to cover unexpected but necessary services that are not provided by other sources

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	Client Emergent Need funding attached to vendor contracts which has reduced barriers to access versus Client-Specific Funding.	According to JJC data, Cumberland's re-entry numbers are so low that they do not warrant a need for specific re-entry programming at this time.	The Cumberland YSC will continue discussion of individual cases at MDT meetings and continue maintenance of emergent needs funding to cover unexpected but necessary services that are not provided by other sources.
B			
C			
D			
E			
F			
G			

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

Comments:

COUNTY VISION OF THE JUVENILE JUSTICE CONTINUUM

Introduction

This final section is intended to bring each individual continuum point within the County Youth Services Commission (CYSC) plan together for the purpose of developing a Vision of local programs and services. By its nature, the Vision requires counties to visualize what their optimal juvenile justice continuum would look like, without the restrictions of funding parameters. Thus, the county Vision should reflect, regardless of funding availability, the programs and/or types of services that the CYSC envisions as part of a reasonable juvenile justice continuum.

To develop this Vision, the CYSC will draw upon the Recommendations section from the earlier pieces of the plan corresponding to each point on the continuum (prevention, diversion, detention, disposition, and reentry). In the Recommendation sections CYSCs used data regarding the extent and nature of the juvenile population served at each point on the continuum to identify programmatic needs. CYSCs then compared the characteristics of juveniles served to the characteristics of the programs providing services to identify where gaps in services currently exist at each point on the continuum. Finally, CYSCs used this information to make specific Recommendations regarding their Comprehensive Plan, identifying how the Recommendation addressed identified needs and gaps in services.

After reviewing the Recommendations section for each point on the continuum, CYSCs should develop their Vision using the Vision chart (attached). Again, CYSCs should draw on their Recommendations to develop a Vision that represents what your County's ideal Continuum of Care would look like, regardless of funding limitations.

Process

CYSCs should use the Vision Chart to list, at each point on the continuum, the programs and/or types of services needed, given the characteristics of youth served at that point, and as identified in each Recommendation section. To complete the Vision Chart, CYSCs are to:

1. Complete, for each point on the continuum, the data analysis and answer the analysis questions.
2. Look at the answers to the Implication questions at each individual point on the continuum and discuss the data, using a group process. In the development of the recommendations and vision, counties are expected to work through either a sub-committee and/or groups of juvenile justice key actors. Through these group discussions, counties should develop, for each point on the continuum, recommendations to be considered in the development of the county vision.

- Looking at the Recommendation Pages of each point on the continuum, complete the Vision chart. For planning purposes, the Vision chart will include programs and services already in existence, as well as identify gaps in programs and services. Note that the programs and services listed on the Vision Chart should represent a reasonable vision for the county's juvenile justice system.

Vision Chart

- For each point of the continuum, the County should list in order of highest need each program and/or service needed to complete the County's ideal Continuum of Care.
- For each program and/or service listed, the County should indicate, with a Yes or No, if the program/service currently exists, is currently being funded by the County, and/or if it is not meeting the need therefore is a gap in service. Multiple columns could have a Yes or No if applicable.

CYSCs should use their completed Vision as the basis for completing the Comprehensive Application. Counties apply for the State/Community Partnership Grant Program, the Family Court Services Grant Program, and the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative – Innovations Funding through one Comprehensive Application. Required in the application is a continuum that represents the types of programs and services the county anticipates funding through a combination of these funding sources, administered through the JJC. Statewide gaps in services will be identified through a comparison of the Vision.

VISION

Delinquency Prevention Programs	Law Enforcement Diversion Programs	Family Crisis Intervention Unit
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____	1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____	1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____
→	→	
+	Family Court Diversion Programs	Detention Alternative Programs (Pre-Adjudicated Youth)
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____		1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____
→	Reentry Programs	Other: _____
1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____	1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____	1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____

VISION

Cumberland 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	Violence Prevention/Safe Space Programming (Community Policing Programs, Euphoria Youth Center)	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Mentoring/Life Skills/Counseling (Police Athletic Leagues, Boys & Girls Clubs, Big Brothers Big Sisters, Municipal Alliance programs)	Yes	Yes	No
3	Academic Success Programs (Boys & Girls Clubs, 21 st Century Programs, Municipal Alliance Programs)	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	Employment/Career Readiness Programs (Wawa Summer Youth Employment Program, Workforce Development Youth Employment Programs)	Yes	Yes	No
5	Recreation Programs (Euphoria Youth Center, Boys & Girls Clubs,	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Municipal Alliance Programs, Sports Leagues)			
--	--	--	--	--

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	Individual Mentoring (Positive Role Model, Socialization Skills, Educational Activities and Supervision)	Yes	Yes	No
2	Mental Health Counseling (Anger Management, Family Counseling, Education Advocacy)	Yes	Yes	No
3	Drug & Alcohol Services (Evaluations, Treatment [Individual/Group], and Education [Juvenile/Family])	Yes	Yes	No
4	Firearm Safety Program (Educate on the dangers and consequences of possessing and using firearms irresponsibly, consequences of gun violence)	No	No	Yes
5	Sexting Intervention Program (Educate on the dangers and consequences of sexting. Education on internet safety, social media use, cyberbullying, healthy relationships, and parent education)	Yes	Yes	No

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	Individual Mentoring (Positive Role Model, Socialization Skills, Educational Activities and Supervision)	Yes	Yes	No
2	Mental Health Counseling (Anger Management, Family Counseling, Education Advocacy)	Yes	Yes	No
3	Drug & Alcohol Services (Evaluations, Treatment [Individual/Group], and	Yes	Yes	No

	Education [Juvenile/Family])			
4	Firearm Safety Program (Educate on the dangers and consequences of possessing and using firearms irresponsibly, consequences of gun violence)	No	No	Yes
5	Sexting Intervention Program (Educate on the dangers and consequences of sexting. Education on internet safety, social media use, cyberbullying, healthy relationships, and parent education)	Yes	Yes	No

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	Individual Mentoring (Positive Role Model, Socialization Skills, Educational Activities and Supervision)	Yes	Yes	No
2	Mental Health Counseling (Anger Management, Family Counseling, Education Advocacy)	Yes	Yes	No
3	Drug & Alcohol Services (Evaluations, Treatment [Individual/Group], and Education [Juvenile/Family])	Yes	Yes	No
4	Firearm Safety Program (Educate on the dangers and consequences of possessing and using firearms irresponsibly, consequences of gun violence)	No	No	Yes
5	Sexting Intervention Program (Educate on the dangers and consequences of sexting. Education on internet safety, social media use, cyberbullying, healthy relationships, and parent education)	Yes	Yes	No

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	Cognitive Skills Program (Cognitive Process Training, Personality Assessment, Conflict Resolution Training, Communication Skills Training, Team Building Exercises)	Yes	No	No
2	Life Skills Program (ADL Training, Banking, Budgeting, Time Management)	Yes	No	No
3	Mental Health Counseling (Anger Management, Family Counseling, Education Advocacy, Truama Counseling)	Yes	No	No
4	Transportation for Family Visits - Client Emergent Funds (Van, taxi, Bus Pass)	Yes	Yes	No
5	Pre-Release Re-Entry Transition Services	Yes	No	No

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	In-Home Detention Alternative (Supervision, Counseling, Employment and Education Assistance)	Yes	Yes	No
2	Electronic Monitoring Program (Counseling and Education Assistance)	Yes	No	Yes
3	Shelter Beds (Supervision, Counseling, Employment and	Yes	Yes	No

	Education Assistance)			
4	Inpatient/Therapeutic Beds	No	No	Yes
5				

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	Individual Mentoring (Positive Role Model, Socialization Skills, Educational Activities and Supervision)	Yes	Yes	No
2	Mental Health Counseling (Anger Management, Family Counseling, Education Advocacy)	Yes	Yes	No
3	Drug & Alcohol Services (Evaluations, Treatment [Individual/Group], and Education [Juvenile/Family])	Yes	Yes	No
4	Cognitive Skills Program (Cognitive Process Training, Personality Assessment, Conflict Resolution Training, Communication Skills Training and Team Building Exercises)	Yes	Yes	No
5	Sex Offender Services (Evaluations, Treatment and Community Supports)	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	Case Management Services (Social Service Appointments, Employment Services, Education Advocacy)	Yes	No	No
2	Housing Assistance (Public Housing Program)	No	No	Yes
3	Ex-Offender Employment Services (Workforce Development, DVR)	Yes	Yes	No
4	Transportation Assistance (Bus passes, Uber/gas cards for Social Service, Court, Employment related appointments)	Yes	No	Yes
5				

The Causes and Correlates of Delinquency

While planning for their local juvenile justice continuum, counties must consider the programs and services within their local continuum with regard to how they address the causes and correlates of delinquency. The causes and correlates of delinquency include characteristics, circumstances, and behaviors that research and experience have shown to be associated with continued involvement in delinquent activity. A description of factors commonly known to have the strongest association with delinquent behavior follows.

Family/Household. Parenting skills- including the ability to supervise and monitor behavior, and to control and respond to negative behavior through the use of consistent rules and discipline – are typically lacking or ineffective in families of delinquent youth. Additionally, youth from homes characterized by a lack of support, communication and cohesiveness are more likely to engage in ongoing antisocial behavior; so are adolescents from families where interpersonal relationships are abusive or otherwise dysfunctional, or where parents are experiencing their own legal, substance use or mental health problems. Finally, housing and family instability are also associated with continued behavioral problems.

Education/Vocation. Poor academic performance, a lack of interest in and commitment to school, and negative behavior in the educational setting are each associated with ongoing involvement in delinquent activity. For adolescents beginning the transition into adulthood, employment and vocational problems- including a lack of experience, training and interest are similarly influential. Additionally, learning disabilities and other intellectual challenges can impair intervention efforts in other areas.

Substance Abuse. Substance use disorders are highly prevalent among juvenile delinquents. In some cases, substance abuse might lead to or facilitate delinquency; in others, substance abuse might stem from the same causal factors as delinquency. Either way, there is an undeniable association between substance abuse and delinquent activity.

Peers/Role Models. Without a doubt, young people are influenced by their peers. As youth enter the adolescent years, the peer group typically replaces the parent as the most relevant source of information and behavioral reinforcement. Whether a juvenile is introduced to delinquent activity via delinquent peers, or whether an already delinquent juvenile seeks out like-minded companions, there is a clear association between negative peer relationships and antisocial behavior.

Attitudes/Behaviors. Delinquent youth often present with attitudes and perceptions that support or justify their negative behavior. These attitudes allow a youth to rationalize delinquency by assigning blame to external sources or by minimizing the harm caused to others. Often these youth do not see a need for change or, believe change is not possible, or feel changes is pointless because ' what will be, will be.' Additionally, many

juveniles with assaultive histories lack anger management and conflict resolution skills, responding to frustration or aggravation with angry outbursts, or relying on aggression to settle disagreements.

Use of Time/Leisure Activity. Youth who participate in constructive recreational activities or who have pro-social hobbies or interests are less likely to engage in delinquency and other antisocial behavior than youth who do not. The association between a lack of involvement in pro-social activities and delinquency is two-pronged. First, involvement in pro-social activities increases the youth's interaction with and exposure to positive peers and adults and promotes feelings of confidence and self-efficacy. Second, the more unstructured and unsupervised time a youth has, the more time the youth has to engage in negative behaviors.

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)	18,270	50.5%	18,015	50.4%	17,962	50.5%	-1.7%
Females (under 18)	17,938	49.5%	17,703	49.6%	17,620	49.5%	-1.8%
Total Youth Population (under 18)	36,208	100%	35,718	100%	35,582	100%	-1.7%

Source: OJJDP Easy Access to Juvenile Population <https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/statistical-briefing-book/data-analysis-tools/ezapop-county-comparisons>

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	25,068	69.2%	24,453	68.7%	-2.5%
Black	9,736	26.9%	9,673	27.2%	-0.6%
Other*	1,404	3.9%	1,456	4.1%	3.7%
Total Youth Population	36,208	100.0%	35,582	100.0%	-1.7%

Source: OJJDP Easy Access to Juvenile Population <https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/statistical-briefing-book/data-analysis-tools/ezapop-county-comparisons>

**See Required Data and Methodology Section*

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	16,608	45.9%	16,632	46.7%	0.1%
Non -Hispanic	19,600	54.1%	18,950	53.3%	-3.3%
Total Youth Population	36,208	100.0%	35,582	100.0%	-1.7%

Source: OJJDP Easy Access to Juvenile Population <https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/statistical-briefing-book/data-analysis-tools/czpop-county-comparisons>

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	74	17.5%	2.04	114	21.0%	3.2	49	19.1%	1.4	-33.8%
Weapons Offenses	28	6.6%	0.8	35	6.5%	1.0	10	3.9%	0.3	-64.3%
Property Offenses	92	21.8%	2.5	136	25.1%	3.8	67	26.1%	1.9	-27.2%
Drug/Alcohol Offenses	77	18.2%	2.1	106	19.6%	3.0	55	21.4%	1.5	-28.6%
Special Needs Offenses	19	4.5%	0.5	16	3.0%	0.4	6	2.3%	0.2	-68.4%
Public Order & Status Offenses	73	17.3%	2.0	70	12.9%	2.0	23	8.9%	0.6	-68.5%
All Other Offenses	59	14.0%	1.6	65	12.0%	1.8	47	18.3%	1.3	-20.3%
Total Juvenile Arrests	422	100%	11.7	542	100%	15.2	257	100%	7.2	-39.1%

Source: New Jersey State Police, 2018, 2019, and 2020

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

*See Required Data and Methodology Section

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	25,068	333	1.3%	24,453	117	0.5%	-2.5%	-64.9%
Black	9,736	298	3.1%	9,673	139	1.4%	-0.6%	-53.4%
Other*	1,404	1	0.1%	1,456	1	0.1%	3.7%	0.0%
Total	36,208	632	1.7%	35,582	257	0.7%	-1.7%	-59.3%

Source: OJJDP Easy Access to Juvenile Population - <https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/statistical-briefing-book/data-analysis-tools/ezapop/county-comparisons>
 Source: New Jersey State Police, 2018, 2019, and 2020

*See Required Data and Methodology Section

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	16,608	229	1.4%	16,632	84	0.5%	0.1%	-63.3%
Non-Hispanic	19,600	372	1.9%	18,950	173	0.9%	-3.3%	-53.5%
Total Youth Population	36,208	601	1.7%	35,582	257	0.7%	-1.7%	-57.2%

Source: OJJDP Easy Access to Juvenile Population - <https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/statistical-briefing-book/data-analysis-tools/ezapop/county-comparisons>
 Source: New Jersey State Police, 2018 and 2020

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	720	76.7%	823	67.2%	14.3%
Incidents of Vandalism	100	10.6%	87	7.1%	-13.0%
Incidents of Weapons	36	3.8%	69	5.6%	91.7%
Incidents of Substances	83	8.8%	245	20.0%	195.2%
TOTAL SCHOOL BASED INCIDENCES	939	100%	1224	100%	30.4%

Source: New Jersey Department of Education, 2017-2018 and 2021-2022 - <https://rc.doc.state.nj.us/download>

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	28,106	26,890	27,304	-2.9%
Total Dropouts*	1.48	1.2	2.32	56.8%

Source: New Jersey Department of Education, 2019-2020, 2020-2021, and 2021-2022. <https://rc.doe.state.nj.us/download>

**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 (Welfare)	1034	759	843	599	594	-43%
Children receiving NJ SNAP (formerly food stamps)	13420	12029	12694	14511	12987	-3%
Child abuse/neglect substantiations	3761	3730	2880	3359		-11%
Births to adolescents (ages 10-19)	123	135	122			-1%

Source: Annie E. Casey Foundation, Kids Count Data Center. <https://datacenter.kidscount.org/data=NJ/5/0/char/0>

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	263	25.0%	237	33.4%	21	8.1%	-92.0%
Serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile	146	13.9%	96	13.5%	108	41.5%	-26.0%
Unauthorized absence by a juvenile for more than 24 hours	10	1.0%	3	0.4%	10	3.8%	0.0%
Truancy	25	2.4%	5	0.7%	53	20.4%	112.0%
Disorderly/Petty Disorderly Persons offense diverted to FCIU	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	36	13.8%	3500.0%
Other	606	57.7%	367	51.8%	32	12.3%	-94.7%
TOTAL CASELOAD	1051	100%	709	100%	260	100%	-75.3%

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	0.0%	0	#DIV/0!	2	40.0%	#DIV/0!
Out-of-Home	4	100.0%	0	#DIV/0!	3	60.0%	-25.0%
TOTAL PETITIONS FILED	4	100%	0	#DIV/0!	5	100%	25.0%

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	36	6.2%	0	0.0%	12	10.7%	-66.7%
Referrals made to Substance Abuse Program	1	0.2%	15	100.0%	6	5.4%	500.0%
Referrals made to Other Outside Agencies	548	93.7%	0	0.0%	94	83.9%	-82.8%
TOTAL REFERRALS	585	100%	15	100%	112	100%	-80.9%

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	63	24.9%	45	25.4%	3	25.0%	-95.2%
Black	126	49.8%	88	#DIV/0!	2	16.7%	-98.4%
Hispanic	57	22.5%	41	#DIV/0!	6	50.0%	-89.5%
Other*	7	2.8%	3	#DIV/0!	1	8.3%	-85.7%
Total Referrals	253	100.0%	177	100%	12	100%	-95.3%

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

*See required Data and Methodology

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	Juvenile Arrests**	Referrals to Court
White	333	63	18.9%	117	45	38.5%	-64.9%	-28.6%
Black	298	126	42.3%	139	88	63.3%	-53.4%	-30.2%
Hispanic	229	57	24.9%	84	41	48.8%	-63.3%	-28.1%
Other*	1	7	700.0%	1	3	300.0%	0.0%	-57.1%
Total	632	253	40.0%	257	177	68.9%	-59.3%	-30.0%

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

*** See required Data and Methodology

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		2022		% Change 2018-2022
	Number	% of Total Cases Diverted	Number	% of Total Cases Diverted	
White	25	23.4%	6	26.1%	-76.0%
Black	55	51.4%	17	73.9%	-69.1%
Hispanic	25	23.4%	-	0.0%	-100.0%
Other*	2	1.9%	-	0.0%	-100.0%
Total Cases	107	100.0%	23	100.0%	-78.5%

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

*See required Data and Methodology

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	333	25	7.5%	117	6	5.1%	-64.9%	-76.0%
Black	298	55	18.5%	139	17	12.2%	-53.4%	-69.1%
Hispanic	229	25	10.9%	84	-	0.0%	-63.3%	-100.0%
Other*	1	2	200.0%	1	-	0.0%	0.0%	-100.0%
Total	632	107	16.9%	257	23	8.9%	-59.3%	-78.5%

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

*/** See required Data and Methodology

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	2	-	2	6	-	6	20	6	26	900.0%	#DIV/0!	#####
Black	27	1	28	20	5	25	6	-	6	-77.8%	-100.0%	-78.6%
Hispanic	13	1	14	7	-	7	9	-	9	-30.8%	-100.0%	-35.7%
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Admissions	42	2	44	33	5	38	35	6	41	-16.7%	200.0%	-6.8%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission: New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JJAI) 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
White	63	2	3.2%	3	26	866.7%	-95.2%	1200.0%
Black	126	28	22.2%	2	6	300.0%	-98.4%	-78.6%
Hispanic	57	14	24.6%	6	9	150.0%	-89.5%	-35.7%
Other*	7	-	0.0%	1	-	0.0%	-85.7%	#DIV/0!
Total	253	44	17.4%	12	41	341.7%	-95.3%	-6.8%

Source: JJC: New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JJAI) 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	27.1	41.8	62.9	132.1%
Average Daily Population	4.2	5.6	7.9	88.1%

Source: JJC: New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAl) 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	6.4	7	6.5	1.6%
Average Monthly Admissions	26	30	35	34.6%

Source: JJC: New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAl) 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	31	26	85	174.8%
Black	33	49	64	96.0%
Hispanic	17	37	40	136.5%
Other	-	-	-	#DIV/0!
Total ALOS	80	111	189	134.9%

Source: JJC: New Jersey Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAl) 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	75.00%	75.00%	72.40%	-3.5%
New Charges	5.00%	3.10%	3.40%	-32.0%
Violation/Non-Compliance	20.00%	21.90%	24.10%	20.5%

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

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	169	77.2%	54	83.1%	-68.0%
Female	50	22.8%	11	16.9%	-78.0%
Total Juveniles	219	100%	65	100%	-70.3%

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 Number	2022 Number	% Change in Dispositions 2018-2022
01 - JJC Committed	7	4	-42.9%
02 - Short-Term Commitment	0	1	#DIV/0!
03 - 14 - Probation*	111	57	-48.6%
Total	118	62	-47.5%

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
White	1	10.0%	2	14.3%	3
Black	2	20.0%	3	21.4%	4
Hispanic	3	30.0%	4	28.6%	5
Other *	4	40.0%	5	35.7%	6
Total	10	100.0%	14	100.0%	18

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
White	333	1	0.3%	117	2	1.7%	-64.9%	100.0%
Black	298	2	0.7%	139	3	2.2%	-53.4%	50.0%
Hispanic	229	3	1.3%	84	4	4.8%	-63.3%	33.3%
Other*	1	4	400.0%	1	5	500.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Total	632	10	1.6%	257	14	5.4%	-59.3%	40.0%

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	4	2.0%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
11 - 12	16	8.1%	7	10.8%	-56.3%
13 - 14	33	16.7%	17	26.2%	-48.5%
15 - 16	83	41.9%	26	40.0%	-68.7%
17	62	31.3%	15	23.1%	-75.8%
18 and over*	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
Total	198	100%	65	100%	-67.2%

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	51	25.8%	2	16.7%	-96.1%
Black	92	46.5%	3	25.0%	-96.7%
Hispanic	51	25.8%	6	50.0%	-88.2%
Other *	4	2.0%	1	8.3%	-75.0%
Total	198	100.0%	12	100.0%	-93.9%

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
White	1	51	5100.0%	3	2	66.7%	200.0%	-96.1%
Black	2	92	4600.0%	4	3	75.0%	100.0%	-96.7%
Hispanic	3	51	1700.0%	5	6	120.0%	66.7%	-88.2%
Other*	4	4	100.0%	6	1	16.7%	50.0%	-75.0%
Total	10	198	1980.0%	18	12	66.7%	80.0%	-93.9%

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	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	#DIV/0!
Black	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Hispanic	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Other *	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
Total	6	100.0%	2	100.0%	-66.7%

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	1	-	0.0%	2	2	100.0%	100.0%	#DIV/0!
Black	2	3	150.0%	3	-	0.0%	50.0%	-100.0%
Hispanic	3	3	100.0%	4	-	0.0%	33.3%	-100.0%
Other*	4	-	0.0%	5	-	0.0%	25.0%	#DIV/0!
Total	10	6	60.0%	14	2	14.3%	40.0%	-66.7%

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

2018			2022		
Rank	Problem Area	Total	Rank	Problem Area	Total
1	Personality/Behavior	175	1	Personality/Behavior	23
2	Family Circumstances/Parenting	86	2	Family Circumstances/Parenting	21
3	Education	80	3	Substance abuse	19
4	Substance Abuse	78	4	Education	14
5	Peer Relations	66	5	Peer Relations	10
6	Attitudes Orientation	44	6	Attitudes/Orientation	9
7	Other	10	7	Teen Pregnancy/Parenting	2
8	Teen Pregnancy/Parenting	5	8	Vocational Skills/Employment	1
9	Vocational Skills/Employment	3	9	Medical Problems	1
10	Medical Problems	3	10	Other	1

Table 11. Ranking of Service Intervention Provided, 2018 and 2022

2018			2022		
Rank	Service Intervention Provided	Total	Rank	Service Intervention Provided	Total
1	Counseling/Individual	45	1	Counseling/Individual	18
2	Decision Making Skills Training	44	2	Life Skills Training	17
3	Counseling/Family	35	3	Decision Making Skills Training	12
4	Anger Management Training	34	4	Substance Abuse Evaluation	10
5	Urine Monitoring	31	5	Urine Monitoring	10
6	Interpersonal Skills Training	26	6	Anger Management Training	7
7	Role Model/Mentor	26	7	Transportation	6
8	Life Skills Training	25	8	Advocacy	6
9	Substance Abuse Evaluation	25	9	Substance Abuse Treatment/Counseling	5
10	Advocacy	20	10	Counseling/Family	4

Table 12. Ranking of Service Intervention Needed, 2018 and 2022

2018			2022		
Rank	Service Intervention Needed	Total	Rank	Service Intervention Needed	Total
1	Counseling/Individual	45	1	Counseling/Individual	18
2	Decision Making Skills Training	44	2	Life Skills Training	17
3	Counseling/Family	35	3	Decision Making Skills Training	12
4	Anger Management Training	34	4	Substance Abuse Evaluation	10
5	Urine Monitoring	31	5	Urine Monitoring	10
6	Interpersonal Skills Training	26	6	Anger Management Training	7
7	Role Model/Mentor	26	7	Transportation	6
8	Life Skills Training	25	8	Advocacy	6
9	Substance Abuse Evaluation	25	9	Substance Abuse Treatment/Counseling	5
10	Advocacy	20	10	Counseling/Family	4

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	0.0%	3	100.0%	#DIV/0!
Black	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Hispanic	3	50.0%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Other *	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
Total	6	100.0%	3	100.0%	-50.0%

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	
Residential	4	3	-25.0%

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	-100.0%	#DIV/0!	-100.0%
Black	1	0	1	2	0	2	100.0%	#DIV/0!	100.0%
Hispanic	1	0	1	1	0	1	0.0%	#DIV/0!	0.0%
Other	1	0	1	0	0	0	-100.0%	#DIV/0!	-100.0%
Total Releases	4	0	4	3	0	3	-25.0%	#DIV/0!	-25.0%

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	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
15 - 16	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	#DIV/0!
17 - 18	0	0.0%	1	33.3%	#DIV/0!
19 and over	3	75.0%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Total	4	100%	3	100%	-25.0%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 & 2022

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	2	12.5%	1	33.3%	-50.0%
Weapons	2	12.5%	1	33.3%	-50.0%
Property	3	18.8%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
CDS	2	12.5%	1	33.3%	-50.0%
Public Order	3	18.8%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
VOP	4	25.0%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Total	16	100.0%	3	100.0%	-81.3%

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	Number	
Pinelands	3	0	-100%

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	0.0%	2	100.0%	#DIV/0!
Black	4	57.1%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Hispanic	3	42.9%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Other	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
Total	7	100.0%	2	100.0%	-71.4%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 & 2022

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

	2018	2022	% Change in 2018-2022
	Number	Number	
Released to Parole Supervision*	7	1	-85.7%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 & 2022

* See Required Data & Methodology

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

	2018	2022	% Change in Average Length of Stay 2018-2022
	Number	Number	
Average LOS in Months	12.04	7.1	-41.0%

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	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
White	0	0	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Black	5	0	5	1	0	1	-80.0%	#DIV/0!	-80.0%
Hispanic	2	0	2	0	0	0	-100.0%	#DIV/0!	-100.0%
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total Releases	7	0	7	1	0	1	-85.7%	#DIV/0!	-85.7%

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
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	
14 and under	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
15 - 16	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
17 - 18	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
19 and over	6	85.7%	1	100.0%	-83.3%
Total Releases	7	100.0%	1	100.0%	-85.7%

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	1	12.5%	1	100.0%	0.0%
Weapons	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
Property	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
CDS	1	12.5%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Public Order	2	25.0%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
VOP	3	37.5%	0	0.0%	-100.0%
Total	8	100.0%	1	100.0%	-87.5%

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*	1	0	-100.0%

Source: Juvenile Justice Commission, 2018 & 2022

* See Required Data & Methodology

Juvenile Automated Management System (JAMS) - Reentry Program

Table 14. Ranking of Problem Areas, 2018 and 2022

2018			2022		
Rank	Problem Area	Total	Rank	Problem Area	Total
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

2018			2022		
Rank	Service Intervention Provided	Total	Rank	Service Intervention Provided	Total
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

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



County of Cumberland
Department of Human Services
70 W. Broad Street, Bridgeton, New Jersey 08302
Phone (856) 459-3081 + Fax (856) 455-5756

Melissa Niles, Director
Human Services

Sam Williams, Administrator
Youth Services

September 22, 2023

Judge Russell DePersia
Justice Complex
70 Hunter Street
Woodbury, New Jersey
(856) 878-5050, Ext. 26054

Judge DePersia,

The Cumberland County Youth Services Advisory Council (YSAC) is formally requesting your membership as Judge of the Family Part of the Superior Court. The Cumberland County YSAC is responsible for the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of a community-based plan of sanctions and services for youth adjudicated or charged as delinquent and delinquency prevention programs. The YSAC is to be comprised of high-level policy makers, parents, youth, and youth serving organizations in the County that are dedicated to developing and delivering effective and accessible programs and services that help youth, young adults, and families reach their full potential.

Your membership and participation would have a significant impact on the council in that it would assist in bringing many prominent decision makers together to assist in the aforementioned responsibilities and goals of YSAC. The membership role of the Judge of the Family Part of the Superior Court is identified by N.J.A.C. 13:90 as a mandated membership position for every county.

It is also important to note that due to responsibilities and scheduling, it may be difficult to attend the standing monthly meetings. With this in mind, it is allowable by State regulations that a designee member also be appointed to attend in your stead.

Members are appointed by the County Board of Commissioners, which requires a resume and brief letter of intent to join the council. Therefore, it is requested that these items be submitted to the County Youth Services Administrator so they can be brought before the Board of Commissioners for review and approval. You may also name a designee that may participate in your place. The aforementioned items are not required to be submitted for a designee.

Thank you for your consideration of this request, I look forward to hearing from you regarding your anticipated participation with the Cumberland YSAC.

Respectfully,

Samuel Williams, Youth Services Commission Administrator
Cumberland County Department of Human Services
70 W. Broad St. Bridgeton, NJ 08302
(P): 856-459-3081

Easy Access to Juvenile Populations (EZAPOP) County Comparisons | Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Table: New Jersey: County by Year Estimates Selection: Year = 2020 Age = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17

County	2020	Total
Atlantic	55,021	55,021
Bergen	195,299	195,299
Burlington	91,808	91,808
Camden	114,399	114,399
Cape May	15,908	15,908
Cumberland	35,582	35,582
Essex	189,657	189,657
Gloucester	62,834	62,834
Hudson	136,182	136,182
Hunterdon	23,467	23,467
Mercer	77,966	77,966
Middlesex	177,643	177,643
Monmouth	128,608	128,608
Morris	101,111	101,111
Ocean	149,924	149,924
Passaic	118,440	118,440
Salem	13,381	13,381

Easy Access to Juvenile Populations (EZAPOP) County Comparisons | Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Table: New Jersey: County by Year Estimates Selection: Year = 2020 Sex = Male Age = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17

County	2020	Total
Atlantic	28,184	28,184
Bergen	99,687	99,687
Burlington	46,693	46,693
Camden	58,338	58,338
Cape May	7,958	7,958
Cumberland	17,962	17,962
Essex	96,808	96,808
Gloucester	32,105	32,105
Hudson	69,266	69,266
Hunterdon	11,895	11,895
Mercer	40,124	40,124
Middlesex	90,660	90,660
Monmouth	65,463	65,463
Morris	52,110	52,110
Ocean	76,878	76,878
Passaic	60,542	60,542
Salem	6,774	6,774

Easy Access to Juvenile Populations (EZAPOP) County Comparisons | Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Table: New Jersey: County by Year Estimates Selection: Year = 2020 Sex = Female Age = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17

County	2020	Total
Atlantic	26,837	26,837
Bergen	95,612	95,612
Burlington	45,115	45,115
Camden	56,061	56,061
Cape May	7,950	7,950
Cumberland	17,620	17,620
Essex	92,849	92,849
Gloucester	30,729	30,729
Hudson	66,916	66,916
Hunterdon	11,572	11,572
Mercer	37,842	37,842
Middlesex	86,983	86,983
Monmouth	63,145	63,145
Morris	49,001	49,001
Ocean	73,046	73,046
Passaic	57,898	57,898
Salem	6,607	6,607

Easy Access to Juvenile Populations (EZAPOP) County Comparisons | Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Table: New Jersey: County by Year Estimates Selection: Year = 2020 Sex = Female, Male Race = White Age = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17

County	2020	Total
Atlantic	36,689	36,689
Bergen	139,826	139,826
Burlington	64,243	64,243
Camden	74,113	74,113
Cape May	14,057	14,057
Cumberland	24,453	24,453
Essex	89,247	89,247
Gloucester	50,591	50,591
Hudson	86,053	86,053
Hunterdon	21,070	21,070
Mercer	44,644	44,644
Middlesex	96,345	96,345
Monmouth	107,678	107,678
Morris	81,794	81,794
Ocean	139,066	139,066
Passaic	86,415	86,415
Salem	10,193	10,193

Easy Access to Juvenile Populations (EZAPOP) County Comparisons | Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Table: New Jersey: County by Year Estimates Selection: Year = 2020 Sex = Female, Male Race = Black Age = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17

County	2020	Total
Atlantic	12,804	12,804
Bergen	17,512	17,512
Burlington	20,146	20,146
Camden	31,305	31,305
Cape May	1,398	1,398
Cumberland	9,673	9,673
Essex	85,504	85,504
Gloucester	9,358	9,358
Hudson	26,219	26,219
Hunterdon	758	758
Mercer	21,128	21,128
Middlesex	25,889	25,889
Monmouth	11,804	11,804
Morris	4,909	4,909
Ocean	6,986	6,986
Passaic	21,909	21,909
Salem	2,834	2,834

Easy Access to Juvenile Populations (EZAPOP) County Comparisons | Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Table: New Jersey: County by Year Estimates Selection: Year = 2020 Sex = Female, Male Race = American Indian, Asian Age = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17

County	2020	Total
Atlantic	5,528	5,528
Bergen	37,961	37,961
Burlington	7,419	7,419
Camden	8,981	8,981
Cape May	453	453
Cumberland	1,456	1,456
Essex	14,906	14,906
Gloucester	2,885	2,885
Hudson	23,910	23,910
Hunterdon	1,639	1,639
Mercer	12,194	12,194
Middlesex	55,409	55,409
Monmouth	9,126	9,126
Morris	14,408	14,408
Ocean	3,872	3,872
Passaic	10,116	10,116
Salem	354	354

Easy Access to Juvenile Populations (EZAPOP) County Comparisons | Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Table: New Jersey: County by Year Estimates Selection: Year = 2020 Sex = Female, Male Ethnicity = Hispanic Age = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17

County	2020	Total
Atlantic	16,739	16,739
Bergen	51,167	51,167
Burlington	11,907	11,907
Camden	30,919	30,919
Cape May	2,903	2,903
Cumberland	16,632	16,632
Essex	55,805	55,805
Gloucester	6,787	6,787
Hudson	66,419	66,419
Hunterdon	2,734	2,734
Mercer	22,251	22,251
Middlesex	53,308	53,308
Monmouth	22,851	22,851
Morris	18,039	18,039
Ocean	19,573	19,573
Passaic	61,905	61,905
Salem	2,309	2,309

Easy Access to Juvenile Populations (EZAPOPOP) County Comparisons | Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Table: New Jersey: County by Year Estimates Selection: Year = 2020 Sex = Female, Male Ethnicity = Non Hispanic Age = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17

County	2020	Total
Atlantic	38,282	38,282
Bergen	144,132	144,132
Burlington	79,901	79,901
Camden	83,480	83,480
Cape May	13,005	13,005
Cumberland	18,950	18,950
Essex	133,852	133,852
Gloucester	56,047	56,047
Hudson	69,763	69,763
Hunterdon	20,733	20,733
Mercer	55,715	55,715
Middlesex	124,335	124,335
Monmouth	105,757	105,757
Morris	83,072	83,072
Ocean	130,351	130,351
Passaic	56,535	56,535
Salem	11,072	11,072



Arrestee Summary Report

Printed On: 04/15/2021

Beginnig Date: 01/01/2020

Ending Date: 12/31/2020

Page 7 of 42

Juvenile Arrests by Age

County: Cumberland County

Offense: All

Classification of Offenses	Sex	Under 10	10-12	13-14	15	16	17	Total
Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	Male	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manslaughter by Negligence	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	Male	0	0	1	2	1	0	4
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Robbery	Male	0	1	3	2	2	1	9
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aggravated Assault (Return A - 4a-d)	Male	0	0	2	0	4	5	11
	Female	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Burglary - Breaking or Entering	Male	0	0	2	1	0	0	3
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Larceny-Theft (Except Motor Vehicle Theft)	Male	0	8	5	3	7	2	25
	Female	0	0	0	1	2	9	12
Motor Vehicle Theft	Male	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Assaults (Return A - 4e)	Male	0	3	3	3	3	2	14
	Female	0	2	5	1	2	2	12
Arson	Male	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forgery and Counterfeiting	Male	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fraud	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Embezzlement	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stolen Property; Buying, Receiving, Possessing	Male	0	0	0	2	0	1	3
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vandalism	Male	0	1	2	1	4	2	10
	Female	0	0	0	1	1	1	3
Weapons; Carrying, Possessing, etc.	Male	0	0	1	0	3	3	7
	Female	0	1	0	0	2	0	3
Prostitution and Commercialized Vice	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prostitution	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



Arrestee Summary Report

Printed On: 04/15/2021

Beginnig Date: 01/01/2020

Ending Date: 12/31/2020

Page 9 of 42

Classification of Offenses	Sex	Under 10	10-12	13-14	15	16	17	Total
Prostitution	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assisting or Promoting Prostitution	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Purchasing Prostitution	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sex Offenses (Except Rape and Prostitution)	Male	0	0	2	0	0	1	3
	Female	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Drug Abuse Violations - Grand Total	Male	0	1	7	10	10	11	39
	Female	0	0	3	1	1	8	13
(1) Sale/Manufacturing - Subtotal	Male	0	0	0	0	4	1	5
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18a - Opium/Cocaine	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18b - Marijuana	Male	0	0	0	0	4	1	5
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18c - Synthetic Narcotics - Manufactured Narcotics Which Can Cause True Drug Addiction (Demerol, Methadones)	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18d - Other - Dangerous Nonnarcotic Drugs (Barbiturates, Benzadrine)	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(2) Possession - Subtotal	Male	0	1	7	10	5	10	34
	Female	0	0	3	1	1	8	13
18e - Opium or Cocaine and Their Derivatives (Morphine, Heroin, Codeine)	Male	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18f - Marijuana	Male	0	1	7	9	5	10	32
	Female	0	0	3	1	1	8	13
18g - Synthetic Narcotics - Manufactured Narcotics Which Can Cause True Drug Addiction (Demerol, Methadones)	Male	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18h - Other - Dangerous Nonnarcotic Drugs	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gambling - Total	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bookmaking (Horse and Sport Book)	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Numbers and Lottery	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Other Gambling	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



Arrestee Summary Report

Printed On: 04/15/2021

Beginning Date: 01/01/2020

Ending Date: 12/31/2020

Page 11 of 42

Classification of Offenses	Sex	Under 10	10-12	13-14	15	16	17	Total
Offenses Against The Family and Children	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Driving Under The Influence	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Liquor Laws	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Drunkenness	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disorderly Conduct	Male	0	2	2	1	1	1	7
	Female	0	0	3	2	1	1	7
Vagrancy	Male	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	Male	0	0	8	6	8	9	31
	Female	0	1	3	0	4	9	17
Suspicion	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Curfew and Loitering Law Violations	Male	1	1	2	0	3	1	8
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Runaway	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Human Trafficking/Commercial Sex Acts	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Human Trafficking/Involuntary Servitude	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUB TOTAL	Male	1	18	41	33	50	39	182
	Female	0	4	16	7	15	33	75
TOTAL		1	22	57	40	65	72	257



Arrestee Summary Report

Printed On: 04/15/2021

Beginnig Date: 01/01/2020

Ending Date: 12/31/2020

Page 17 of 42

Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity

County: Cumberland County

Offense: All

Classification of Offenses	White	Black	American Indian / Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	Race Total	Hispanic	Not Hispanic	Ethnicity Total
Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	2
Manslaughter by Negligence	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	3	1	0	0	0	4	2	2	4
Robbery	4	5	0	0	0	9	4	5	9
Aggravated Assault (Return A - 4a-d)	0	13	0	0	0	13	0	13	13
Burglary - Breaking or Entering	1	2	0	0	0	3	1	2	3
Larceny-Theft (Except Motor Vehicle Theft)	12	25	0	0	0	37	8	29	37
Motor Vehicle Theft	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
Other Assaults (Return A - 4e)	15	11	0	0	0	26	10	16	26
Arson	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
Forgery and Counterfeiting	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	2
Fraud	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Embezzlement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stolen Property; Buying, Receiving, Possessing	2	1	0	0	0	3	0	3	3
Vandalism	3	10	0	0	0	13	2	11	13
Weapons; Carrying, Possessing, etc.	4	6	0	0	0	10	5	5	10
Prostitution and Commercialized Vice	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prostitution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assisting or Promoting Prostitution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Purchasing Prostitution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sex Offenses (Except Rape and Prostitution)	3	0	1	0	0	4	2	2	4
Drug Abuse Violations - Grand Total	24	28	0	0	0	52	20	32	52
(1) Sale/Manufacturing - Subtotal	3	2	0	0	0	5	3	2	5
18a - Opium/Cocaine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18b - Marijuana	3	2	0	0	0	5	3	2	5



Arrestee Summary Report

Printed On: 04/15/2021

Beginnig Date: 01/01/2020

Ending Date: 12/31/2020

Page 19 of 42

18c - Synthetic Narcotics - Manufactured Narcotics Which Can Cause True Drug Addiction (Demerol, Methadones)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18d - Other - Dangerous Nonnarcotic Drugs (Barbiturates, Benzedrine)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(2) Possession - Subtotal	21	26	0	0	0	47	17	30	47	
18e - Opium or Cocaine and Their Derivatives (Morphine, Heroin, Codeine)	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	
18f - Marijuana	21	24	0	0	0	45	17	28	45	
18g - Synthetic Narcotics - Manufactured Narcotics Which Can Cause True Drug Addiction (Demerol, Methadones)	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	
18h - Other - Dangerous Nonnarcotic Drugs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Gambling - Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Bookmaking (Horse and Sport Book)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Numbers and Lottery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
All Other Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Offenses Against The Family and Children	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	
Driving Under The Influence	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	
Liquor Laws	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	
Drunkenness	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Disorderly Conduct	6	8	0	0	0	14	6	8	14	
Vagrancy	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	
All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	26	22	0	0	0	48	20	28	48	
Suspicion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Curfew and Loitering Law Violations	7	1	0	0	0	8	0	8	8	
Runaway	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	
Human Trafficking/Commercial Sex Acts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Human Trafficking/Involuntary Servitude	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL	117	139	1	0	0	257	84	173	257	



Arrestee Summary Report

Printed On: 04/15/2021

Beginning Date: 01/01/2019

Ending Date: 12/31/2019

Page 7 of 42

Juvenile Arrests by Age

County: Cumberland County

Offense: All

Classification of Offenses	Sex	Under 10	10-12	13-14	15	16	17	Total
Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manslaughter by Negligence	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	Male	0	0	2	0	1	0	3
	Female	0	0	0	2	2	1	5
Robbery	Male	0	0	2	4	4	1	11
	Female	0	0	0	1	0	3	4
Aggravated Assault (Return A - 4a-d)	Male	0	0	4	2	1	5	12
	Female	0	0	1	0	0	2	3
Burglary - Breaking or Entering	Male	0	2	6	4	2	4	18
	Female	0	4	0	2	1	2	9
Larceny-Theft (Except Motor Vehicle Theft)	Male	0	2	10	12	7	5	36
	Female	0	4	8	4	7	8	31
Motor Vehicle Theft	Male	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
	Female	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Other Assaults (Return A - 4e)	Male	1	2	6	12	2	12	35
	Female	0	4	18	8	8	4	42
Arson	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forgery and Counterfeiting	Male	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fraud	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Embezzlement	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stolen Property, Buying, Receiving, Possessing	Male	0	0	4	0	0	1	5
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vandalism	Male	0	0	3	4	0	3	10
	Female	0	1	0	1	1	4	7
Weapons; Carrying, Possessing, etc.	Male	1	8	5	3	3	6	26
	Female	0	2	3	0	1	3	9
Prostitution and Commercialized Vice	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prostitution	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



Arrestee Summary Report

Printed On: 04/15/2021

Beginning Date: 01/01/2019

Ending Date: 12/31/2019

Page 9 of 42

Classification of Offenses	Sex	Under 10	10-12	13-14	15	16	17	Total
Prostitution	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assisting or Promoting Prostitution	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Purchasing Prostitution	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sex Offenses (Except Rape and Prostitution)	Male	0	1	3	0	0	0	4
	Female	0	1	0	2	1	6	10
Drug Abuse Violations - Grand Total	Male	0	1	4	7	17	37	66
	Female	0	0	0	1	11	22	34
(1) Sale/Manufacturing - Subtotal	Male	0	0	2	3	2	5	12
	Female	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
18a - Opium/Cocaine	Male	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18b - Marijuana	Male	0	0	1	1	1	4	7
	Female	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
18c - Synthetic Narcotics - Manufactured Narcotics Which Can Cause True Drug Addiction (Demerol, Methadones)	Male	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18d - Other - Dangerous Nonnarcotic Drugs (Barbiturates, Benzedrine)	Male	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
(2) Possession - Subtotal	Male	0	1	2	4	15	32	54
	Female	0	0	0	1	9	21	31
18e - Opium or Cocaine and Their Derivatives (Morphine, Heroin, Codeine)	Male	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
	Female	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
18f - Marijuana	Male	0	1	2	4	14	26	47
	Female	0	0	0	1	8	20	29
18g - Synthetic Narcotics - Manufactured Narcotics Which Can Cause True Drug Addiction (Demerol, Methadones)	Male	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18h - Other - Dangerous Nonnarcotic Drugs	Male	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gambling - Total	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bookmaking (Horse and Sport Book)	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Numbers and Lottery	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Other Gambling	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



Arrestee Summary Report

Printed On: 04/15/2021

Beginning Date: 01/01/2019

Ending Date: 12/31/2019

Page 11 of 42

Classification of Offenses	Sex	Under 10	10-12	13-14	15	16	17	Total
Offenses Against The Family and Children	Male	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
	Female	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Driving Under The Influence	Male	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Liquor Laws	Male	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
	Female	0	0	1	1	1	1	4
Drunkenness	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disorderly Conduct	Male	0	3	12	6	7	4	32
	Female	0	2	7	6	4	5	24
Vagrancy	Male	1	2	0	0	1	0	4
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	Male	0	6	17	3	12	19	57
	Female	0	5	6	1	3	9	24
Suspicion	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Curfew and Loitering Law Violations	Male	0	0	2	0	2	0	4
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Runaway	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Human Trafficking/Commercial Sex Acts	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Human Trafficking/Involuntary Servitude	Male	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SUB TOTAL	Male	3	27	81	59	60	101	331
	Female	0	23	44	30	42	72	211
TOTAL		3	50	125	89	102	173	542



Arrestee Summary Report

Printed On: 04/15/2021

Beginnig Date: 01/01/2019

Ending Date: 12/31/2019

Page 17 of 42

Juvenile Arrests by Race/Ethnicity

County: Cumberland County

Offense: All

Classification of Offenses	White	Black	American Indian / Alaskan Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	Race Total	Hispanic	Not Hispanic	Ethnicity Total
Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manslaughter by Negligence	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rape	8	0	0	0	0	8	3	5	8
Robbery	3	12	0	0	0	15	1	14	15
Aggravated Assault (Return A - 4a-d)	9	6	0	0	0	15	6	9	15
Burglary - Breaking or Entering	15	12	0	0	0	27	8	19	27
Larceny-Theft (Except Motor Vehicle Theft)	26	41	0	0	0	67	17	50	67
Motor Vehicle Theft	1	3	0	0	0	4	0	4	4
Other Assaults (Return A - 4e)	49	28	0	0	0	77	25	52	77
Arson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Forgery and Counterfeiting	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Fraud	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Embezzlement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stolen Property; Buying, Receiving, Possessing	3	2	0	0	0	5	3	2	5
Vandalism	10	7	0	0	0	17	6	11	17
Weapons; Carrying, Possessing, etc.	21	14	0	0	0	35	18	17	35
Prostitution and Commercialized Vice	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prostitution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assisting or Promoting Prostitution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Purchasing Prostitution	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sex Offenses (Except Rape and Prostitution)	13	1	0	0	0	14	4	10	14
Drug Abuse Violations - Grand Total	69	31	0	0	0	100	46	54	100
(1) Sale/Manufacturing - Subtotal	9	6	0	0	0	15	8	7	15
18a - Opium/Cocaine	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	2
18b - Marijuana	6	4	0	0	0	10	5	5	10



Arrestee Summary Report

Printed On: 04/15/2021

Beginnig Date: 01/01/2019

Ending Date: 12/31/2019

Page 19 of 42

18c - Synthetic Narcotics - Manufactured Narcotics Which Can Cause True Drug Addiction (Demerol, Methadones)	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
18d - Other - Dangerous Nonnarcotic Drugs (Barbiturates, Benzedrine)	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2
(2) Possession - Subtotal	60	25	0	0	0	85	38	47	85
18e - Opium or Cocaine and Their Derivatives (Morphine, Heroin, Codeine)	5	1	0	0	0	6	4	2	6
18f - Marijuana	53	23	0	0	0	76	32	44	76
18g - Synthetic Narcotics - Manufactured Narcotics Which Can Cause True Drug Addiction (Demerol, Methadones)	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	2
18h - Other - Dangerous Nonnarcotic Drugs	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
Gambling - Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bookmaking (Horse and Sport Book)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Numbers and Lottery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Other Gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Offenses Against The Family and Children	2	2	0	0	0	4	1	3	4
Driving Under The Influence	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2
Liquor Laws	5	1	0	0	0	6	5	1	6
Drunkenness	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disorderly Conduct	26	30	0	0	0	56	17	39	56
Vagrancy	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	4
All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	33	48	0	0	0	81	19	62	81
Suspicion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Curfew and Loitering Law Violations	1	3	0	0	0	4	0	4	4
Runaway	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Human Trafficking/Commercial Sex Acts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Human Trafficking/Involuntary Servitude	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	301	241	0	0	0	542	181	361	542

CountyCode	CountyName	DistrictCode	DistrictName	Violence	Weapons
11	Cumberland	0540	Bridgeton City S200		23
11	Cumberland	0950	Commercial To 2		0
11	Cumberland	0995	Cumberland Co 7		0
11	Cumberland	0997	Cumberland Re 33		4
11	Cumberland	1020	Deerfield Town 18		0
11	Cumberland	1120	Downe Townsh 2		0
11	Cumberland	1460	Fairfield Towns 32		2
11	Cumberland	1820	Greenwich Tow N		N
11	Cumberland	2270	Hopewell Town 1		0
11	Cumberland	2570	Lawrence Town 0		0
11	Cumberland	3050	Maurice River T 0		0
11	Cumberland	3230	Millville School 253		28
11	Cumberland	5070	Stow Creek To 1		0
11	Cumberland	5300	Upper Deerfiel 0		0
11	Cumberland	5390	Vineland Public 274		12

	Vandalism	Substances	Harassment, Int	Total Unique Inc	Incidents Per 10
23		58	18	321	5.25
0		0	1	2	0.45
0		4	5	16	1.56
1		24	4	65	6.00
9		0	6	33	11.34
0		2	5	9	5.70
2		0	7	43	9.03
N		N	N	N	N
2		0	2	5	1.01
0		3	4	7	1.45
0		1	2	3	0.75
29		72	43	424	8.46
0		0	0	1	0.81
1		0	11	11	1.19
20		81	52	439	4.29

EnrollmentTrendsbyGrade

12/1/2023

CountyCode	CountyName	DistrictCode	DistrictName	GradePK	GradeKG
11	Cumberland	0540	Bridgeton City S 615		379
11	Cumberland	0950	Commercial To 55		32
11	Cumberland	0995	Cumberland Co 0		0
11	Cumberland	0997	Cumberland Re 0		0
11	Cumberland	1020	Deerfield Town 33		25
11	Cumberland	1120	Downe Townsh 24		13
11	Cumberland	1460	Fairfield Towns 72		36
11	Cumberland	1820	Greenwich Tow 12		5
11	Cumberland	2270	Hopewell Town 45		33
11	Cumberland	2570	Lawrence Town 64		36
11	Cumberland	3050	Maurice River T 48		28
11	Cumberland	3230	Millville School 565		291
11	Cumberland	5070	Stow Creek To 17		14
11	Cumberland	5300	Upper Deerfiel 129		86
11	Cumberland	5390	Vineland Public 1126		640

EnrollmentTrendsbyGrade

12/1/2023

Grade01	Grade02	Grade03	Grade04	Grade05	Grade06
415	420	403	441	426	465
41	41	44	43	49	44
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0
26	24	27	27	29	36
17	16	18	8	14	14
37	43	41	46	47	56
7	6	9	7	8	6
33	61	49	41	52	52
39	42	56	46	34	58
38	38	33	34	42	54
281	324	283	312	299	349
7	14	8	14	11	14
100	82	82	79	87	81
641	666	712	701	729	801

EnrollmentTrendsbyGrade

12/1/2023

Grade07	Grade08	Grade09	Grade10	Grade11	Grade12
477	463	620	339	308	342
55	43	0	0	0	0
0	0	298	260	236	230
0	0	327	253	241	263
28	36	0	0	0	0
16	17	0	0	0	0
47	51	0	0	0	0
8	6	0	0	0	0
58	70	0	0	0	0
57	51	0	0	0	0
35	45	0	0	0	0
339	362	483	337	373	386
13	11	0	0	0	0
100	99	0	0	0	0
780	853	771	653	611	550

Total
6113
447
1024
1084
291
157
476
74
494
483
395
4984
123
925
10234

CountyCode	CountyName	DistrictCode	DistrictName	Dropout_Distric	Dropout_State
11	Cumberland	0540	Bridgeton City S	2.6	1.2
11	Cumberland	0995	Cumberland Co	0	1.2
11	Cumberland	0997	Cumberland Re	1.8	1.2
11	Cumberland	3230	Millville School	5.4	1.2
11	Cumberland	5390	Vineland Public	1.8	1.2

DropoutRateTrends

12/1/2023

2020-21

CountyCode	CountyName	DistrictCode	DistrictName	Dropout_District	Dropout_State
11	Cumberland	0540	Bridgeton City S	0.5	1.1
11	Cumberland	0995	Cumberland Co	0	1.1
11	Cumberland	0997	Cumberland Re	1.9	1.1
11	Cumberland	3230	Millville School	2.3	1.1
11	Cumberland	5390	Vineland Public	1.3	1.1

SELECTED KIDS COUNT INDICATORS FOR COUNTY IN NEW JERSEY

COMPARE TO NEW JERSEY

JUMP TO SPECIFIC INDICATOR:

Children Living In Families Receiving Temporary Assistance For Needy Families (TANF)

CREATE NEW REPORT

Children living in families receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) (Number)

Location	Data Type	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Cumberland	Number	759	843	599	594	624

Definition and Source

PROVIDER

[Advocates For Children Of New Jersey](#)

DEFINITION

Children receiving Temporary Assistance to Needy Families - TANF.

DATA SOURCE

New Jersey Department of Human Services, Division of Family Development

NOTES

Data are as of June of each year.

Data updated 10/18/2023.

LAST UPDATED

October 2023

Children receiving New Jersey Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (NJ SNAP) (Number)

Location	Data Type	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Cumberland	Number	12,029	12,694	14,511	12,987	13,404

Definition and Source

PROVIDER

Advocates For Children Of New Jersey

DEFINITION

Children living in families that receive NJ Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits.

DATA SOURCE

New Jersey Department of Human Services, Division of Family Development

NOTES

Data are as of June for each year.

Updated 10/18/2023.

LAST UPDATED

October 2023

Births to adolescents ages 10 to 19 (Number & Percent)

Location	Data Type	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Cumberland	Percent	8.4%	6.5%	7.5%	6.8%	6.0%
	Number	152	123	135	122	106

Definition and Source

PROVIDER

Advocates For Children Of New Jersey

DEFINITION

Number and percentage of births to female adolescents ages 10 to 19.

DATA SOURCE

New Jersey Department of Health, New Jersey State Health Assessment Data

NOTES

UNKNOWN - New Jersey births where no county has been identified.

Updated 8/4/2023.

LAST UPDATED

August 2023

Children with Substantiated/Established Findings of Abuse/Neglect (Number & Percent)

Location	Data Type	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Cumberland	Percent	9.6%	10.1%	7.6%	5.1%	3.2%
	Number	364	378	283	148	107

Definition and Source

PROVIDER

Advocates For Children Of New Jersey

DEFINITION

Number and percentage of child abuse/neglect investigations that are substantiated. Based on the number of children reported to be victims of child abuse/neglect.

DATA SOURCE

New Jersey Department of Children and Families, Child Protection and Permanency

NOTES

Due to a change in the way in which CP&P conducts investigations of child abuse/neglect in 2005, 2005 data is not comparable to prior or future years.

Beginning in 2013, the NJ Department of Children and Families added two possible findings of child abuse/neglect investigations: established and not established. Data from 2013 onward includes substantiated and established findings.

Updated 8-22-2022.

LAST UPDATED

August 2022

FY 2023-24 Cumberland HSAC Funded Prevention Programs

- ❖ Big Brothers Big Sisters Mentoring / 33 youth slots
- ❖ Boys & Girls Club of Cumberland County / 51 youth slots
- ❖ Cumberland Empowerment Zone, Afterschool programming for Haleyville, Lakeside and Cherry Street Schools / 88 youth slots
- ❖ Girl Scouts of Central and Southern NJ / 150 youth slots



Summer In Cumberland 2023



This guide provides a list of summer events/activities for children and families, including camps in the area.

Please note the County of Cumberland does not endorse or take responsibility for any program listed below. The County of Cumberland makes every effort to ensure that published information is accurate and current. However, the County of Cumberland, nor any agency, officer or employee of the County of Cumberland warrants the accuracy, reliability or timeliness of any information provided in this document. The County of Cumberland shall not be held liable for any losses caused by reliance on the accuracy, reliability or timeliness of such information or for your participation in any of the listed programs. Updated 6/5/23.

Online: [Human Services Advisory Council \(HSAC\)](#)

Questions? samuelwi@CumberlandCountyNJ.gov or 856-459-3081

Summer In Cumberland 2023

Pages

- 3- Adventure Camp, Fishing Camp, L.E.A.D.E.R.S Camp, Warriors Camp
All Kids First Summer
"Around the World in a Summer" Camp
- 4- BGC Summer Enrichment Program
Bridgeton P.A.L Soccer / Bridgeton P.A.L Dance Academy
Camp Merrywood
- 5- Camp YEY
Compass Camp
Courtyard School
- 6- Cumberland County 2023 Police Youth Week (PYW)
Cumberland County Library Summer Reading Program—"All Together Now!"
Cumberland County Middle School Summer Exposure Program
- 7- Holly City Family Center Summer Camp
KidsFest
Millville 21st CCLC
- 8- Millville Day Care Center
Out to Lunch (Children's program)
PlayStreets
- 9- Rise and Shine Summer Camps
Splash Park
Students Soar
- 10- Summer Zoo Camp
Vineland P.A.L Summer Camp
- 11- Workforce Development Summer Youth Employment Program
YMCA of Vineland Summer Camp
- 12- Additional Resources

Adventure Camp, Fishing Camp, L.E.A.D.E.R.S Camp, Warriors Camp

Dates: June 20 – August 25, 2023

Location: Camp Edge, 26 Camp Edge Road, PO Box 325, Alloway, NJ 08001

Ages: 6-13 years old

Cost: \$145-\$330

Information: www.ranchhope.org

Contact: Ryen Garrison, campedge@ranchhope.org, 856-935-1555 Ext. 420

All Kids First Summer

Dates: June 26 – August 11, 2023

Location: 1385 Magnolia Road, Vineland, NJ 08361

Ages: 3-6 years old

Cost: Full-time - \$175, 3 days - \$130

Information: Monday - Friday, 7:30am - 4:30pm. www.allkidsfirstnj.com

Contact: Carol A. Deola, caroladeola@gmail.com, 856-405-0711

“Around the World in a Summer” Camp

Dates: July 3 – August 11, 2023

Location: Harvest Point Community Center - 496 Grieves Pkwy, Salem, NJ 08079

Ages: 7-12 years old

Cost: Free

Information: Delaware Ave Ste 1, Wilmington, DE 19802; PO BOX 662, www.iamthevillage.org

Contact: Lanice Wilson and Armani Coleman, family@iamthevillage.org, 855-968-8433

BGC Summer Enrichment Program

Dates: July 5 – August 11, 2023

Location: Carl Arthur Center, 304 W. Plum Street, Vineland, NJ 08360

Ages: 5-13 years old

Cost: \$125 per week for six weeks (member registration fee of \$20 additional)

Information: Some scholarships available based on need. M-F (9am-4pm), Breakfast, lunch and snack provided along with field trips. Before and after care available for a nominal charge.
www.bgccumberland.org.

Contact: Ethel Wade and Taryn Allison, ewade@vinelandbgc.org, tallison@vinelandbgc.org, 856-896-0244, Fax: 856-896-0367

Bridgeton P.A.L Soccer / Bridgeton P.A.L Dance Academy

Dates: July 10 – August 18, 2023. Mon., Wed., Fri. (Soccer is 9am-12pm) (Dance is 9am-3:30pm)

Location: Bridgeton High School Soccer Field / Alms Center

Ages: 6-17 years old

Cost: \$25

Information: Bridgeton Police Juvenile Unit / P.A.L Program, 330 Fayette Street Bridgeton, NJ 08094

Contact: Detective Sergeant Lowe and Detective Thompson, lowek@cityofbridgeton.com, thompsonj@cityofbridgeton.com

Camp Merrywood

Dates: June 19 – August 25, 2023. 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM with before and after camp care available

Location: Camp Merrywood, 1249 Jesse Bridge Rd, Pittsgrove, NJ 08318

Ages: 8-15 years old

Cost: \$205 per week

Information: Campers will be bused from the YMCA in Vineland to Camp Merrywood. Subsidies accepted – contact our Financial Services Department at 856-691-0030 ext 111. Healthy Breakfast and Lunch included for all campers. 68 acre YMCA owned traditional day camp. Activities include: Safe swim instruction and free swim in Lake Greenbranch at our campground, Kayaking, Corcels, Baseball, Basketball, Archery, Mini Golf, Zip Line, Gaga, Four square, Soccer, Biking, Nature trails. www.ccamymca.org.

Contact: Genesis Melendez, 856-691-0030 ext. 158.

Camp YEY

Dates: August 7– 11, 2023 – Youth going into grades 6th - 8th, August 14– 18, 2023 – Youth going into grades 4th – 5th.

Location: 26 Camp Edge Road, Alloway, NJ 08001

Ages: Youth going into grades 4th – 8th grade. Youth going into 9th – 12th grade can apply to be Counselor Assistants.

Cost: Free

Information: We do have limited space for the number of campers that we can accept. Preregistration opens on April 3rd, 2023 and remains open until May 12th, 2023, or when we have reached capacity, whichever happens first. All information that we need regarding campers will be available on April 3rd, 2023, on our website at www.southwestcouncil.org/campyey.

Contact: Freddie Vega, campyey@southwestcouncil.org, 856-794-1011 Ext. 316

Compass Camp

Dates: July 3 – August 11, 2023

Location: Compass Academy Charter School, 23 W Chestnut Ave #5301, Vineland, NJ 08360

Ages: 4 years old and up

Cost: Free

Information: 8:00am- 5:30pm each day. Fun and creative outdoor activities. Breakfast, lunch and snack included. Weekly themes of S.T.E.A.M, Olympics, Disney Games/Pixar, Water Fun, Games, Carnival Fun and much more.

Contact: Aubrie Bonestell, 845-901-5337

Courtyard School

Dates: June 26 – August 25, 2023

Location: 1270 S East Avenue, Vineland, NJ 08360

Ages: 3-12 years old

Cost: \$250-\$275

Information: Daily swimming, breakfast, lunch and snacks are provided free of charge. We are open from 7:30AM - 4:30PM. www.courtyardschool.com.

Contact: Lewis D'Ippolito, ldippi@aol.com, 856-692-0414

Cumberland County 2023 Police Youth Week (PYW)

Dates: August 21 – 26, 2023

Location: Millville

Ages: 13-17 years old

Cost: Free

Information: Must fill out an application for registration. Child must live in Cumberland County and must have medical insurance. This camp includes physical fitness, drill ceremonies, and other police functions such as range instruction and police dogs. Parents must attend ONE parent meeting (dates listed on flyer) to fully register their child. Please contact an agency on flyer to pick up an application. ccsonj.org.

Contact: Officer R. Riley, Officer D. Lugo, Officer N. Cruz, ryenri@CumberlandCountyNJ.gov, daniellelu@CumberlandCountyNJ.gov, natanael@CumberlandCountyNJ.gov, 856-451-4449 Ext(s). 25138 or 25124 or 25134.

Cumberland County Library Summer Reading Program—"All Together Now!"

Dates: June 26 – August 12, 2023 (Registration begins June 19th)

Location: 800 E. Commerce Street, Bridgeton, NJ 08302

Ages: 0-18 years old

Cost: Free

Information: The Youth Services Department of the Cumberland County Library offers special events for children and teens, as well as an opportunity to earn fun incentives for reading. Registration for this year's program will open on June 19th and participants can begin logging their reading on June 26th. Special weekly programs include Story Times, Teen Programs, Family Nights and STEAM Wednesdays. For more information, please visit cclnj.org or call (856) 453-2210 x26105. Follow us on Facebook at www.facebook.com/cclibrarynj or on Instagram @cclibrarynj.org. cclnj.org.

Contact: Terri Carpenter, Head of Youth Services, terrica@cclnj.org, 856-453-2210 Ext. 26105

Cumberland County Middle School Summer Exposure Program

Dates: July 10 – 21, 2023

Location: Cumberland County Technical Education Center, 3400 College Drive, Vineland, NJ 08360

Ages: Cumberland County students entering 7th or 8th grade in September

Cost: Free

Information: Students may select up to 3 programs to participate in during the event. Space is limited! A flyer for the Middle School Summer Exposure Program will be shared on the school's website, Facebook, and Instagram. Registration information will be available on the flyer. Our school website is www.cumberland.tec.nj.us. Please follow us on Facebook and Instagram @CCTECNJ.

Contact: Lauren DeBello, Chief Academic Officer, ldebello@cctecnj.org, 856-451-9000 Ext. 2103

Holly City Family Center Summer Camp

Dates: June 26 – September 1, 2023

Location: 8 E. Mulberry Street, Millville, NJ 08332

Ages: 5-12 years old

Cost: \$150 for first child, \$120 for additional children.

Information: Swimming every day, free lunch and snack. www.hollycity.org.

Contact: Andrea Vanaman, andrea@hollycity.org, 856-293-0609

KidsFest

Dates: May 6, 2023 (11 am - 2pm) No rain date.

Location: Cohanzick Zoo. 45 Mayor Aitken Drive, Bridgeton, NJ 08302 (City Park)

Ages: Up to 14 years old

Cost: Free

Information: No pets, except for service animals. Alcohol and smoking prohibited. Annual event with fun kid centered activities such as sand art, games, etc. (Some activities have a small fee). www.CityofBridgeton.com. Facebook: Bridgeton City Park & Zoo-BPAZ.

Contact: Janet Hepburn, Secretary, recdept@cityofbridgeton.com, 856-453-1675

Millville 21st CCLC

Dates: June 26 – July 27, 2023

Location: Lakeside Middle School

Ages: 6th - 8th grade

Cost: N/A

Information: Millville.org

Contact: Amanda DeVita, Amanda.devita@millville.org, 856-293-2250

Millville Day Care Center

Dates: June 26 – August 11, 2023

Location: 1001 Columbia Avenue, Millville, NJ 08332

Ages: Age before Kindergarten

Cost: \$205 weekly includes breakfast, lunch and afternoon snack

Information: \$50 activity fee due on the 1st day of camp

Contact: Dayna Thompson, director1mdcc@gmail.com, 856-825-9364

Out to Lunch (Children's program)

Dates: Mondays - July 10, 17 and 24, 2023

Location: Cohanzick Zoo in City Park. 45 Mayor Aitken Drive, Bridgeton, NJ 08302.

Ages: Up to 14 years old

Cost: Free

Information: No pets, except for service animals. Bring a bagged lunch and enjoy fun entertainment. www.CityofBridgeton.com. Facebook: Bridgeton City Park & Zoo-BPAZ.

Contacts: Janet Hepburn, Secretary, recdept@cityofbridgeton.com, 856-453-1675

PlayStreets

Dates: Every Wednesday from July 12 – August 16, 2023

Location: Pine Street in Millville, between 2nd and 3rd Streets

Ages: Youth of all ages

Cost: Free

Information: Programming takes place from 10am - 2pm.

Contact: Heather Garrison, hgarrison@hollycitydevelopment.org, 856-776-7979

Rise and Shine Summer Camps

Dates: July 10 – August 18, 2023 (Various teen and children's camps)

Location: 301 North 3rd Street, Millville, NJ 08332

Ages: Pre-K through 12th grade

Cost: Free

Information: Must be potty trained. No cost for any of the activities offered, field trips included. All children are welcomed.

Contact: Shaun Connors, shaun.connors.sc@gmail.com, 856-503-9186

Splash Park

Dates: Memorial Day to Labor Day. Three 2-hour sessions: 11am-1pm, 1:30-3:30pm, 4-6pm.

Location: City Park 45 Mayor Aitken Drive, Bridgeton, NJ08302. Adjacent to Cohanzick Zoo.

Ages: Up to 14 years old.

Cost: \$4/per person, cash only. No bills over \$20.00. Private and semi-private parties available. Contact office.

Information: No food, beverages, pets or smoking allowed. Proper swimwear is required. No flip-flops. All footwear on adult and child must have a back-ankle strap. Open weekends only until local school is dismissed for summer. Open daily thereafter, weather permitting. www.CityofBridgeton.com. Facebook: Bridgeton City Park & Zoo-BPAZ.

Contact: Janet Hepburn, Secretary, recdept@cityofbridgeton.com, 856-453-1675

Students Soar

Dates: June 27 – August 3, 2023

Location: Millville Army Air Field Museum & Henry E. Wyble Library & Education Center, 1 Leddon Street, Millville Executive Airport, Millville NJ 08332

Ages: 13 – 18 year olds

Cost: Free

Information: Program to be held Tuesday and Thursday mornings from 10:00 – 12:00. Students may attend individual days as each session has a separate activity. www.p47millville.org.

Contact: Lisa Jester, ljester@p47millville.org, 856-327-2347

Summer Zoo Camp

Dates: Seven 4-hour sessions; AM & PM. Sessions based upon age.

Session 1: 5 & 6 yr. olds—July 10-14, 8am-12pm

Session 2: 5 & 6 yr. olds—July 10-14, 1-5pm

Session 3: 7 & 8 yr. olds—July 17-21, 8am-12pm

Session 4: 7 & 8 yr. olds—July 17-21, 1-5pm

Session 5: 9, 10, 11 yr. olds—July 24-28, 8am-12pm

Session 6: 9, 10, 11 yr. olds—July 24-28, 1-5pm

Session 7: 12, 13, 14 yr. olds—July 31-Aug. 4, 8am-12pm

Location: Zoo and other park areas.

Ages: See above.

Cost: \$115

Information: No pets allowed. Campers receive a complimentary t-shirt. Snack provided. www.CityofBridgeton.com. Facebook: Bridgeton City Park & Zoo-BPAZ.

Contact: Janet Hepburn, Secretary, recdept@cityofbridgeton.com, 856-453-1675

Vineland P.A.L Summer Camp

Dates: June 19 – August 18, 2023

Location: Vineland City

Ages: 8 – 12 year olds

Cost: \$60 per week. \$540 for the entire 9 weeks plus \$20 for P.A.L membership. Bi-weekly payments of \$120. Check or money order only.

Information: Youth will be educated in anti-gang activities, drug awareness, health, child abuse and meeting several first responders (Police, EMS and Fire Dept.). The program is supervised by the PAL Director, Julio DeJesus along with additional Police Officers from the Juvenile Unit. The Summer Camp also consists of volunteer teachers from schools who donate their time and field of expertise to educate our children in a refresher course in Math, Reading, Sign Language and etc. During the camp, the children will travel to several educational trips along with recreational trips. The trips include and are not limited to the Philadelphia Museums, Camden Aquarium, Cape May Zoo, Amusement Parks, Swimming/Water Parks, Movies, Bowling and more. www.vinelandpal.org/summer-camp

Contact: Officer Dejesus, 856-691-4111 Ext. 4673, Phillip Martinez, 856-691-4111 Ext. 4369

Workforce Development Summer Youth Employment Program

Dates: 8 consecutive weeks between May 12 – August 26, 2023

Location: Worksites throughout Cumberland County.
3322 College Drive, Vineland NJ 08360 (office)

Ages: 16 - 24 year olds

Cost: Free

Information: Youth will be paid a stipend fo \$15 per hour for a maximum of 165 hours. Start dates may vary depending on worksite. 35 hours of paid work readiness training included. 100 slots are available for Cumberland County youth. Income eligibility requirements apply.

Contact: Tim Andrews, tandrews@ccoel.org, 856-696-5660 Ext. 3029

YMCA of Vineland Summer Camp

Dates: June 19 – August 25, 2023. 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM – Before and After Camp Care available

Location: YMCA of Vineland, 1159 E. Landis Ave. Vineland, NJ 08360

Ages: 3 – 8 year olds

Cost: \$199.50 per week

Information: Subsidizes accepted – contact our Financial Services Department at 856-691-0030 ext 111. Healthy Breakfast and lunch included for all campers. Camper activities may include: Safe Swim instruction and free swim in our indoor pool, Water play time in our Splash Zone, Play Zone – scooters, bikes, hop scotch, four square, basketball and other games, Family Adventure Center, GagaSpecial visitors, Ice Cream and pretzel Days. www.ccaymca.org.

Contact: Genesis Melendez, 856-691-0030 ext. 158

**If you are in need of financial assistance,
please contact:**

RUTGERS

Southern Regional Child Care
Resource and Referral Agency

www.rusouthernccrr.org

856-462-6800

**For youth under 21 years old with Intellectual
& Developmental Disabilities,
please contact:**

PerformCARE

24 hours a day, 7 days a week

www.performcarenj.org

www.performcarenj.org/families/disability/summer-camp

1-877-652-7624

2020 HSAC Needs Assessment

Need Area: CHILD CARE

Status: General Need Area

Child care services include agencies that provide care and supervision to children; as well as, before- and after- school care programs. This need area seeks to assess the level to which residents throughout the county need child care and before and after school care and the existence of community services and supports that address the need for child care (e.g., licensed daycares providers, subsidized and unsubsidized childcare, Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, Boys & Girls Clubs, YMCAs, Family Success Centers, County Board of Social Services, etc.)

In Cumberland County in 2017 the median monthly center-based child care cost for an infant was less than the median monthly cost for NJ. The median monthly center-based child care cost for a toddler was less than the median monthly cost for NJ. Median monthly center-based child care cost child care cost for Pre-K in Cumberland County was less than the median monthly cost for NJ.

Need Assessment Key Findings

Summary: Scope of the Need

Nearly half of survey respondents who indicated knowledge of Child care needs disagreed or strongly disagreed that there are enough available and accessible services. Forty-seven percent indicated that services are not well advertised. In this area of the survey, many respondents indicated not having enough knowledge to answer (range: 17.95% to 41.88%).

Due to recent school closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic, there is a great influx of children learning from home, while not all parents in the local economy have occupations that allow them to be home nor social networks adequate to meet childcare needs. Cumberland County's largest employment sectors are healthcare, manufacturing, and retail- all areas with considerable need for in-person interactions.

Summary: Nature of the Need

Commonly selected barriers from the provided list included transportation, expense, and waitlists.

Child care assistance eligibility requirements were noted as problematic for the lowest income families as well as those in middle-income brackets. Work requirements for childcare assistance leave some unemployed or unengaged in educational pursuits because they are not able to commit to work until childcare is secured, while other families "earn too much" to qualify for assistance, but are limiting their opportunities based on expense.

Those living outside of ABBOTT districts, or with limited access to pre-school through public education are at a disadvantage in returning to work or school. Some respondents also indicated a need for greater childcare options for older children through before and after school programs and childcare options for parents who work outside of traditional weekday business hours.

Summary: Local Considerations for Addressing the Need for County Prioritized Need Area

*Required only if focus group need area topic

If applicable: Additional Notable Focus Group Trends for County Prioritized Need Area

Need Area: Survey Results

Item	Total Number of Respondents	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't Know	Total
1. There are enough services available in the county to help those who have this need.	117	21.37 %	23.08 %	27.35 %	8.55 %	19.66 %	100 %
2. Anyone in the county is able to access services.	117	17.95 %	25.64 %	28.21 %	10.26 %	17.95 %	100 %
3. Services are widely advertised and known by the county.	117	19.66 %	27.35 %	28.21 %	5.98 %	18.80 %	100 %
4. Services take race, age, gender, ethnicity and more into account.	117	11.97 %	11.11 %	29.91 %	5.13 %	41.88 %	100 %
5. Facilities that provide service to meet this need are of good quality (e.g., clean, well supplied).	117	11.11 %	5.98 %	41.03 %	6.84 %	35.04 %	100 %
6. Staff are well-trained, knowledgeable and provide good customer service.	117	11.97 %	9.40 %	35.90 %	8.55 %	34.19 %	100 %

Key Barriers

Barrier	Total Number of Respondents	Number of Times Identified	Percentage of Responses
Wait Lists	117	45	38.46
Services do not exist	117	26	22.22
Transportation	117	49	41.88
Cannot contact the service provider	117	13	11.11
Too expensive	117	46	39.32
Lack of awareness of service	117	41	35.04
Cultural Barriers	117	29	24.79
Services provided are one-size fits all, and don't meet individual needs	117	26	22.22
Stigma Leads to Avoidance	117	11	9.40
Eligibility Requirement (explain below)	117	28	23.93
Other (explain below)	117	17	14.53

Crisis Intervention Unit Report
Cumberland County Total :: Calendar Year :: 2022
January 1, 2022 - December 31, 2022

I. Unit Caseload

1. Beginning Pending (Active Cases at Start of Time Period)

2/3. Cases Added

	<u>Primary</u>	<u>Secondary</u>
(a) Serious threat to the well-being and physical safety of a juvenile	0	0
(b) Serious conflict between a parent or guardian and a juvenile	0	0
(c) Unauthorized absence by a juvenile for more than 24 hours	0	0
(d) Truancy	0	0
(e) Prostitution or human trafficking	0	0
(f) DP, PDP or other disorderly persons or other delinquency offense diverted to CIU	0	0
(g) Mental/behaviorial health issues		0
(h) Substance abuse		0
(i) None		0
(j) Other	0	0
(k) Total Cases Added (items (a) through (j) from above)	0	0

4. Cases Disposed

5. Total Active Pending [(1)+(2k)-(4)]

143

II. Information and/or Referral

1. Contacts resulting in information and/or referral ONLY!
(Cases were NOT counted in the Added or Disposed totals)

0

III. Cases Disposed

(Counseling sessions need not have been held during the time period)

1. Counseling sessions - Disposed cases only

(a) Telephone contacts only	0	
(b) 1-2 Face to face counseling sessions	0	
(c) 3-5 Face to face counseling sessions	0	
(d) 6 or more face to face counseling sessions	0	
(e) Total cases Disposed (items III.1.a through III.1.d)		0

2. Referrals - Disposed cases only

(a) Cases disposed where no family member was ever referred to other services	0	
(b) Cases disposed where a family member was referred to other services	0	
(c) Total cases Referred (items III.2.a and III.2.b)		0

3. Petitions - Disposed cases only

(a) Cases closed where one or more Juvenile/Family Crisis or Out-of-Home Placement petitions were filed during the course of the case	0	
(b) Cases closed where no Juvenile/Family Crisis or Out-of-Home Placement petitions were filed during the course of the case	0	
(c) Total Placements (items III.3.a and III.3.b)		0

IV. Placements Made

1. Total placements

(a) Number of Voluntary Placements by agreement of the family	0	
(b) Number of Involuntary Placements of juveniles outside of their home	0	
(c) Total Placements (items IV.1.a and IV.1.b)		0

2. Juveniles placed within the time period of this report

0

V. Petitions Filed

1. Juveniles/Family Crisis Petitions

0

2. Out-of-Home Petitions

0

3. Total Petitions (items V.1 and V.2)

0

VI. Referrals Made

(Multiple referrals for a single case may be reported)

1. Number of referrals made to the Division of Child Protection and Permanency (formerly DYFS)

0

2. Number of referrals made to the Division of Children's System of Care (formerly DCBHS)

0

3. Number of referrals made to substance abuse programs

0

4. Number of referrals made to all other services

0

5. Total Referrals (items VI.1 through VI.4)

0

Crisis Intervention Unit Report
Cumberland County Total :: Calendar Year :: 2021
January 1, 2021 - December 31, 2021

I. Unit Caseload

	<u>Primary</u>	<u>Secondary</u>
1. Beginning Pending (Active Cases at Start of Time Period)		108
2/3. Cases Added		
(a) Serious threat to the well-being and physical safety of a juvenile	232	5
(b) Serious conflict between a parent or guardian and a juvenile	85	11
(c) Unauthorized absence by a juvenile for more than 24 hours	2	1
(d) Truancy	3	2
(e) Prostitution or human trafficking	1	0
(f) DP, PDP or other disorderly persons or other delinquency offense diverted to CIU	1	0
(g) Mental/behaviorial health issues		637
(h) Substance abuse		0
(i) None		11
(j) Other	355	12
(k) Total Cases Added {items (a) through (j) from above}	679	679
4. Cases Disposed		535
5. Total Active Pending [(1)+(2k)-(4)]		143
II. Information and/or Referral		
1. Contacts resulting in information and/or referral ONLY! <i>(Cases were NOT counted in the Added or Disposed totals)</i>		93
III. Cases Disposed <i>(Counseling sessions need not have been held during the time period)</i>		
1. Counseling sessions - Disposed cases only		
(a) Telephone contacts only	0	
(b) 1-2 Face to face counseling sessions	532	
(c) 3-5 Face to face counseling sessions	3	
(d) 6 or more face to face counseling sessions	0	
(e) Total cases Disposed {items III.1.a through III.1.d}		535
2. Referrals - Disposed cases only		
(a) Cases disposed where no family member was ever referred to other services	0	
(b) Cases disposed where a family member was referred to other services	535	
(c) Total cases Referred {items III.2.a and III.2.b}		535
3. Petitions - Disposed cases only		
(a) Cases closed where one or more Juvenile/Family Crisis or Out-of-Home Placement petitions were filed during the course of the case	0	
(b) Cases closed where no Juvenile/Family Crisis or Out-of-Home Placement petitions were filed during the course of the case	535	
(c) Total Placements {items III.3.a and III.3.b}		535
IV. Placements Made		
1. Total placements		
(a) Number of Voluntary Placements by agreement of the family	13	
(b) Number of Involuntary Placements of juveniles outside of their home	2	
(c) Total Placements {items IV.1.a and IV.1.b}		15
2. Juveniles placed within the time period of this report		15
V. Petitions Filed		
1. Juveniles/Family Crisis Petitions	0	
2. Out-of-Home Petitions	2	
3. Total Petitions {items V.1 and V.2}		2
VI. Referrals Made <i>(Multiple referrals for a single case may be reported)</i>		
1. Number of referrals made to the Division of Child Protection and Permanency (formerly DYFS)	19	
2. Number of referrals made to the Division of Children's System of Care (formerly DCBHS)	234	
3. Number of referrals made to substance abuse programs	2	
4. Number of referrals made to all other services	280	
5. Total Referrals {items VI.1 through VI.4}		535

All data for Cumberland County have been entered for the time period specified.

FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County
(PART C1) Age of Juveniles by County
Calendar Year - 2022 { 01/01/2022 to 12/31/2022 }

County	6 - 10		11 - 12		13 - 14		15 - 16		17 only		Total	Under 6		Over 17		Out of Range		Grand Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	#	%	
Atlantic	2	.00	13	1.81	69	15.22	108	50.00	64	32.97	276	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	256
Bergen	0	.00	5	2.39	39	18.66	106	50.72	59	28.23	209	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	209
Burlington	4	.91	49	11.19	125	28.54	168	38.36	92	21.00	438	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	438
Camden	0	.00	13	3.22	86	21.29	181	44.80	124	30.69	404	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	404
Cape May	0	.00	2	6.90	10	34.48	10	34.48	7	24.14	29	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	29
Cumberland	1	.77	9	6.92	40	30.77	55	42.31	25	19.23	130	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	130
Essex	1	.17	17	2.93	107	18.45	282	48.62	173	29.83	580	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	580
Gloucester	1	.71	9	6.43	46	32.86	50	35.71	34	24.29	140	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	140
Hudson	0	.00	20	6.45	64	20.65	141	45.48	85	27.42	310	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	310
Hunterdon	0	.00	1	3.70	2	7.41	15	55.56	9	33.33	27	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	27
Mercer	0	.00	9	4.92	66	36.07	78	42.62	30	16.39	183	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	183
Middlesex	2	.56	24	6.70	81	22.63	164	45.81	87	24.30	358	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	358
Monmouth	1	.44	10	4.41	58	25.55	91	40.09	67	29.52	227	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	227
Morris	0	.00	3	2.75	24	22.02	44	40.37	38	34.86	109	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	109
Ocean	0	.00	7	4.22	37	22.29	83	50.00	39	23.49	166	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	166
Passaic	1	.54	7	3.80	38	20.65	89	48.37	49	26.63	184	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	184
Salem	1	1.61	7	11.29	22	35.48	17	27.42	15	24.19	62	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	62
Somerset	0	.00	2	2.44	13	15.85	39	47.56	28	34.15	82	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	82
Sussex	0	.00	3	12.00	3	12.00	17	68.00	2	8.00	25	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	25
Union	0	.00	5	1.81	42	15.22	138	50.00	91	32.97	276	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	276
Warren	0	.00	0	.00	14	25.00	29	51.79	13	23.21	56	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	56
TOTAL	14	5.72	215	106.29	986	481.07	1905	958.06	1131	548.86	4271	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4251

1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).

FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County
(PART D) Race of Juveniles by County
Calendar Year - 2022 { 01/01/2022 to 12/31/2022 }

County	Caucasian		Black		Hispanic		Asian/ Pacific Islander		American Indian		Other		Alaskan Native		Not Indicated		Grand Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Atlantic	4	.36	12	2.17	0	2.90	0	.00	0	.00	3	.36	0	.00	237	94.20	256
Bergen	0	.00	1	.48	3	1.44	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	205	98.09	209
Burlington	3	.68	8	1.83	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	427	97.49	438
Camden	4	.99	6	1.49	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	394	97.52	404
Cape May	1	3.45	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	28	96.55	29
Cumberland	3	2.32	2	1.54	6	4.62	0	.00	0	.00	1	.77	0	.00	118	90.77	130
Essex	0	.00	13	2.24	3	.52	0	.00	0	.00	2	.34	0	.00	562	96.90	580
Gloucester	1	.71	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	139	99.29	140
Hudson	5	1.61	10	3.23	7	2.26	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	288	92.90	310
Hunterdon	1	3.70	0	.00	1	3.70	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	25	92.59	27
Mercer	1	.55	4	2.19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	178	97.27	183
Middlesex	3	.84	5	1.40	5	1.40	0	.00	0	.00	3	.84	0	.00	342	95.53	358
Monmouth	0	.00	1	.44	4	1.76	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	222	97.80	227
Morris	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	109	100.00	109
Ocean	6	3.61	6	3.61	3	1.81	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	151	90.96	166
Passaic	0	.00	7	3.80	4	2.17	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	173	94.02	184
Salem	0	.00	3	4.84	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	59	95.16	62
Somerset	0	.00	1	1.22	1	1.22	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	80	97.56	82
Sussex	2	8.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	23	92.00	25
Union	1	.36	6	2.17	8	2.90	0	.00	0	.00	1	.36	0	.00	260	94.20	276
Warren	6	10.71	2	3.57	1	1.79	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	47	83.93	56
TOTAL	41	37.90	87	36.22	46	28.47	0	.00	0	.00	10	2.68	0	.00	4067	*****	4251

1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).

**FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County
(PART E1) Gender of Juveniles by County
Calendar Year - 2022 { 01/01/2022 to 12/31/2022 }**

County	#	Male		Female		UnDeclared		Not Indicated		Grand Total
		%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Atlantic	175	68.36	78	30.47	0	.00	3	1.17	256	
Bergen	171	81.82	36	17.22	0	.00	2	.96	209	
Burlington	316	72.15	121	27.63	0	.00	1	.23	438	
Camden	334	82.67	68	16.83	0	.00	2	.50	404	
Cape May	26	89.66	2	6.90	0	.00	1	3.45	29	
Cumberland	102	78.46	28	21.54	0	.00	0	.00	130	
Essex	492	84.83	88	15.17	0	.00	0	.00	580	
Gloucester	112	80.00	26	18.57	0	.00	2	1.43	140	
Hudson	246	79.35	63	20.32	0	.00	1	.32	310	
Hunterdon	21	77.78	5	18.52	0	.00	1	3.70	27	
Mercer	140	76.50	42	22.95	0	.00	1	.55	183	
Middlesex	274	76.54	77	21.51	0	.00	7	1.96	358	
Monmouth	182	80.18	44	19.38	0	.00	1	.44	227	
Morris	92	84.40	15	13.76	0	.00	2	1.83	109	
Ocean	143	86.14	22	13.25	0	.00	1	.60	166	
Passaic	149	80.98	34	18.48	0	.00	1	.54	184	
Salem	50	80.65	11	17.74	0	.00	1	1.61	62	
Somerset	62	75.61	18	21.95	0	.00	2	2.44	82	
Sussex	22	88.00	3	12.00	0	.00	0	.00	25	
Union	225	81.52	51	18.48	0	.00	0	.00	276	
Warren	36	64.29	18	32.14	0	.00	2	3.57	56	
TOTAL	3370	79.28	850	20.00	0	.00	31	.73	4251	

1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).

FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County
(PART C1) Age of Juveniles by County
Calendar Year - 2020 { 01/01/2020 to 12/31/2020 }

County	6 - 10		11 - 12		13 - 14		15 - 16		17 only		Total	Under 6		Over 17		Out of Range		Grand Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	#	%	
Atlantic	2	.59	14	4.13	67	19.76	144	42.48	112	33.04	339	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	339
Bergen	0	.00	22	6.40	61	17.73	141	40.99	120	34.88	344	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	344
Burlington	7	1.83	23	6.01	80	20.89	133	34.73	140	36.55	383	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	383
Camden	0	.00	29	5.59	96	18.50	234	45.09	160	30.83	519	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	519
Cape May	0	.00	11	8.09	21	15.44	54	39.71	50	36.76	136	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	136
Cumberland	2	1.13	12	6.78	44	24.86	61	34.46	58	32.77	177	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	177
Essex	2	.35	9	1.56	74	12.82	282	48.87	210	36.40	577	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	577
Gloucester	1	.40	14	5.53	43	17.00	115	45.45	80	31.62	253	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	253
Hudson	0	.00	9	2.31	73	18.72	170	43.59	138	35.38	390	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	390
Hunterdon	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	15	60.00	10	40.00	25	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	25
Mercer	2	.77	14	5.38	49	18.85	109	41.92	86	33.08	260	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	260
Middlesex	2	.43	9	1.92	81	17.27	204	43.50	173	36.89	469	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	469
Monmouth	0	.00	13	4.61	56	19.86	115	40.78	98	34.75	282	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	282
Morris	0	.00	8	3.28	42	17.21	89	36.48	105	43.03	244	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	244
Ocean	1	.27	7	1.91	69	18.80	160	43.60	130	35.42	367	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	367
Passaic	0	.00	21	6.03	62	17.82	158	45.40	107	30.75	348	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	348
Salem	0	.00	11	13.25	15	18.07	33	39.76	24	28.92	83	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	83
Somerset	0	.00	7	6.03	13	11.21	54	46.55	42	36.21	116	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	116
Sussex	0	.00	2	6.25	3	9.38	15	46.88	12	37.50	32	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	32
Union	0	.00	15	3.82	56	14.25	189	48.09	133	33.84	393	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	393
Warren	0	.00	1	1.54	14	21.54	30	46.15	20	30.77	65	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	65
TOTAL	19	.33	251	4.33	1019	17.56	2505	43.17	2008	34.61	5802	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5802

1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).

**FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County
(PART D) Race of Juveniles by County
Calendar Year - 2020 { 01/01/2020 to 12/31/2020 }**

County	Caucasian		Black		Hispanic		Asian/ Pacific Islander		American Indian		Other		Alaskan Native		Not Indicated		Grand Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Atlantic	102	30.09	187	55.16	38	11.21	2	.59	0	.00	6	1.77	0	.00	4	1.18	339
Bergen	124	36.05	90	26.16	107	31.10	13	3.78	0	.00	4	1.16	1	.29	5	1.45	344
Burlington	162	42.30	175	45.69	30	7.83	6	1.57	1	.26	9	2.35	0	.00	0	.00	383
Camden	140	26.97	290	55.88	77	14.84	4	.77	1	.19	7	1.35	0	.00	0	.00	519
Cape May	87	63.97	34	25.00	13	9.56	1	.74	0	.00	1	.74	0	.00	0	.00	136
Cumberland	45	25.42	88	49.72	41	23.16	0	.00	0	.00	2	1.13	0	.00	1	.56	177
Essex	64	11.09	452	78.34	47	8.15	7	1.21	0	.00	6	1.04	0	.00	1	.17	577
Gloucester	122	48.22	101	39.92	14	5.53	0	.00	0	.00	8	3.16	1	.40	7	2.77	253
Hudson	41	10.51	166	42.56	172	44.10	5	1.28	2	.51	2	.51	0	.00	2	.51	390
Hunterdon	17	68.00	1	4.00	6	24.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1	4.00	25
Mercer	63	24.23	157	60.38	25	9.62	7	2.69	0	.00	5	1.92	0	.00	3	1.15	260
Middlesex	159	33.90	163	34.75	122	26.01	22	4.69	0	.00	3	.64	0	.00	0	.00	469
Monmouth	107	37.94	131	46.45	38	13.48	4	1.42	0	.00	1	.35	0	.00	1	.35	282
Morris	146	59.84	53	21.72	32	13.11	5	2.05	1	.41	4	1.64	0	.00	3	1.23	244
Ocean	228	62.13	87	23.71	40	10.90	3	.82	1	.27	1	.27	0	.00	7	1.91	367
Passaic	110	31.61	112	32.18	119	34.20	1	.29	1	.29	4	1.15	0	.00	1	.29	348
Salem	38	45.78	38	45.78	3	3.61	0	.00	0	.00	2	2.41	0	.00	2	2.41	83
Somerset	32	27.59	63	54.31	19	16.38	2	1.72	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	116
Sussex	20	62.50	5	15.63	5	15.63	0	.00	0	.00	1	3.13	0	.00	1	3.13	32
Union	103	26.21	206	52.42	74	18.83	6	1.53	0	.00	2	.51	1	.25	1	.25	393
Warren	36	55.38	22	33.85	6	9.23	1	1.54	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	65
TOTAL	1946	33.54	2621	45.17	1028	17.72	89	1.53	7	.12	68	1.17	3	.05	40	.69	5802

1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).

FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County
(PART E1) Gender of Juveniles by County
Calendar Year - 2020 { 01/01/2020 to 12/31/2020 }

County	Male		Female		UnDeclared		Not Indicated		Grand Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Atlantic	256	75.52	83	24.48	0	.00	0	.00	339
Bergen	261	75.87	83	24.13	0	.00	0	.00	344
Burlington	276	72.06	107	27.94	0	.00	0	.00	383
Camden	406	78.23	113	21.77	0	.00	0	.00	519
Cape May	112	82.35	24	17.65	0	.00	0	.00	136
Cumberland	128	72.32	49	27.68	0	.00	0	.00	177
Essex	455	78.86	122	21.14	0	.00	0	.00	577
Gloucester	188	74.31	65	25.69	0	.00	0	.00	253
Hudson	326	83.59	64	16.41	0	.00	0	.00	390
Hunterdon	19	76.00	6	24.00	0	.00	0	.00	25
Mercer	202	77.69	58	22.31	0	.00	0	.00	260
Middlesex	343	73.13	126	26.87	0	.00	0	.00	469
Monmouth	208	73.76	74	26.24	0	.00	0	.00	282
Morris	204	83.61	40	16.39	0	.00	0	.00	244
Ocean	293	79.84	74	20.16	0	.00	0	.00	367
Passaic	275	79.02	73	20.98	0	.00	0	.00	348
Salem	65	78.31	18	21.69	0	.00	0	.00	83
Somerset	98	84.48	18	15.52	0	.00	0	.00	116
Sussex	24	75.00	8	25.00	0	.00	0	.00	32
Union	308	78.37	85	21.63	0	.00	0	.00	393
Warren	49	75.38	16	24.62	0	.00	0	.00	65
TOTAL	4496	77.49	1306	22.51	0	.00	0	.00	5802

1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).

FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County
(PART A1) Diverted Cases (per Case Status Date)
Calendar Year - 2020 { 01/01/2020 to 12/31/2020 }

County	Count of Juveniles	Count of Cases	Count of Offenses	Average Number of Offenses per Juvenile	Average Number of Offenses per Case	Average Number of Cases per Juvenile
Atlantic	192	210	302	1.57	1.44	1.09
Bergen	97	99	141	1.45	1.42	1.02
Burlington	188	195	279	1.48	1.43	1.04
Camden	172	183	247	1.44	1.35	1.06
Cape May	25	25	32	1.28	1.28	1.00
Cumberland	36	37	40	1.11	1.08	1.03
Essex	257	291	494	1.92	1.70	1.13
Gloucester	89	100	125	1.40	1.25	1.12
Hudson	195	225	409	2.10	1.82	1.15
Hunterdon	7	7	8	1.14	1.14	1.00
Mercer	110	111	134	1.22	1.21	1.01
Middlesex	116	119	133	1.15	1.12	1.03
Monmouth	48	48	78	1.63	1.63	1.00
Morris	109	110	170	1.56	1.55	1.01
Ocean	156	163	238	1.53	1.46	1.04
Passaic	36	36	42	1.17	1.17	1.00
Salem	8	9	11	1.38	1.22	1.13
Somerset	40	41	64	1.60	1.56	1.02
Sussex	16	17	27	1.69	1.59	1.06
Union	162	171	223	1.38	1.30	1.06
Warren	53	58	86	1.62	1.48	1.09
Total	2,112	2,255	3,283	1.55	1.46	1.07

1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).
3.) These figures Exclude Violation-of-Probation Offenses.

2.) Figures were based on the Case Status Date of the Juvenile Delinquency Compliant.
4.) These figures Exclude Transferred-In Cases.

STATIONHOUSE ADJUSTMENT TOTALS

Year	Bridgeton	Millville	Vineland	State Police	Cumberland County
2012					23
2013	2	14	25	N/A	41
2014	7	6	19	N/A	32
2015	35	25	31	N/A	91
2016	31	26	34	N/A	91
2017	24	53	52	3	132
2018	19	30	47	10	106
2019	19	82	37*	5	143*
2020	8	19	35	0	62
2021	6	109	55	0	166
2022	5	135	71	18	229
Percent Change Overall ('12-'22)	150%	864%	184%	500% (2017-2022)	896%

TABLE 62. CUMBERLAND ANNUAL TRENDS

	ADP				Admissions			ALOS							
	ADP	Youth of Color	Female	High	Monthly	Youth of Color	Female	Total	1-5 Days	60+ Days	M	F	W	B	H
DET 09	27.3	94.4%	17.0%	40	20.8	89.6%	28.9%	33.6	44.4%	16.7%	36.8	25.9	14.0	37.3	31.6
10	22.3	92.3%	10.8%	38	17.8	87.8%	22.5%	36.0	46.2%	18.3%	41.2	18.7	23.2	37.0	40.7
11	18.1	93.6%	5.9%	28	15.6	90.9%	16.6%	30.8	50.0%	14.6%	34.4	12.6	25.5	33.1	27.0
12	11.1	94.6%	9.0%	17	10.5	92.1%	29.4%	30.0	45.4%	13.8%	37.8	8.1	20.7	27.2	41.9
13	9.9	95.9%	12.4%	19	10.8	87.6%	16.3%	23.6	47.2%	14.2%	24.7	18.0	4.5	28.0	19.4
14	10.3	89.8%	9.3%	20	7.7	90.2%	17.4%	48.4	28.7%	24.1%	54.0	21.4	21.7	61.5	30.4
15	8.7	81.2%	4.3%	13	5.8	85.5%	13.0%	38.5	44.6%	21.5%	41.7	16.1	57.3	35.7	30.9
16	7.4	99.7%	9.7%	11	3.8	93.3%	20.0%	72.6	21.1%	36.8%	58.8	146.7	*	86.9	41.8
17	9.0	96.1%	7.2%	13	6.5	93.6%	16.7%	30.4	27.9%	14.7%	33.6	16.6	42.0	30.0	27.7
18	4.2	98.4%	1.2%	7	3.7	93.2%	4.5%	27.1	42.1%	15.8%	27.1	*	31.0	32.6	16.7
19	5.0	97.2%	22.0%	7	4.3	88.2%	2.0%	26.7	44.9%	18.4%	26.1	40.0	10.3	36.6	19.2
20	5.4	95.2%	7.1%	7	3.3	97.5%	17.5%	38.8	46.2%	25.6%	42.0	24.1	64.0	40.8	33.6
21	5.6	99.0%	1.8%	8	3.2	84.2%	13.2%	41.8	48.7%	20.5%	46.8	20.6	25.5	48.8	37.0
22	7.9	92.9%	5.9%	6	3.4	85.4%	14.6%	62.9	27.5%	30.0%	69.1	28.0	85.2	63.9	39.5
ATD 12	6.9	91.9%	20.5%	-	4.8	91.4%	29.3%	44.1	5.2%	24.1%	49.5	28.4	23.3	47.2	37.0
13	8.2	92.9%	17.6%	-	4.8	89.7%	19.0%	42.8	5.9%	21.6%	46.4	29.5	28.3	41.5	47.9
14	8.6	89.5%	7.5%	-	3.4	92.7%	12.2%	78.9	12.8%	56.4%	84.1	43.2	98.5	97.8	44.9
15	5.8	82.0%	18.3%	-	3.4	75.6%	4.9%	52.9	5.6%	30.6%	49.9	77.8	42.9	65.5	36.2
16	5.7	87.5%	18.6%	-	3.3	84.6%	38.5%	41.9	0.0%	28.6%	49.0	24.0	56.0	41.6	29.0
17	9.7	94.5%	12.1%	-	4.9	94.9%	11.9%	27.8	11.4%	13.6%	29.6	16.3	47.5	24.5	29.7
18	6.4	93.3%	4.8%	-	2.2	92.3%	7.7%	51.6	0.0%	26.1%	53.4	12.0	21.0	46.3	67.4
19	5.2	97.6%	2.6%	-	3.1	89.2%	0.0%	52.3	5.7%	42.9%	52.8	37.0	43.0	48.8	65.5
20	5.3	100.0%	14.2%	-	2.2	100.0%	15.4%	62.1	4.5%	40.9%	60.7	71.0	*	47.9	76.4
21	7.0	77.6%	12.8%	-	2.5	83.3%	23.3%	109.1	16.1%	64.5%	121.7	75.4	109.7	91.8	178.2
22	6.5	90.3%	8.9%	-	2.9	88.6%	11.4%	90.4	6.9%	51.7%	91.9	79.3	96.0	61.6	158.3

2022 Detention -- Admission by Age

County	# of youth	Average Age	Minimum Age	Maximum Age
Atlantic	72	16.2	13.4	20.0
Bergen	50	16.3	13.1	20.1
Burlington	70	16.4	12.5	18.8
Camden	254	16.5	11.8	20.3
Cape May	5	17.2	15.7	19.3
Cumberland	41	16.2	14.0	18.5
Gloucester	21	16.3	6.9	19.1
Hudson	147	16.4	12.7	19.8
Hunterdon	1	17.8	17.8	17.8
Mercer	94	16.1	12.2	19.5
Middlesex	76	16.4	12.2	19.9
Monmouth	55	16.6	12.7	20.4
Morris	19	16.8	14.1	19.3
Ocean	30	16.1	14.3	18.1
Passaic	85	16.9	13.4	22.0
Salem	27	16.5	14.2	19.7
Somerset	19	16.2	13.3	18.4
Sussex	6	16.2	15.7	16.6
Union	76	16.7	13.3	18.2
Warren	12	16.9	15.6	17.8
Total	1160	16.4	6.9	22.0

2022 Detention -- Admission by age and degree of offense

Age		Atlantic	Bergen	Burlington	Camden	Cape May	Cumberland
6	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% within County	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	Count	0	0	0	1	0	0
	% within County	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
12	Count	0	0	1	6	0	0
	% within County	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%
13	Count	4	3	2	13	0	0
	% within County	5.6%	6.0%	2.9%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%
14	Count	9	5	4	27	0	7
	% within County	12.5%	10.0%	5.7%	10.6%	0.0%	17.1%
15	Count	20	12	16	46	2	12
	% within County	27.8%	24.0%	22.9%	18.1%	40.0%	29.3%
16	Count	15	13	21	52	0	11
	% within County	20.8%	26.0%	30.0%	20.5%	0.0%	26.8%
17	Count	19	13	22	68	1	10
	% within County	26.4%	26.0%	31.4%	26.8%	20.0%	24.4%
18	Count	2	1	4	29	1	1
	% within County	2.8%	2.0%	5.7%	11.4%	20.0%	2.4%
19	Count	2	1	0	9	1	0
	% within County	2.8%	2.0%	0.0%	3.5%	20.0%	0.0%
20	Count	1	2	0	3	0	0
	% within County	1.4%	2.7%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%

2022 Detention -- Admission by age and degree of offense

	% within County	1.4%	4.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%
22	Count	0	0	0	0	0	0
	% within County	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Count	72	50	70	254	5	41
	% within County	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Detention Admissions 2022

			M	F	T
		Other	1	0	1
	Total		31	5	36
Bur	Race/Ethnicity	Afr	27	4	31
		Amer	10	0	10
		Cauc	2	1	3
		Hisp	2	0	2
		Other	41	5	46
	Total		41	5	46
Oce	Race/Ethnicity	Afr	10	4	14
		Amer	5	0	5
		Cauc	2	1	3
		Hisp	17	5	22
		Other	6	2	8
	Total		14	2	16
Som	Race/Ethnicity	Afr	31	1	32
		Amer	20	3	23
		Cauc	51	4	55
		Hisp	26	4	30
		Other	2	1	3
	Total		46	6	52
Pas	Race/Ethnicity	Afr	14	5	19
		Amer	4	0	4
		Cauc	4	0	4
		Hisp	22	5	27
		Other	5	0	5
	Total		8	0	8
Mid	Race/Ethnicity	Afr	11	1	12
		Amer	5	0	5
		Cauc	16	1	17
		Hisp	1	1	2
		Other	1	1	2
	Total		1	1	2

Detention Admissions 2021

M F T

			M	F	T
Det	Race/Ethnicity	Hispanic	15	6	21
		Other	1	0	1
	Total		28	8	36
Bur	Race/Ethnicity	African	34	4	38
		American	13	3	16
		Caucasian			
	Total		47	7	54
Oce	Race/Ethnicity	African	5	5	10
		American	10	2	12
		Caucasian	4	0	4
		Hispanic			
	Total		19	7	26
Som	Race/Ethnicity	African	8	1	9
		American	4	3	7
		Caucasian	2	0	2
		Hispanic	0	1	1
		Other			
	Total		14	5	19
Pas	Race/Ethnicity	African	44	4	48
		American	2	0	2
		Caucasian	35	2	37
		Hispanic	1	0	1
		Other			
	Total		82	6	88
Mid	Race/Ethnicity	African	21	2	23
		American	9	3	12
		Caucasian	21	7	28
		Hispanic	1	1	2
		Other			
	Total		52	13	65
Cmb	Race/Ethnicity	African	20	5	25
		American	6	0	6
		Caucasian	7	0	7
		Hispanic			
	Total		33	5	38
War	Race/Ethnicity	African	5	0	5
		American	5	1	6
	Total		10	1	11
Glo	Race/Ethnicity	African	12	1	13
		American	5	0	5
		Caucasian	4	1	5
	Total		21	2	23

Cumberland MSCO 2022

Most Serious Current Offense
Calendar Year 2022

Offense	Frequency	Percent
1- Murder, Attempted Murder, Conspiracy to Commit Murder	4	9.8
1- Carjacking	1	2.4
1- Robbery	7	17.1
2- Robbery	5	12.2
2- Possession of Firearm, Explosives, or Destructive Device	9	22.0
3- Terroristic Threats	1	2.4
Violation of Probation	3	7.3
FTA	3	7.3
Violation of Detention Alternative/Alternative Custody	6	14.6
Violation of a Court Order	2	4.9
Total	41	100.0

Cumberland 2022

Detention Admission by municipality/town Calendar Year 2022

Municipality/Town	# of youth admitted	% of Total
Bridgeton	17	41.5
Cedarville	2	4.9
Millville	9	22.0
Seabrook	2	4.9
Swedesboro	1	2.4
Vineland	10	24.4
Total	41	100.0

TABLE 42. 2022 MONTHLY DETENTION ADP, BY SITE

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL
ESX	70.5	71.1	66.5	70.9	79.8	70.5	73.2	76.5	75.7	79.2	72.8	80.0	73.9
CAM	34.8	32.6	29.3	27.4	31.9	29.8	32.5	38.1	38.7	37.9	31.7	24.7	32.5
PASC	27.3	26.4	25.2	25.1	17.4	22.9	23.5	21.6	23.6	24.5	26.0	27.4	24.2
HUD	13.6	11.8	11.3	16.0	16.6	19.0	19.3	18.6	18.8	19.7	19.4	18.6	16.9
MIDSX	14.5	16.5	12.8	13.2	15.2	17.8	15.8	13.5	13.8	15.7	20.9	20.2	15.8
ATL	13.0	14.0	13.4	13.1	15.4	17.3	18.1	18.0	16.9	15.5	13.9	14.4	15.2
MER	12.4	9.9	11.8	13.5	15.4	13.5	15.9	17.6	13.2	8.6	7.5	7.4	12.2
UNI	13.2	8.8	10.8	9.5	10.4	13.0	10.2	13.1	13.3	10.2	9.4	10.3	11.1
MON	9.3	6.8	7.9	9.2	9.9	9.2	9.1	11.7	11.1	10.8	10.3	10.7	9.7
CUMB	4.7	8.5	8.5	9.4	9.1	10.9	9.8	7.3	8.2	9.1	6.2	3.7	7.9
BURL	4.0	6.0	5.6	7.0	7.7	6.7	8.3	8.4	7.3	6.2	8.1	6.3	6.8
BERG	3.5	1.8	1.9	5.1	6.6	7.7	7.1	7.8	8.4	8.6	7.1	6.1	6.0
OCE	0.1	1.4	1.6	2.6	4.0	6.0	3.5	4.9	4.6	4.3	3.6	3.3	3.3
SOM	3.2	3.4	4.0	4.1	2.3	2.7	2.2	2.5	2.3	3.1	4.0	3.3	3.1
GLO	2.3	2.9	1.8	1.8	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.4	2.6	1.7	1.1	2.1	2.4
SAL	1.0	4.0	0.6	1.5	2.6	3.3	3.0	6.9	3.5	1.0	0.3	0.0	2.2
MOR	0.2	1.9	2.7	1.1	0.9	0.5	0.8	1.9	3.8	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.6
WAR	1.8	1.3	0.9	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	1.0	2.9	2.5	3.0	1.2
CAPE	2.2	1.9	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.2	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9
SUSX	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.6
HUN	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.2
TOTAL	232.6	232	218.7	232.4	249.2	254.9	256.5	274.7	268.6	261.9	248.7	245.2	247.7

TABLE 43. 2022 MONTHLY DETENTION ALTERNATIVE ADP, BY SITE

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL
ESX	49.2	59.8	52.3	56.7	49.8	54.8	51.9	52.2	55.0	54.0	52.8	51.1	49.4
CAM	26.8	36.0	32.4	36.7	49.8	46.1	48.0	47.0	47.1	53.2	60.0	48.4	44.3
HUD	25.3	23.5	21.2	19.4	18.4	21.3	20.9	20.1	20.0	18.0	15.0	20.0	20.1
BURL	18.9	19.1	18.9	13.3	16.2	19.1	18.7	21.5	18.4	17.4	16.8	16.2	17.8
PASC	13.9	15.4	17.0	17.7	17.1	17.2	18.7	17.7	16.0	15.5	16.8	16.2	16.8
BERG	19.9	12.1	8.1	10.2	15.1	16.2	13.5	13.2	14.0	13.5	11.6	12.4	13.3
ATL	6.2	4.1	5.2	5.1	8.8	1.7	14.3	10.6	13.4	8.9	7.7	10.1	8.9
MER	3.6	2.1	7.2	8.6	16.2	10.2	4.9	12.8	12.8	4.1	7.3	3.9	7.9
CUMB	2.8	2.8	5.0	7.6	10.8	12.7	10.3	5.6	4.2	1.7	5.1	8.9	6.5
MIDSX	13.1	9.4	9.9	10.0	9.1	8.4	2.4	0.5	2.0	2.8	4.1	3.6	6.3
MON	5.5	5.4	6.0	5.5	3.5	5.8	6.0	6.6	6.9	7.2	6.8	3.0	5.7
SOM	0.8	0.8	1.0	3.4	2.3	7.4	8.2	8.0	7.3	8.0	6.7	7.8	5.1
OCE	4.5	4.4	5.0	5.2	6.3	5.0	6.3	7.4	3.0	1.6	3.0	2.6	4.5
SAL	5.6	2.9	2.5	2.7	3.2	6.4	4.5	3.4	6.1	6.6	5.0	4.9	4.5
GLO	1.5	1.8	1.0	1.3	5.9	6.3	5.3	8.8	4.2	3.6	4.5	2.3	3.9
UNI	3.9	2.8	3.3	3.3	6.0	8.0	6.0	2.0	1.2	2.2	0.7	0.3	3.4
CAPE	4.8	2.1	2.0	0.6	1.2	2.5	2.7	4.2	3.1	4.0	2.4	1.0	2.6
SUSX	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.5	3.3	3.2	3.8	4.7	2.8	4.7	2.0	1.1	2.6
MORRIS	1.5	2.6	2.5	0.6	1.2	3.3	3.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
WAR	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.0	0.3	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.7
HUN	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	208.8	208.1	202.3	211.4	244.5	255.6	250.4	248.8	238.5	228.5	229.3	214.3	225.6

TABLE 44. 2022 MONTHLY DETENTION ADMISSIONS, BY SITE

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL
ATL	4	6	4	4	12	11	7	4	5	3	6	6	447
BERG	1	2	5	8	4	5	6	5	4	4	0	6	254
BURL	2	10	5	1	6	5	6	11	6	7	7	4	149
CAM	26	18	15	23	20	23	26	27	25	26	9	16	94
CAPE	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	86
CUMB	3	5	3	6	4	4	0	2	3	4	3	4	77
ESX	29	39	24	50	47	38	33	46	43	31	24	43	76
GLO	2	1	2	2	1	3	2	4	2	0	1	2	72
HUD	15	11	10	16	9	19	13	11	7	11	14	13	70
HUN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	55
MER	5	6	6	12	3	9	13	12	9	7	7	5	50
MIDSX	6	3	9	6	5	12	7	4	1	7	11	5	41
MON	2	7	2	6	4	8	7	4	8	5	0	2	30
MOR	1	4	3	0	2	0	3	4	0	1	2	0	27
OCE	2	1	5	1	3	4	2	4	1	2	3	2	22
PASC	4	4	6	7	11	10	3	10	8	8	8	7	20
SAL	1	2	4	1	5	2	1	2	6	1	0	2	19
SOM	2	1	3	2	1	5	0	2	1	1	1	0	12
UNI	5	2	4	5	11	11	3	11	3	7	1	14	6
SUSX	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	5
WAR	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	1	0	1
TOTAL	110	125	112	153	149	168	131	173	133	127	100	131	1613

TABLE 45. 2022 MONTHLY DETENTION ALTERNATIVE ADMISSIONS, BY SITE

	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL
ESX	22	41	21	51	46	35	29	27	30	31	30	31	394
CAM	30	20	24	29	28	30	21	28	29	28	18	17	302
HUD	13	9	10	4	10	14	18	11	16	9	7	5	126
BURL	11	13	7	6	9	15	9	11	10	6	9	8	114
MER	4	4	11	14	2	8	7	10	15	6	7	4	92
BERG	10	7	11	8	10	13	5	5	9	6	3	3	90
PASC	8	1	5	10	5	8	10	8	4	13	8	1	81
ATL	3	2	4	3	10	10	2	3	2	2	2	8	51
CUMB	2	1	5	3	7	1	2	2	1	2	5	4	35
MIDSX	3	2	6	2	3	4	1	0	3	3	2	1	30
UNI	0	0	4	1	4	5	1	3	2	3	2	4	29
SAL	1	0	2	0	4	3	1	2	7	1	1	2	24
MON	1	2	1	2	1	4	2	3	4	1	0	0	21
OCE	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	3	0	21
SUSX	0	0	0	3	0	2	2	3	2	6	1	2	20
SOM	1	0	4	0	0	7	1	0	1	0	0	4	18
GLO	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	3	1	16
CAPE	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	1	0	1	0	9
MORRIS	1	3	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9
WAR	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	4
HUN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	115	108	119	140	145	162	116	126	138	121	102	95	1486

PUBLIC SAFETY OUTCOMES

Detention Alternative Outcomes. Detention alternatives are short-term placements for youth who would otherwise remain in detention while their cases are pending in court. The primary purpose of detention alternatives is to provide supervision and basic supports to youth, in order to minimize the likelihood that youth will be charged with a new delinquency offense while awaiting the disposition of their current case. Alternatives also help to ensure youth appear at each required court hearing.

Table 21 describes outcomes for youth supervised via detention alternatives by reporting the nature of departures from alternative placement. In 2020, across the 21 sites, the vast majority of youth were released from detention alternatives following successful completion. Averaging across sites, 76.2% of youth were released successfully, though success rates ranged from 0.0% in Warren to 92.8% in Bergen. Importantly, the percentage of youth removed from a detention alternative as the result of a new delinquency charge is small, averaging just 5.5% across sites, and keeping at or below 10.0% in 16 sites (ranging from 0.0% in Somerset, Warren, Gloucester, Sussex, and Salem, to 19.8% in Passaic and 14.3% in Cape May). Finally, in 2020, 18.3% of youth were removed from alternative programs for rule violations (no new charges), ranging from a low of 0.0% in Passaic and Cape May, to a high of 100.0% in Warren and 36.4% in Somerset.

TABLE 21. DETENTION ALTERNATIVE OUTCOMES

	Successful Completion			New Charges			Violation/Non-Compliance		
	Earliest [†]	2019	2020	Earliest	2019	2020	Earliest	2019	2020
ATL	70.6%	62.8%	69.2%	9.5%	4.5%	9.0%	19.9%	32.7%	21.8%
CAM	81.4%	67.2%	67.4%	4.3%	3.0%	7.0%	14.3%	29.9%	25.7%
ESX	78.1%	81.0%	68.7%	6.7%	8.7%	9.2%	15.2%	10.4%	22.1%
MON	78.0%	85.1%	82.8%	6.6%	4.2%	10.3%	15.4%	10.6%	6.8%
HUD	81.3%	81.8%	85.4%	9.4%	8.5%	4.3%	9.4%	9.7%	10.3%
MER	77.6%	81.3%	84.3%	2.4%	3.3%	4.5%	20.0%	15.4%	11.2%
UNI	83.3%	83.6%	73.1%	3.3%	3.3%	1.9%	13.3%	13.1%	25.0%
BERG	90.1%	91.6%	92.8%	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%	8.9%	7.4%	6.2%
BURL	83.0%	83.6%	87.9%	4.3%	1.4%	4.4%	12.8%	15.0%	7.6%
OCE	72.3%	57.6%	78.3%	0.0%	3.0%	4.3%	27.7%	39.4%	17.4%
SOM	52.6%	92.3%	63.6%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	36.8%	7.7%	36.4%
PASC	82.3%	81.4%	80.2%	2.0%	1.4%	19.8%	15.7%	17.2%	0.0%
MDSX	78.7%	85.1%	89.5%	4.3%	4.5%	5.3%	17.0%	10.4%	5.3%
CUMB	68.8%	76.5%	72.2%	1.3%	2.9%	11.1%	29.9%	20.6%	16.7%
WAR	83.3%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	100.0%
GLO	90.6%	84.0%	89.5%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%	16.0%	10.5%
CAPE	75.0%	100.0%	85.7%	16.7%	0.0%	14.3%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%
SUSX	93.7%	80.0%	91.7%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	6.3%	10.0%	8.3%
SAL	78.7%	60.0%	83.3%	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	14.8%	40.0%	16.7%
MOR	--	86.7%	77.3%	--	6.7%	4.5%	--	6.7%	18.2%
HUN	--	100.0%	-	--	0.0%	-	--	0.0%	-
SITE AVG	78.9%	81.9%	76.2%	4.9%	3.2%	5.5%	16.2%	14.9%	18.3%

[†] Outcomes were not measured prior to JDAI, so data is reported for the earliest full-year of data available: 2006 (Atlantic, Camden, Essex, Monmouth); 2008 (Hudson, Burlington, Ocean); 2009 (Mercer); 2010 (Union, Bergen, Somerset); 2011 (Middlesex, Warren, Cumberland); 2012 (Passaic, Sussex); 2013 (Gloucester); 2014 (Cape May); 2015 (Salem); 2018 (Morris); 2019 (Hunterdon).

PUBLIC SAFETY OUTCOMES

Detention Alternative Outcomes. Detention alternatives are short-term placements for youth who would otherwise remain in detention while their cases are pending in court. The primary purpose of detention alternatives is to provide supervision and basic supports to youth, in order to minimize the likelihood that youth will be charged with a new delinquency offense while awaiting the disposition of their current case. Alternatives also help to ensure youth appear at each required court hearing.

Table 21 describes outcomes for youth supervised via detention alternatives by reporting the nature of departures from alternative placement. In 2021, across the 21 sites, the vast majority of youth were released from detention alternatives following successful completion. Averaging across sites, 81.0% of youth were released successfully, though success rates ranged from 64.3% in Gloucester to 100.0% in Union, Middlesex, Warren, and Sussex. Importantly, the percentage of youth removed from a detention alternative as the result of a new delinquency charge is small, averaging just 4.2% across sites, and keeping at or below 10.0% in 17 sites (ranging from 0.0% in Union, Middlesex, Ocean, Somerset, Warren, Cape May, and Sussex, to 14.3% in Monmouth and 12.8% in Passaic). Finally, in 2021, 14.3% of youth were removed from alternative programs for rule violations (no new charges), ranging from a low of 0.0% in Union, Middlesex, Warren, and Sussex, to a high of 33.3% in Ocean.

TABLE 21. DETENTION ALTERNATIVE OUTCOMES

	Successful Completion			New Charges			Violation/Non-Compliance		
	Earliest ¹	2020	2021	Earliest	2020	2021	Earliest	2020	2021
ATL	70.6%	69.2%	67.4%	9.5%	9.0%	10.9%	19.9%	21.8%	21.7%
CAM	81.4%	67.4%	76.0%	4.3%	7.0%	3.3%	14.3%	25.7%	20.7%
ESX	78.1%	68.7%	70.3%	6.7%	9.2%	8.2%	15.2%	22.1%	21.5%
MON	78.0%	82.8%	71.4%	6.6%	10.3%	14.3%	15.4%	6.8%	14.3%
HUD	81.3%	85.4%	78.5%	9.4%	4.3%	6.9%	9.4%	10.3%	14.6%
MER	77.6%	84.3%	85.7%	2.4%	4.5%	2.9%	20.0%	11.2%	11.4%
UNI	83.3%	73.1%	100.0%	3.3%	1.9%	0.0%	13.3%	25.0%	0.0%
BERG	90.1%	92.8%	92.4%	1.0%	1.0%	6.1%	8.9%	6.2%	1.5%
BURL	83.0%	87.9%	93.3%	4.3%	4.4%	2.2%	12.8%	7.6%	4.4%
OCE	72.3%	78.3%	66.7%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	27.7%	17.4%	33.3%
SOM	52.6%	63.6%	70.0%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	36.8%	36.4%	30.0%
PASC	82.3%	80.2%	66.7%	2.0%	19.8%	12.8%	15.7%	0.0%	20.5%
MDSX	78.7%	89.5%	100.0%	4.3%	5.3%	0.0%	17.0%	5.3%	0.0%
CUMB	68.8%	72.2%	75.0%	1.3%	11.1%	3.1%	29.9%	16.7%	21.9%
WAR	83.3%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%
GLO	90.6%	89.5%	64.3%	3.8%	0.0%	7.1%	5.7%	10.5%	28.6%
CAPE	75.0%	85.7%	85.7%	16.7%	14.3%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	14.3%
SUSX	93.7%	91.7%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	8.3%	0.0%
SAL	78.7%	83.3%	80.0%	6.6%	0.0%	6.7%	14.8%	16.7%	13.3%
MOR	--	77.3%	76.9%	--	4.5%	0.0%	--	18.2%	23.1%
HUN	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
SITE AVG	78.9%	76.2%	81.0%	4.9%	5.5%	4.2%	16.2%	18.3%	14.8%

¹ Outcomes were not measured prior to JDAI, so data is reported for the earliest full-year of data available: 2006 (Atlantic, Camden, Essex, Monmouth); 2008 (Hudson, Burlington, Ocean); 2009 (Mercer); 2010 (Union, Bergen, Somerset); 2011 (Middlesex, Warren, Cumberland); 2012 (Passaic, Sussex); 2013 (Gloucester); 2014 (Cape May); 2015 (Salem); 2018 (Morris); 2019 (Hunterdon).

PUBLIC SAFETY OUTCOMES

Detention Alternative Outcomes. Detention alternatives are short-term placements for youth who would otherwise remain in detention while their cases are pending in court. The primary purpose of detention alternatives is to provide supervision and basic supports to youth, in order to minimize the likelihood that youth will be charged with a new delinquency offense while awaiting the disposition of their current case. Alternatives also help to ensure youth appear at each required court hearing.

Table 19 describes outcomes for youth supervised via detention alternatives by reporting the nature of departures from alternative placement. In 2022, across the 21 sites, the vast majority of youth were released from detention alternatives following successful completion. Averaging across sites, 84.8% of youth were released successfully, though success rates ranged from 70.0% in Morris to 100.0% in Cape May and Warren. Importantly, the percentage of youth removed from a detention alternative as the result of a new delinquency charge is small, averaging just 4.0% across sites, and keeping at or below 5.0% in 14 sites. Finally, in 2022, 11.2% of youth were removed from alternative programs for rule violations (no new charges), ranging from a low of 0.0% in Warren and Cape May to a high of 24.1% in Cumberland and 22.6% in Camden.

TABLE 19. DETENTION ALTERNATIVE OUTCOMES

	Successful Completion			New Charges			Violation/Non-Compliance		
	Earliest [†]	2021	2022	Earliest	2021	2022	Earliest	2021	2022
ATL	70.6%	67.4%	84.4%	9.5%	10.9%	4.4%	19.9%	21.7%	11.1%
CAM	81.4%	76.0%	72.7%	4.3%	3.3%	4.7%	14.3%	20.7%	22.6%
ESX	78.1%	70.3%	71.0%	6.7%	8.2%	15.2%	15.2%	21.5%	13.8%
MON	78.0%	71.4%	81.0%	6.6%	14.3%	0.0%	15.4%	14.3%	19.0%
HUD	81.3%	78.5%	86.7%	9.4%	6.9%	2.7%	9.4%	14.6%	10.6%
MER	77.6%	85.7%	86.4%	2.4%	2.9%	8.6%	20.0%	11.4%	4.9%
UNI	83.3%	100.0%	87.5%	3.3%	0.0%	9.3%	13.3%	0.0%	3.1%
BERG	90.1%	92.4%	92.6%	1.0%	6.1%	5.8%	8.9%	1.5%	1.2%
BURL	83.0%	93.3%	90.6%	4.3%	2.2%	5.1%	12.8%	4.4%	4.3%
OCE	72.3%	66.7%	91.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.7%	33.3%	8.7%
SOM	52.6%	70.0%	81.8%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	36.8%	30.0%	18.2%
PASC	82.3%	66.7%	84.3%	2.0%	12.8%	1.2%	15.7%	20.5%	14.5%
MDSX	78.7%	100.0%	97.4%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	17.0%	0.0%	2.6%
CUMB	68.8%	75.0%	72.4%	1.3%	3.1%	3.4%	29.9%	21.9%	24.1%
WAR	83.3%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%
GLO	90.6%	64.3%	94.7%	3.8%	7.1%	0.0%	5.7%	28.6%	5.3%
CAPE	75.0%	85.7%	100.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	14.3%	0.0%
SUSX	93.7%	100.0%	79.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	21.0%
SAL	78.7%	80.0%	72.7%	6.6%	6.7%	9.1%	14.8%	13.3%	18.2%
MOR	0.0%	76.9%	70.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	23.1%	20.0%
HUN	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SITE AVG	78.9%	81.0%	84.8%	4.9%	4.2%	4.0%	16.2%	14.8%	11.2%

[†] Outcomes were not measured prior to JDAI, so data is reported for the earliest full-year of data available: 2006 (Atlantic, Camden, Essex, Monmouth); 2008 (Hudson, Burlington, Ocean); 2009 (Mercer); 2010 (Union, Bergen, Somerset); 2011 (Middlesex, Warren, Cumberland); 2012 (Passaic, Sussex); 2013 (Gloucester); 2014 (Cape May); 2015 (Salem); 2018 (Morris); 2019 (Hunterdon).

FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County
(PART A1) Adjudicated Cases (per Case Status Date)
Calendar Year - 2020 { 01/01/2020 to 12/31/2020 }

County	Count of Juveniles	Count of Cases	Count of Offenses	Average Number of Offenses per Juvenile	Average Number of Offenses per Case	Average Number of Cases per Juvenile
Atlantic	161	369	1,324	8.22	3.59	2.29
Bergen	206	309	730	3.54	2.36	1.50
Burlington	164	230	486	2.96	2.11	1.40
Camden	251	398	1,035	4.12	2.60	1.59
Cape May	80	116	328	4.10	2.83	1.45
Cumberland	159	198	333	2.09	1.68	1.25
Essex	260	382	1,115	4.29	2.92	1.47
Gloucester	101	137	280	2.77	2.04	1.36
Hudson	227	364	953	4.20	2.62	1.60
Hunterdon	11	13	62	5.64	4.77	1.18
Mercer	194	342	826	4.26	2.42	1.76
Middlesex	315	428	1,077	3.42	2.52	1.36
Monmouth	201	250	426	2.12	1.70	1.24
Morris	78	112	386	4.95	3.45	1.44
Ocean	195	286	627	3.22	2.19	1.47
Passaic	271	298	807	2.98	2.71	1.10
Salem	41	61	109	2.66	1.79	1.49
Somerset	36	57	125	3.47	2.19	1.58
Sussex	11	15	41	3.73	2.73	1.36
Union	206	276	598	2.90	2.17	1.34
Warren	12	14	33	2.75	2.36	1.17
Total	3,180	4,655	11,701	3.68	2.51	1.46

1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).
3.) These figures Exclude Violation-of-Probation Offenses.

2.) Figures were based on the Case Status Date of the Juvenile Delinquency Compliant.
4.) These figures Exclude Transferred-In Cases.

FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County
(PART A1) Adjudicated Cases (per Case Status Date)
Calendar Year - 2022 { 01/01/2022 to 12/31/2022 }

County	Count of Juveniles	Count of Cases	Count of Offenses	Average Number of Offenses per Juvenile	Average Number of Offenses per Case	Average Number of Cases per Juvenile
Atlantic	57	143	410	7.19	2.87	2.51
Bergen	100	131	337	3.37	2.57	1.31
Burlington	187	243	448	2.40	1.84	1.30
Camden	158	251	600	3.80	2.39	1.59
Cape May	13	15	43	3.31	2.87	1.15
Cumberland	38	56	194	5.11	3.46	1.47
Essex	125	202	545	4.36	2.70	1.62
Gloucester	30	41	85	2.83	2.07	1.37
Hudson	63	113	388	6.16	3.43	1.79
Hunterdon	5	5	7	1.40	1.40	1.00
Mercer	96	123	356	3.71	2.89	1.28
Middlesex	164	221	505	3.08	2.29	1.35
Monmouth	90	134	487	5.41	3.63	1.49
Morris	19	30	88	4.63	2.93	1.58
Ocean	69	110	233	3.38	2.12	1.59
Passaic	88	98	288	3.27	2.94	1.11
Salem	10	11	43	4.30	3.91	1.10
Somerset	10	10	24	2.40	2.40	1.00
Sussex	9	10	35	3.89	3.50	1.11
Union	106	140	363	3.42	2.59	1.32
Warren	13	21	49	3.77	2.33	1.62
Total	1,450	2,108	5,528	3.81	2.62	1.45

1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).
3.) These figures Exclude Violation-of-Probation Offenses.

2.) Figures were based on the Case Status Date of the Juvenile Delinquency Complaint.
4.) These figures Exclude Transferred-In Cases.

FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County
(PART C1) Age of Juveniles by County
Calendar Year - 2022 { 01/01/2022 to 12/31/2022 }

County	6 - 10		11 - 12		13 - 14		15 - 16		17 only		Total	Under 6		Over 17		Out of Range		Grand Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	#	%	
Atlantic	0	.00	3	.94	12	16.98	30	50.94	12	31.13	106	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	57
Bergen	0	.00	4	4.00	23	23.00	47	47.00	26	26.00	100	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	100
Burlington	1	.53	26	13.90	53	28.34	70	37.43	37	19.79	187	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	187
Camden	0	.00	8	5.06	29	18.35	72	45.57	49	31.01	158	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	158
Cape May	0	.00	1	7.69	5	38.46	4	30.77	3	23.08	13	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	13
Cumberland	0	.00	2	5.26	10	26.32	17	44.74	9	23.68	38	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	38
Essex	0	.00	4	3.20	26	20.80	50	40.00	45	36.00	125	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	125
Gloucester	0	.00	2	6.67	9	30.00	13	43.33	6	20.00	30	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	30
Hudson	0	.00	4	6.35	6	9.52	30	47.62	23	36.51	63	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	63
Hunterdon	0	.00	0	.00	1	20.00	2	40.00	2	40.00	5	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5
Mercer	0	.00	4	4.17	34	35.42	41	42.71	17	17.71	96	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	96
Middlesex	1	.61	12	7.32	38	23.17	70	42.68	43	26.22	164	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	164
Monmouth	0	.00	4	4.44	28	31.11	41	45.56	17	18.89	90	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	90
Morris	0	.00	0	.00	5	26.32	4	21.05	10	52.63	19	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	19
Ocean	0	.00	5	7.25	22	31.88	28	40.58	14	20.29	69	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	69
Passaic	0	.00	4	4.55	22	25.00	37	42.05	25	28.41	88	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	88
Salem	0	.00	0	.00	4	40.00	2	20.00	4	40.00	10	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	10
Somerset	0	.00	0	.00	3	30.00	4	40.00	3	30.00	10	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	10
Sussex	0	.00	1	11.11	1	11.11	7	77.78	0	.00	9	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	9
Union	0	.00	1	.94	18	16.98	54	50.94	33	31.13	106	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	106
Warren	0	.00	0	.00	2	15.38	7	53.85	4	30.77	13	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	13
TOTAL	2	1.14	85	92.86	351	518.15	630	904.60	382	583.25	1499	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	1450

1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).

**FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County
(PART D) Race of Juveniles by County
Calendar Year - 2022 { 01/01/2022 to 12/31/2022 }**

County	Caucasian		Black		Hispanic		Asian/ Pacific Islander		American Indian		Other		Alaskan Native		Not Indicated		Grand Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Atlantic	1	2.83	5	3.77	4	13.21	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	47	80.19	57
Bergen	8	8.00	5	5.00	9	9.00	0	.00	1	1.00	0	.00	0	.00	77	77.00	100
Burlington	10	5.35	12	6.42	1	.53	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	164	87.70	187
Camden	12	7.59	22	13.92	8	5.06	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	116	73.42	158
Cape May	6	46.15	0	.00	1	7.69	0	.00	0	.00	1	7.69	0	.00	5	38.46	13
Cumberland	2	5.26	3	7.89	6	15.79	0	.00	0	.00	1	2.63	0	.00	26	68.42	38
Essex	2	1.60	14	11.20	3	2.40	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	106	84.80	125
Gloucester	5	16.67	2	6.67	1	3.33	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	22	73.33	30
Hudson	0	.00	1	1.59	1	1.59	0	.00	0	.00	1	1.59	0	.00	60	95.24	63
Hunterdon	1	20.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	4	80.00	5
Mercer	3	3.13	10	10.42	7	7.29	1	1.04	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	75	78.13	96
Middlesex	6	3.66	6	3.66	6	3.66	0	.00	0	.00	2	1.22	0	.00	144	87.80	164
Monmouth	5	5.56	4	4.44	5	5.56	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	76	84.44	90
Morris	0	.00	2	10.53	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	17	89.47	19
Ocean	10	14.49	5	7.25	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	54	78.26	69
Passaic	5	5.68	8	9.09	12	13.64	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	63	71.59	88
Salem	0	.00	2	20.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	8	80.00	10
Somerset	0	.00	1	10.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	9	90.00	10
Sussex	2	22.22	1	11.11	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	6	66.67	9
Union	3	2.83	4	3.77	14	13.21	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	85	80.19	106
Warren	1	7.69	0	.00	1	7.69	0	.00	0	.00	1	7.69	0	.00	10	76.92	13
TOTAL	82	178.71	107	146.73	79	109.65	1	1.04	1	1.00	6	20.82	0	.00	1174	*****	1450

1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).

FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County
(PART E1) Gender of Juveniles by County
Calendar Year - 2022 { 01/01/2022 to 12/31/2022 }

County	#	Male		Female		UnDeclared		Not Indicated		Grand Total
		%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Atlantic	43	75.44	14	24.56	0	.00	0	.00	57	
Bergen	80	80.00	20	20.00	0	.00	0	.00	100	
Burlington	147	78.61	40	21.39	0	.00	0	.00	187	
Camden	139	87.97	19	12.03	0	.00	0	.00	158	
Cape May	10	76.92	3	23.08	0	.00	0	.00	13	
Cumberland	32	84.21	6	15.79	0	.00	0	.00	38	
Essex	119	95.20	6	4.80	0	.00	0	.00	125	
Gloucester	28	93.33	2	6.67	0	.00	0	.00	30	
Hudson	58	92.06	5	7.94	0	.00	0	.00	63	
Hunterdon	5	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	5	
Mercer	80	83.33	15	15.63	0	.00	1	1.04	96	
Middlesex	136	82.93	25	15.24	0	.00	3	1.83	164	
Monmouth	81	90.00	9	10.00	0	.00	0	.00	90	
Morris	18	94.74	1	5.26	0	.00	0	.00	19	
Ocean	57	82.61	11	15.94	0	.00	1	1.45	69	
Passaic	73	82.95	15	17.05	0	.00	0	.00	88	
Salem	10	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	10	
Somerset	10	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	10	
Sussex	9	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	9	
Union	96	90.57	10	9.43	0	.00	0	.00	106	
Warren	13	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	13	
TOTAL	1244	85.79	201	13.86	0	.00	5	.34	1450	

1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).

**FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County
(PART E1) Gender of Juveniles by County
Calendar Year - 2022 { 01/01/2022 to 12/31/2022 }**

County	Male		Female		UnDeclared		Not Indicated		Grand Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Atlantic	104	80.62	25	19.38	0	.00	0	.00	129
Bergen	125	75.30	39	23.49	0	.00	2	1.20	166
Burlington	194	75.19	64	24.81	0	.00	0	.00	258
Camden	253	84.62	46	15.38	0	.00	0	.00	299
Cape May	26	86.67	4	13.33	0	.00	0	.00	30
Cumberland	54	83.08	11	16.92	0	.00	0	.00	65
Essex	258	91.17	25	8.83	0	.00	0	.00	283
Gloucester	78	83.87	14	15.05	0	.00	1	1.08	93
Hudson	107	89.17	13	10.83	0	.00	0	.00	120
Hunterdon	9	90.00	1	10.00	0	.00	0	.00	10
Mercer	122	79.74	30	19.61	0	.00	1	.65	153
Middlesex	182	82.73	35	15.91	0	.00	3	1.36	220
Monmouth	137	85.63	22	13.75	0	.00	1	.63	160
Morris	45	77.59	11	18.97	0	.00	2	3.45	58
Ocean	99	84.62	17	14.53	0	.00	1	.85	117
Passaic	107	79.85	27	20.15	0	.00	0	.00	134
Salem	24	96.00	1	4.00	0	.00	0	.00	25
Somerset	22	91.67	1	4.17	0	.00	1	4.17	24
Sussex	17	100.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	17
Union	138	85.19	24	14.81	0	.00	0	.00	162
Warren	23	74.19	8	25.81	0	.00	0	.00	31
TOTAL	2124	83.16	418	16.37	0	.00	12	.47	2554

1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).

FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County
(PART D) Race of Juveniles by County
Calendar Year - 2022 { 01/01/2022 to 12/31/2022 }

County	Caucasian		Black		Hispanic		Asian/ Pacific Islander		American Indian		Other		Alaskan Native		Not Indicated		Grand Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Atlantic	5	3.70	15	8.64	6	9.88	0	.00	0	.00	1	.00	0	.00	102	77.78	129
Bergen	11	6.63	10	6.02	17	10.24	0	.00	1	.60	0	.00	0	.00	127	76.51	166
Burlington	13	5.04	18	6.98	1	.39	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	226	87.60	258
Camden	17	5.69	47	15.72	18	6.02	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	217	72.58	299
Cape May	7	23.33	0	.00	2	6.67	0	.00	0	.00	1	3.33	0	.00	20	66.67	30
Cumberland	4	6.15	5	7.69	7	10.77	0	.00	0	.00	1	1.54	0	.00	48	73.85	65
Essex	8	2.83	55	19.43	8	2.83	0	.00	0	.00	1	.35	0	.00	211	74.56	283
Gloucester	10	10.75	12	12.90	1	1.08	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	70	75.27	93
Hudson	0	.00	4	3.33	4	3.33	0	.00	0	.00	1	.83	0	.00	111	92.50	120
Hunterdon	1	10.00	0	.00	1	10.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	8	80.00	10
Mercer	4	2.61	16	10.46	8	5.23	1	.65	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	124	81.05	153
Middlesex	10	4.55	11	5.00	10	4.55	0	.00	0	.00	2	.91	0	.00	187	85.00	220
Monmouth	10	6.25	7	4.38	11	6.88	1	.63	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	131	81.88	160
Morris	5	8.62	3	5.17	3	5.17	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	47	81.03	58
Ocean	14	11.97	8	6.84	1	.85	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	94	80.34	117
Passaic	6	4.48	14	10.45	18	13.43	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	96	71.64	134
Salem	0	.00	4	16.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	21	84.00	25
Somerset	0	.00	1	4.17	1	4.17	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	22	91.67	24
Sussex	3	17.65	1	5.88	2	11.76	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	11	64.71	17
Union	6	3.70	14	8.64	16	9.88	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	126	77.78	162
Warren	3	9.68	3	9.68	1	3.23	0	.00	0	.00	1	3.23	0	.00	23	74.19	31
TOTAL	137	143.62	248	167.38	136	126.34	2	1.28	1	.60	8	10.19	0	.00	2022	*****	2554

1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).

FJ Statistical Processing
Juveniles, Cases and Offenses by County
(PART C1) Age of Juveniles by County
Calendar Year - 2022 { 01/01/2022 to 12/31/2022 }

County	6 - 10		11 - 12		13 - 14		15 - 16		17 only		Total	Under 6		Over 17		Out of Range		Grand Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%	#	%	
Atlantic	0	.00	6	.62	35	19.75	58	48.77	30	30.86	162	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	129
Bergen	0	.00	9	5.42	39	23.49	75	45.18	43	25.90	166	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	166
Burlington	3	1.16	34	13.18	72	27.91	94	36.43	55	21.32	258	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	258
Camden	0	.00	17	5.69	60	20.07	127	42.47	95	31.77	299	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	299
Cape May	0	.00	2	6.67	11	36.67	9	30.00	8	26.67	30	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	30
Cumberland	0	.00	7	10.77	17	26.15	26	40.00	15	23.08	65	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	65
Essex	0	.00	5	1.77	58	20.49	117	41.34	103	36.40	283	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	283
Gloucester	1	1.08	8	8.60	30	32.26	31	33.33	23	24.73	93	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	93
Hudson	0	.00	6	5.00	22	18.33	52	43.33	40	33.33	120	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	120
Hunterdon	0	.00	0	.00	1	10.00	7	70.00	2	20.00	10	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	10
Mercer	0	.00	9	5.88	49	32.03	64	41.83	31	20.26	153	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	153
Middlesex	3	1.36	16	7.27	52	23.64	90	40.91	59	26.82	220	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	220
Monmouth	0	.00	8	5.00	49	30.63	70	43.75	33	20.63	160	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	160
Morris	0	.00	4	6.90	19	32.76	13	22.41	22	37.93	58	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	58
Ocean	0	.00	7	5.98	33	28.21	50	42.74	27	23.08	117	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	117
Passaic	1	.75	5	3.73	29	21.64	56	41.79	43	32.09	134	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	134
Salem	0	.00	3	12.00	9	36.00	8	32.00	5	20.00	25	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	25
Somerset	0	.00	1	4.17	5	20.83	10	41.67	8	33.33	24	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	24
Sussex	0	.00	1	5.88	4	23.53	11	64.71	1	5.88	17	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	17
Union	0	.00	1	.62	32	19.75	79	48.77	50	30.86	162	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	162
Warren	0	.00	2	6.45	5	16.13	17	54.84	7	22.58	31	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	31
TOTAL	8	4.35	151	121.59	631	520.27	1064	906.27	700	547.52	2587	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	2554

1.) Data were derived from the Family Automated Case Tracking System (FACTS).

FJ Statistical Processing
(PART A5.1) Lead Dispositions for ADJUDICATED DELINQUENT Cases by County
For the period between 01/01/2022 - 12/31/2022
Lead Disposition Categories (One per Case)

County	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	99	Cases
Atlantic	27	0	39	0	0	12	0	0	0	116	4	4	16	0	2	1	0	0	11	5	0	0	0	14	251
Bergen	0	1	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	48	0	1	87	1	6	3	0	0	41	8	0	0	0	9	213
Burlington	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	242	2	2	5	0	1	43	12	0	0	0	4	326
Camden	39	0	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	207	0	4	13	0	0	120	21	1	0	0	17	476
Cape May	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	0	2	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	15	42
Cumberland	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	55	0	7	9	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	21	116
Essex	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	204	2	0	0	0	0	147	17	0	0	0	55	434
Gloucester	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	41	2	3	14	0	0	36	4	0	0	0	11	113
Hudson	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	0	0	0	0	0	38	13	0	0	0	44	226
Hunterdon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	11
Mercer	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	114	0	3	28	0	0	17	4	0	0	0	49	239
Middlesex	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	218	0	7	0	0	0	24	2	0	0	0	6	274
Monmouth	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	0	3	3	0	0	44	42	0	0	0	31	260
Morris	4	3	0	6	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	4	7	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	50
Ocean	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	113	0	4	12	0	0	12	1	0	0	0	10	157
Passaic	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	82	0	0	0	0	0	34	1	0	0	0	7	143
Salem	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	1	3	0	0	9	1	0	0	0	5	32
Somerset	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	1	6	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	30
Sussex	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	1	1	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	1	19
Union	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	0	1	23	0	0	3	22	0	0	0	20	218
Warren	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	2	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	15	42
TOTAL	153	9	56	25	0	25	0	0	0	165	14	57	1860	7	56	131	0	1	602	172	1	0	0	338	3672

- 1) JJC Incarceration
- 2) Short-Term Commitment
- 3) Residential Program JJC
- 4) DCF Residential

- 5) DMH-H/DHS
- 6) Other Residential
- 7) Non-Residential Program JJC
- 8) DCF Non-Residential

- 9) Div. of Mntl Retard (DMR)
- 10) Other Remedial Non-Residential
- 11) DCF (Unspecified)
- 12) JJC Incarceration (Suspended)

- 13) Probation
- 14) Probation (Suspended)
- 15) Restitution
- 16) Community Service

- 17) Res/Non-Res (Suspended)
- 18) Fine
- 19) Formal Continuance
- 20) Other Conditional

- 21) Continue with Prior Disposition
- 22) Other
- 23) Suspended (Conditional)
- * Categories Above 23 are NOT considered valid

State of New Jersey
 Juvenile Justice Commission
 Probationers Intake Report from 01/01/2022 - 12/31/2022 by County/Race/Ethnicity

County	Race/Ethnicity	Number
ATLANTIC	WHITE	0
	BLACK	6
	HISPANIC	1
	OTHER	0
	Sub Totals	7
BERGEN	WHITE	0
	BLACK	1
	HISPANIC	0
	OTHER	0
	Sub Totals	1
BURLINGTON	WHITE	0
CAMDEN		
CAPE MAY		0
	OTHER	0
	Sub Totals	1
CUMBERLAND	WHITE	0
	BLACK	2
	HISPANIC	1
	OTHER	0
	Sub Totals	3

Re-entry
Data

State of New Jersey
 Juvenile Justice Commission
 Probationers Released in 2022 by County/Program Type

County	Program Type	Total
ATLANTIC	RESIDENTIAL	4
BERGEN	RESIDENTIAL	1
BURLINGTON	RESIDENTIAL	5
CAMDEN	RESIDENTIAL	1
CAPE MAY	RESIDENTIAL	1
CUMBERLAND	RESIDENTIAL	3
ESSEX	RESIDENTIAL	1
GLOUCESTER	RESIDENTIAL	0
HUDSON	RESIDENTIAL	4
HUNTERDON	RESIDENTIAL	0
MERCER	RESIDENTIAL	1
MIDDLESEX	RESIDENTIAL	0
MONMOUTH	RESIDENTIAL	2
MORRIS	RESIDENTIAL	1
OCEAN	RESIDENTIAL	4
PASSAIC	RESIDENTIAL	5
SALEM	RESIDENTIAL	0
SOMERSET	RESIDENTIAL	0
SUSSEX	RESIDENTIAL	0
UNION	RESIDENTIAL	2
WARREN	RESIDENTIAL	0

State of New Jersey
 Juvenile Justice Commission
 Probationers Released from JJC Residential in 2022 by County/Race/Ethnicity/Gender

County	Race/Ethnicity	Male	Female	Total
ATLANTIC	WHITE	0	0	0
	BLACK	4	0	4
	HISPANIC	0	0	0
	OTHER	0	0	0
	Sub Totals	4	0	4
BERGEN	WHITE	0	0	0
	BLACK	1	0	1
	HISPANIC	0	0	0
	OTHER	0	0	0
	Sub Totals	1	0	1
BURLINGTON	WHITE	0	0	0
	BLACK	5	0	5
	HISPANIC	0	0	0
	OTHER	0	0	0
	Sub Totals	5	0	5
CAMDEN	WHITE	0	0	0
	BLACK	0	1	1
	HISPANIC	0	0	0
	OTHER	0	0	0
	Sub Totals	0	1	1
CAPE MAY	WHITE	0	0	0
	BLACK	1	0	1
	HISPANIC	0	0	0
	OTHER	0	0	0
	Sub Totals	1	0	1
CUMBERLAND	WHITE	0	0	0
	BLACK	2	0	2
	HISPANIC	1	0	1
	OTHER	0	0	0
	Sub Totals	3	0	3

State of New Jersey
 Juvenile Justice Commission
 Probationers Released from JJC Residential in 2022 by County/Age

County	Age	Number	% of Total
ATLANTIC	14 and under	0	0.0%
	15 - 16	1	25.0%
	17 - 18	3	75.0%
	19 and over	0	0.0%
	Sub Totals	4	100%
BERGEN	14 and under	0	0.0%
	15 - 16	1	100.0%
	17 - 18	0	0.0%
	19 and over	0	0.0%
	Sub Totals	1	100%
BURLINGTON	14 and under	0	0.0%
	15 - 16	2	40.0%
	17 - 18	3	60.0%
	19 and over	0	0.0%
	Sub Totals	5	100%
CAMDEN	14 and under	0	0.0%
	15 - 16	1	100.0%
	17 - 18	0	0.0%
	19 and over	0	0.0%
	Sub Totals	1	100%
CAPE MAY	14 and under	0	0.0%
	15 - 16	0	0.0%
	17 - 18	1	100.0%
	19 and over	0	0.0%
	Sub Totals	1	100%
CUMBERLAND	14 and under	0	0.0%
	15 - 16	2	66.7%
	17 - 18	1	33.3%
	19 and over	0	0.0%
	Sub Totals	3	100%

State of New Jersey
 Juvenile Justice Commission
 Probationers Offenses in 2022 by Type/County

County	Persons	Weapons	Property	CDS	Public Order	VOP	Total
ATLANTIC	2 50%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 25%	1 25%	4 100%
BERGEN	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 100%	1 100%
BURLINGTON	0 0%	1 20%	2 40%	0 0%	1 20%	1 20%	5 100%
CAMDEN	1 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 100%
CAPE MAY	0 0%	0 0%	1 100%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 100%
CUMBERLAND	1 33%	1 33%	0 0%	1 33%	0 0%	0 0%	3 100%

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission
Probationers Released in 2022 from Pinelands by County

County	Total
ATLANTIC	0
BERGEN	0
BURLINGTON	0
CAMDEN	0
CAPE MAY	0
CUMBERLAND	0
ESSEX	0
GLOUCESTER	0
HUDSON	0
HUNTERDON	0
MERCER	0
MIDDLESEX	0
MONMOUTH	0
MORRIS	0
OCEAN	1
PASSAIC	0
SALEM	0
SOMERSET	0
SUSSEX	0
UNION	0
WARREN	0

**State of New Jersey
 Juvenile Justice Commission
 Committed Juveniles Admitted to JJC in 2022 by County/Race/Ethnicity**

County	Race/Ethnicity	Number
ATLANTIC	WHITE	0
	BLACK	8
	HISPANIC	1
	OTHER	0
	Sub Totals	9
BERGEN	WHITE	0
	BLACK	1
	HISPANIC	0
	OTHER	0
	Sub Totals	1
BURLINGTON	WHITE	0
	BLACK	4
	HISPANIC	1
	OTHER	0
	Sub Totals	5
CAMDEN	WHITE	1
	BLACK	16
	HISPANIC	3
	OTHER	0
	Sub Totals	20
CAPE MAY	WHITE	0
	BLACK	0
	HISPANIC	0
	OTHER	0
	Sub Totals	0
CUMBERLAND	WHITE	2
	BLACK	0
	HISPANIC	0
	OTHER	0
	Sub Totals	2

County	Departure Type/ Program Type	Number	% of Total
ATLANTIC	Released to Parole Supervision	6	100.0%
	Recalled to Probation	0	0.0%
BERGEN	Released to Parole Supervision	1	100.0%
	Recalled to Probation	0	0.0%
BURLINGTON	Released to Parole Supervision	6	100.0%
	Recalled to Probation	0	0.0%
CAMDEN	Released to Parole Supervision	18	100.0%
	Recalled to Probation	0	0.0%
CAPE MAY	Released to Parole Supervision	0	0.0%
	Recalled to Probation	0	0.0%
CUMBERLAND	Released to Parole Supervision	1	100.0%
	Recalled to Probation	0	0.0%
ESSEX	Released to Parole Supervision	7	100.0%
	Recalled to Probation	0	0.0%
GLOUCESTER	Released to Parole Supervision	0	0.0%
	Recalled to Probation	0	0.0%
HUDSON	Released to Parole Supervision	2	100.0%
	Recalled to Probation	0	0.0%
HUNTERDON	Released to Parole Supervision	0	0.0%
	Recalled to Probation	0	0.0%

State of New Jersey
 Juvenile Justice Commission
 Committed Juveniles Released in 2022
 Average Length of Stay by County

County	LOS in Months
ATLANTIC	6.9
BERGEN	3.7
BURLINGTON	13.5
CAMDEN	11.8
CAPE MAY	0
CUMBERLAND	7.1
ESSEX	27.1
GLOUCESTER	0
HUDSON	4
HUNTERDON	0
MERCER	16
MIDDLESEX	23.1
MONMOUTH	9.2
MORRIS	0
OCEAN	0
PASSAIC	9
SALEM	0
SOMERSET	6
SUSSEX	0
UNION	9.7
WARREN	0

State of New Jersey
 Juvenile Justice Commission
 Committed Juveniles Released in 2022 by County/Age

County	Age	Number	% of Total
ATLANTIC	14 and under	0	0.0%
	15 - 16	1	16.7%
	17 - 18	4	66.7%
	19 and over	1	16.7%
	Sub Totals	6	100.0%
BERGEN	14 and under	0	0.0%
	15 - 16	0	0.0%
	17 - 18	1	100.0%
	19 and over	0	0.0%
	Sub Totals	1	100.0%
BURLINGTON	14 and under	0	0.0%
	15 - 16	1	16.7%
	17 - 18	4	66.7%
	19 and over	1	16.7%
	Sub Totals	6	100.0%
CAMDEN	14 and under	0	0.0%
	15 - 16	3	16.7%
	17 - 18	7	38.9%
	19 and over	8	44.4%
	Sub Totals	18	100.0%
CAPE MAY	14 and under	0	0.0%
	15 - 16	0	0.0%
	17 - 18	0	0.0%
	19 and over	0	0.0%
	Sub Totals	0	0.0%
CUMBERLAND	14 and under	0	0.0%
	15 - 16	0	0.0%
	17 - 18	0	0.0%
	19 and over	1	100.0%
	Sub Totals	1	100.0%

State of New Jersey
Juvenile Justice Commission
of Committed Juveniles with a Sex Offense History in 2022 by County

County	Total
ATLANTIC	0
BERGEN	0
BURLINGTON	3
CAMDEN	0
CAPE MAY	0
CUMBERLAND	0
ESSEX	0
GLOUCESTER	0
HUDSON	0
HUNTERDON	0
MERCER	0
MIDDLESEX	1
MONMOUTH	0
MORRIS	0
OCEAN	0
PASSAIC	1
SALEM	0
SOMERSET	0
SUSSEX	0
UNION	0
WARREN	0