Forum #1 –PREVENTION. Examples include youth development and family support services, educational and community mentoring, and in-school and out-of-school activities.		Rating
Leadership and Youth Development *All Stars* *PeaceBuilders*	This broad-based strategy includes any intervention that steers juveniles away from antisocial norms and toward conventional adulthood. It emphasizes (but is not limited to) interventions that concentrate on improvements in education, social competencies, employability, and civic and other life skills in order to change the capacity of the youth from a liability to an asset (Bazemore and Terry, 2001). In summary, the evidence concerning the impact of positive youth development programs is small but growing. This growing body of research suggests that youth development programs are a promising tool in the arsenal of programs designed to decrease problem behaviors.	Promising
Mentoring *Early Risers "Skills for Success" Programs* *BBBS Community-Based Mentoring*	Although the exact nature of the mentoring relationship varies from program to program and over time, it is generally defined as follows: A relationship over a prolonged period of time between two or more people where an older, caring, more experienced individual provides help to the younger person as [he or she] goes through life. [CSAP 2000, 2] Given the consensus from studies that the effects of mentoring are limited to small to moderate outcomes, it is not surprising that researchers have suggested that the extensive support given to implementing mentoring programs for at-risk youth is based on unsubstantiated claims about these programs' effectiveness (Rhodes and Lowe 2008).	Promising
Academic Skills Enhancement *The Incredible Years* *Boys and Girls Club Project Learn*	The underlying point of both theoretical frameworks is that for some students academic failure produces frustration and poor study habits. This, in turn, can initiate a chain of events that lead to a withdrawal from and rejection of participation in classroom activities, prompting some youths to become disruptive in class or even drop out of school. If left unchecked, this behavior can eventually lead to delinquency and other serious problem behaviors (Elliot and Voss, 1974). While few other academic skill-building interventions have evaluated the specific impact of academic success on delinquency, several studies have examined the educational impact of the programs. In fact, a rigorous review of hundreds of such programs by the American Youth Policy Forum recently identified 20 academic skills programs that produce significant gains in academic	Promising

	achievement. An overall analysis of these programs found that in comparison with peers or their own past academic performance, the adolescents involved in these 20 programs have higher test scores, graduate from school in higher numbers, and matriculate and remain in college in higher numbers (Jurich and Estes, 2000).	
Afterschool/Recreation *SMART Leaders* *Broader Urban Initiative Leadership Development Program*	Afterschool programs (ASPs)—also called out-of-school time (OST) programs—include a variety of program types, structured in numerous ways, designed to affect a variety of outcomes. As the name implies, such programs generally occur outside of mandated school hours, although some programs classified as afterschool or out-of-school may be part of a larger program where elements are delivered during school hours. These may be delivered before school, in the afternoons once school has been dismissed, on weekends, or during the summer. Research over the 1st decade of the 21st century has been largely divided between studies that emphasize the positive effects of ASPs and reviews that argue the research methods of most ASP evaluations are so weak that one can only draw the most preliminary of conclusions about programs' effectiveness.	Promising
Alternative Schools *Career Academy*	Alternative schools are essentially specialized educational environments that place a great deal of emphasis on small classrooms, high teacher-to-student ratios, individualized instruction, noncompetitive performance assessments, and less structured classrooms (Raywid, 1983). The purpose of these schools is to provide academic instruction to students expelled or suspended for disruptive behavior or weapons possession, or who are unable to succeed in the mainstream school environment (Ingersoll and Leboeuf, 1997). Recent evaluations (Kemple and Snipes, 2000; Cox, 1999; Cox, Davison, and Bynum, 1995) suggest that alternative schools have some positive effects. A meta-analysis of 57 alternative school programs found that alternative schools have a positive effect on school performance,	Promising

	attitudes toward school, and self-esteem but no effect on delinquency (Cox, Davison, and Bynum, 1995). The study also found that alternative schools targeting at-risk youths produced larger effects than other programs and that the more successful programs tend to have a curriculum and structure centered on the needs of the designated population. A 5-year evaluation of the career academy concept (the OJJDP alternative school model) covering nine schools and 1,900 students found that, compared with their counterparts who did not attend, at-risk students enrolled in career academies were 1) one third less likely to drop out of school, 2) more likely to attend school, complete academic and vocational courses, and apply to college, and 3) provided with more opportunities to set goals and reach academic and professional objectives (Kemple and Snipes, 2000).	
Classroom Curricula *Good Behavior Game* *Fast Track*	Curricula are classroom-based instruction programs designed to teach students factual information; increase their awareness of social influences to engage in misbehavior; expand their repertoires for recognizing and appropriately responding to risky or potentially harmful situations (e.g., drug use, gang involvement, violence); increase their appreciation for diversity in society; improve their moral character; improve conflict resolution skills; and encourage accountability. Drug and alcohol abuse prevention curricula have traditionally been based on pure information dissemination. Previous evaluations show that this didactic approach may be effective at transmitting information regarding drug and alcohol abuse however it is not effective at changing the underlying attitudes and behaviors (Sherman, 2000; Gottfredson, 1998; Botvin, Botvin and Ruchlin, 1998; Miller, 2001; Mendel, 2000; Sherman, et al., 1998; Rosenbaum and Hanson, 1998; Wyrick, et al., 2001). However, a review of the literature in the drug abuse prevention field suggests certain types of school-based curricula can effectively reduce substance abuse in adolescence (Botvin and Botvin, 1992; Dusenbury and Falco, 1997; Perry and Kelder, 1992; Tobler and Stratton, 1997). Efficacious prevention curricula consist of several key elements. Curricula delivered in an interactive format with smaller groups of young people have been shown to produce strong and lasting positive results (Tobler and Stratton, 1997). Effective curricula gives students the tools to recognize internal pressures like stress or anxiety and external pressures like peer attitudes and advertising	Promising

	that may influence them to use alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs. Following this, another useful component is helping students develop and practice personal, social, and refusal skills in order to resisting these influences effectively (Dusenbury and Falco, 1997). Changing perceptions of friends' tolerance of drug use was a substantial mediator of program effects on drug use (MacKinnon, et al., 1991).	
Cognitive Behavioral Therapy *Agression Replacement Training* *Operation New Hope*	Cognitive–Behavioral Therapy/Treatment* (CBT) is a problem-focused approach to helping people identify and change the dysfunctional beliefs, thoughts, and patterns of behavior that contribute to their problems. Its underlying principle is that thoughts affect emotions, which then influence behaviors. The studies reviewed provide consistent empirical evidence that CBT is associated with significant and clinically meaningful positive changes, particularly when therapy is provided by experienced practitioners (Waldron and Kaminer 2004). CBT has been successfully applied across settings (e.g., schools, support groups, prisons, treatment agencies, community-based organizations, churches) and across ages and roles (e.g., students, parents, teachers). It has been shown to be relevant for people with differing abilities and from a diverse range of backgrounds.	Effective
Gang Prevention *Little Village Gang Violence Reduction Project (Comprehensive Gang Model)* *Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT)*	Research suggests that most government and private programs for gang prevention have been left unevaluated and the few evaluated programs have either failed to decrease gang violence or have actually increased it (Sherman et al., 1997). Moreover, gang prevention programs have ignored the most likely causes of the recent growth of gangs (e.g., the community structure of urban neighbors). Nonetheless, successful methods for preventing gang violence are available. The next section reviews some available community-based programs for preventing gang violence.	Promising
School/Classroom Environment *Al's Pals: Kids Making*	**School organization intervention.** In addition, an OJJDP Study Group found that several such programs appear to reduce risk factors (including academic failure, dropping out of school, and rebelliousness) and increase protective factors (such as commitment to school and good attendance) (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1999). There is emerging	Promising

Healthy Choices *School Transitional Environmental Program (STEP)*	evidence that some research-based models of school reform, which provide clear guidance on specific changes that schools and classrooms must make, can result in significant improvement in achievement outcomes for schools with large numbers of students placed at risk of educational failure (U.S. Department of Education, 1998). Other risk factors may also include academic failure, dropping out of school, and rebelliousness. School organization intervention programs seek to counteract these risk factors by enhancing protective factors such as a commitment to school and good attendance. **Classroom Organization, management, and instruction.** Accordingly, certain skills have emerged as critical to preventing and reducing substance abuse and violent behavior, including communication, assertiveness, media resistance, resistance training, social problem-solving, character/belief development, empathy and perspective taking, stress management and coping, and anger management or impulse control (Northeast Center for the Application of Prevention Technologies, 1999). School and classroom environment programs seek to address these needs as they enhance educational skills from within the classroom environment	
Truancy Prevention *Career Academy* *Boys and Girls Club Project Learn*	Habitual truancy can be defined as unexcused absences from school by a minor that exceed the number of such absences allowed under state law. Rigorous data on the effectiveness of dropout programs has been lacking to a large degree, but there is a growing body of evidence regarding truancy reduction programs. Numerous programs have been found either to be effective for prevention of or intervention with truancy or to have promising or emerging evidence of programmatic effectiveness. Additionally, many programs that address multiple risk factors may have positive outcomes in regard to truancy reduction, although that may not be the primary goal of the program. Specific program descriptions found on this site delineate the available evidence for each program. There are also multiple programs that lack sufficient evidence to be classified as effective or ineffective. Strategies shown to be ineffective at reducing truancy include solution-oriented	Promising

	group interventions for at-risk students (Newsome 2004) and financial sanctions (Gandy and Schultz 2007).	
Conflict Resolution/Interpersonal skills *Linking the Interests of Families and Teachers (LIFT)* *Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline®*	These programs are typically designed with the overall goal of changing the mental processes and interpersonal behavioral strategies that lead young people to engage in problem behaviors such as violence, aggression, delinquency, risky sexual activity, and alcohol and drug use. Although numerous studies have documented positive results from various conflict resolution and interpersonal skills programs, researchers caution that results tended to be more positive for the well-implemented programs (Wilson and Lipsey 2007). Researchers also called for additional rigorous studies to determine the effects of program characteristics and settings on outcomes as well as the variations in effectiveness for various population and ages of children and youth.	Promising
Family Therapy *Multisystemic Therapy (MST)* *Functional Family Therapy (FFT)*	These family strengthening interventions include family skills training, family education, family therapy, family services, and family preservation programs. In summary, the research regarding family strengthening initiatives is impressive. Overall, analyses of family-based programs find that family strengthening initiatives (compared with programs that concentrate solely on parents or children) have more immediate and direct impact on improving family relationships, support, and communication and on reducing family conflict (Kumpfer and Alvarado, 1997; Szapocznik and Kurtines, 1989; Szapocznik, 1997).	Effective
Parent Training *Adolescent Transitions Program* *Coping Power Program*	These programs concentrate on teaching parents and prospective parents the use of effective management skills. This highly structured approach generally includes parents only, in small groups led by a skilled trainer or clinician. Numerous researchers have found that parent training helps reduce aggressive, antisocial, and delinquent behavior among children (Dumas,1989; Satterfield et al., 1987; Tremblay et al., 1991; Tremblay et al., 1992; Kazdin, Siegel, and Bass, 1992).	Effective

| **Drug / Alcohol Therapy** *Wraparound Milwaulkee* *Linking the Interest of Families and Teachers* | These interventions are designed and tested to help optimize the development of children. Scientists have found effective ways to work with families, schools, and communities in order to help young people develop skills and approaches to stopping problems related to substance use before they occur (NIDA, 2003). The key to success to many of these treatment initiatives has been promoting buy-in from all stakeholders, staffing with well-trained providers, and encouraging excellent communication between the interested parties (Castellano and Beck, 1991). Further, for treating juvenile offenders, providing adequate aftercare and involving participants' families in the transition is also critical. **Wraparound** Wraparound initiatives have produced promising results in providing support, guidance, and services to at-risk youth and juvenile offenders with substance-use related issues. Wraparound offers a highly structured, integrated services environment that, when well run and staffed by committed individuals, have the potential to offer positive benefits for all. **Treatment Centers** Recent studies have demonstrated that properly implemented treatment programs for juvenile offenders can have a significant impact on both the substance abuse and recidivism rates of incarcerated youth. | Promising |
| **Gender-specific programming** *Nurse Family Partnership (NFP)* *Project Link* | Gender-specific programming has recently emerged over the past decade as an increasingly important issue, in large part because the number of girls involved in the juvenile justice system has been growing over the past decade. Systems and practitioners are working to understand the phenomenon and to identify ways to address the issues this growing population of female delinquents face. Several recent reviews on gender-specific programming suggest that the evidence is thus far weak for the effectiveness of gender-specific programming. While the evidence for the effectiveness of gender-specific programming is still relatively scant, this could be attributed to | Promising |

	two interrelated problems. First, programs for girls are scarce. Also, research indicates inadequate training on how to work with female juveniles for those in the juvenile justice system.	
Vocational/Job Training *Job Corps* *Supporting Adolescents with Guidance and Employment (SAGE)*	Employment and vocational programs, which vary in program intensity and expense, include: **Career curricula**. These programs are usually incorporated into high school and summer programs that serve at-risk youth. **Summer work and subsidized employment**. These programs generally are limited to several months. **Short-term training with job placement.** These short-term vocational skills programs generally last 6 months and help participants find employment. **Long-term intensive residential programs**. These programs provide vocational and life skills training, general education, and job placement. In summary, the available evidence regarding success of employment and vocational skills training programs is mixed (Public/Private Ventures 2002). While some positive outcomes have been documented, they are often not large in magnitude and may be greatest for a small percentage of participants—typically those at highest risk. Shortcomings of evaluation designs may also result in failure to detect positive effects. Participants may need to be followed for longer periods, and differences in dosage among program sites may need to be considered in program analyses.	Promising
Community Awareness / Mobilization	The purpose of **community mobilization** is to facilitate change within the community to alter the basic patterns of social interaction, values, customs, and institutions in ways that will significantly improve the quality of life in a community. Community mobilization reflects a set of community-based strategies, each designed to address different goals, target specific groups or neighborhoods, and work in different arenas of community action. What community mobilization efforts all share in common is communication and outreach. But community mobilization initiatives differ because of their different target	Promising

	audiences and different outcomes. The most common citizen mobilization programs are **neighborhood block watch programs and citizen patrols.** Neighborhood block watch programs follow from the premise that residents are in the best position to monitor suspicious activities and individuals in their neighborhoods. Evaluations of such programs, however, found little evidence that the programs have a significant effect on neighborhood crime (Lindsay, and McGillis, 1986; Rosenbaum, Lewis, and Grant, 1986). The research evidence of preventing antisocial behavior by juveniles through **policy change** is promising. For instance, policies limiting the availability of alcohol tend to reduce both the consumption of alcohol and the problems associated with alcohol use. Specifically, studies on raising the minimum drinking age to 21 (O'Malley and Wagenaar, 1991), taxes on alcohol (Grossman, Coate, and Arluck, 1987), and the licensing of establishments to sell alcohol (Holder and Blose, 1987; Wagenaar and Holder, 1991) all seem to reduce the prevalence of alcohol use. Similarly, studies of laws regulating the purchase and sale of firearms have revealed positive results (Brewer et al., 1995). **Media campaigns** attempt to change public attitudes and standards, educate community residents, or support other community interventions. Evaluations show that media interventions can be effective when used in conjunction with other interventions, such as curriculums to prevent smoking or other substance abuse (Flynn et al., 1992; Flynn et al., 1995; Goodstadt, 1989; Pentz et al., 1989; Perry et al., 1992; Vartiainen et al., 1986, 1990).	
Anti-Bullying *KiVA Anti-bullying Program* *Positive Action*	Bullying prevention programs include those with a focus on creating a school-wide environment or climate that builds connection and caring and discourages bullying and aggression, using classroom management techniques to detect and deal with bullying, training teachers, and using classroom rules against bullying that students were expected to follow. Additional content is pending.	Insufficient Information

Forum #2 –INTERVENTION. Programs that engage with high-risk and gang-involved youth in a range of settings, and may include educational, health, drug treatment, and other services.		Rating
Afterschool/Recreation *SMART Leaders* *Broader Urban Initiative Leadership Development Program*	Afterschool programs (ASPs)—also called out-of-school time (OST) programs—include a variety of program types, structured in numerous ways, designed to affect a variety of outcomes. As the name implies, such programs generally occur outside of mandated school hours, although some programs classified as afterschool or out-of-school may be part of a larger program where elements are delivered during school hours. These may be delivered before school, in the afternoons once school has been dismissed, on weekends, or during the summer. Research over the 1st decade of the 21st century has been largely divided between studies that emphasize the positive effects of ASPs and reviews that argue the research methods of most ASP evaluations are so weak that one can only draw the most preliminary of conclusions about programs' effectiveness.	Promising
Cognitive Behavioral Therapy *Agression Replacement Training* *Operation New Hope*	Cognitive–Behavioral Therapy/Treatment* (CBT) is a problem-focused approach to helping people identify and change the dysfunctional beliefs, thoughts, and patterns of behavior that contribute to their problems. Its underlying principle is that thoughts affect emotions, which then influence behaviors. The studies reviewed provide consistent empirical evidence that CBT is associated with significant and clinically meaningful positive changes, particularly when therapy is provided by experienced practitioners (Waldron and Kaminer 2004). CBT has been successfully applied across settings (e.g., schools, support groups, prisons, treatment agencies, community-based organizations, churches) and across ages and roles (e.g., students, parents, teachers). It has been shown to be relevant for people with differing abilities and from a diverse range of backgrounds.	Effective
Wraparound/Case Management *Healthy Families America*	**Wraparound** is complex, multifaceted intervention strategy designed to keep delinquent youth at home and out of institutions whenever possible. As the name suggests, this strategy involves "wrapping" a comprehensive array of individualized services and support networks "around" young people, rather than forcing them to enroll in pre-determined, inflexible treatment programs (Portland State University Research and Training Center, 2003).	Effective

Project Link	Repeated evaluations of Wraparound Milwaukee have found that its participants show marked improvement in their behavior and socialization, and they are significantly less likely to recidivate than graduates of conventional treatment programs. The average monthly cost of treatment in Wraparound Milwaukee is also less than half the cost of traditional residential programming (Kamradt, 2000; Milwaukee County Behavioral Health Division, 2003). Recent literature on wraparound also emphasizes the importance of recruiting **committed and persistent staff** and creating programs that are **culturally competent** and **strengths-based (**Franz, 2003; Bruns et al., 2004).	
Family Therapy *Multisystemic Therapy (MST)* *Functional Family Therapy (FFT)*	These family strengthening interventions include family skills training, family education, family therapy, family services, and family preservation programs. In summary, the research regarding family strengthening initiatives is impressive. Overall, analyses of family-based programs find that family strengthening initiatives (compared with programs that concentrate solely on parents or children) have more immediate and direct impact on improving family relationships, support, and communication and on reducing family conflict (Kumpfer and Alvarado, 1997; Szapocznik and Kurtines, 1989; Szapocznik, 1997).	Effective
Parent Training *Adolescent Transitions Program* *Coping Power Program*	These programs concentrate on teaching parents and prospective parents the use of effective management skills. This highly structured approach generally includes parents only, in small groups led by a skilled trainer or clinician. Numerous researchers have found that parent training helps reduce aggressive, antisocial, and delinquent behavior among children (Dumas,1989; Satterfield et al., 1987; Tremblay et al., 1991; Tremblay et al., 1992; Kazdin, Siegel, and Bass, 1992).	Effective
Drug / Alcohol Therapy *Wraparound Milwaulkee* *Linking the Interest of Families and Teachers*	These interventions are designed and tested to help optimize the development of children. Scientists have found effective ways to work with families, schools, and communities in order to help young people develop skills and approaches to stopping problems related to substance use before they occur (NIDA, 2003). The key to success to many of these treatment initiatives has been promoting buy-in from all stakeholders, staffing with well-trained providers, and encouraging excellent communication	Promising

	between the interested parties (Castellano and Beck, 1991). Further, for treating juvenile offenders, providing adequate aftercare and involving participants' families in the transition is also critical. **Wraparound** Wraparound initiatives have produced promising results in providing support, guidance, and services to at-risk youth and juvenile offenders with substance-use related issues. Wraparound offers a highly structured, integrated services environment that, when well run and staffed by committed individuals, have the potential to offer positive benefits for all. **Treatment Centers** Recent studies have demonstrated that properly implemented treatment programs for juvenile offenders can have a significant impact on both the substance abuse and recidivism rates of incarcerated youth.	
Gender-specific programming *Nurse Family Partnership (NFP)* *Project Link*	Several recent reviews on gender-specific programming suggest that the evidence is thus far weak for the effectiveness of gender-specific programming. While the evidence for the effectiveness of gender-specific programming is still relatively scant, this could be attributed to two interrelated problems. First, programs for girls are scarce. Also, research indicates inadequate training on how to work with female juveniles for those in the juvenile justice system.	Promising
Vocational/Job Training *Job Corps* *Supporting Adolescents with Guidance and Employment (SAGE)*	Employment and vocational programs, which vary in program intensity and expense, include: **Career curricula.** These programs are usually incorporated into high school and summer programs that serve at-risk youth. **Summer work and subsidized employment**. These programs generally are limited to several months. **Short-term training with job placement**. These short-term vocational skills programs generally last 6 months and help participants find employment.	Promising

	Long-term intensive residential programs. These programs provide vocational and life skills training, general education, and job placement. In summary, the available evidence regarding success of employment and vocational skills training programs is mixed (Public/Private Ventures 2002). While some positive outcomes have been documented, they are often not large in magnitude and may be greatest for a small percentage of participants—typically those at highest risk. Shortcomings of evaluation designs may also result in failure to detect positive effects. Participants may need to be followed for longer periods, and differences in dosage among program sites may need to be considered in program analyses.	
Diversion *Michigan State Diversion Project* *Maine Juvenile Drug Treatment Court*	Diversion is "an attempt to divert, or channel out, youthful offenders from the juvenile justice system" (Bynum and Thompson, 1996). The primary objective of diversion programs is to redirect youths away from formal processing in the juvenile justice system, while still holding them accountable for their actions (Beck et al., 2006). Diversion programs are also intended to be less costly than formal court proceedings by diminishing the burden on the juvenile court system and reducing the caseload of juvenile probation officers, thus freeing up limited resources that allow the system to concentrate on more chronic or serious juvenile offenders (Cuellar, McReynolds, and Wasserman, 2006; Dick et al., 2004). More recent studies on diversion programs have yielded more positive results. For example, a study of the Detention Diversion Advocacy Project (DDAP) found that diverted youths were less likely than their counterparts to be referred to court for a new offense, to go before a judge for actual adjudication, or to be referred to out-of-home placement (Shelden, 1999). An evaluation of the Michigan State Diversion Project found that youths randomly assigned to one of the several treatment strategy groups were significantly less likely to have had a court petition filed during the 2 years following the end of the program, compared with the control group. The results suggested that active hands-on intervention of several kinds works better than normal court processing of juvenile offenders, but only if they were thoroughly separated from the system (Davidson et al., 1987). Although further research is needed to determine the components of an effective diversion	Promising

	program, Dryfoos (1990), Mackenzie (1997), and Shelden (1999) argue that the most successful programs are those that provide intensive, comprehensive services over an extended time, coupled with placement in community-based programs. Shelden also points out the following factors as contributing to DDAP's success: caseworkers' small caseloads, the program's location outside the mainstream of the juvenile justice system, the program's physical accessibility, and benefits of intensive supervision (e.g., caseworkers' ability to deflect potential problems and help clients avoid arrest). There is a clear need for more rigorous diversion research conducted on current youth populations.	
Group Homes *Boys Town* *Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care–Adolescents*	A group home is a residential placement for juveniles that operates in a homelike setting in which a number of unrelated children live for varying time periods. Each home typically serves 5 to 15 clients, who are placed there as result of a court order or through interactions with public welfare agencies. The homes may have one set of "house parents" or a rotating staff. Some therapeutic or treatment group homes also employ specially trained staff to assist children with emotional and behavior difficulties. roup homes of many different kinds have been a popular intervention for juvenile offenders ever since Father Flanagan established his famous Boys Town in 1917. However, there is little research to support their overall effectiveness (Daly, 1996). Indeed, many researchers believe that small group settings that encourage fraternization among delinquents may actually promote disruptive and deviant behavior (Dishion et al., 1996). Studies suggest that adolescents placed in therapeutic group homes do experience positive effects on their behavior *while they are in homes ,* but there is little, if any, evidence to suggest that treatment outcomes are sustained over time (Kirigin et al., 1982). In addition, two controlled studies (Rubenstein et al., 1978; Chamberlain and Reid, 1998) comparing the benefits of therapeutic group homes with therapeutic foster homes have clearly demonstrated that foster homes offer several important advantages (lower costs in the first study; fewer criminal referrals and more frequent reunifications with families in the second study).	Promising
Residential Treatment *Mendota Juvenile Treatment Center*	Residential test treatment centers (RTCs) usually house youths with significant psychiatric or substance abuse problems who have proved too ill or unruly to be housed in foster care, day treatment programs, and other nonsecure environments but who do not yet merit commitment to a psychiatric hospital or secure correctional facility. These facilities frequently offer a combination of substance abuse and mental health treatment programs, such as psychoanalytic therapy, psychoeducational counseling, special education, behavioral management, group counseling, family therapy, and medication management, along with 24-hour supervision in a highly structured (often staff-secure) environment.	Promising

	As with most treatment options where there is enormous diversity in the type and quality of services being offered, the literature regarding RTCs shows mixed results. Bettmann and Jasperson (2009) conducted a review of the outcome literature on adolescent residential treatment programs, including RTCs. Examining 13 studies they found to fit their review criteria, they concluded that "the outcome literature of adolescent residential and inpatient treatment indicates that these therapeutic settings are successful interventions for many clients" (2009, 174). However, they also observed several significant deficits in the existing literature that limit any definitive conclusions about the effectiveness of residential treatment programs. They note that there is a lack of research that assesses the effectiveness of specific program elements; there is no consensus in the research on a definition of residential treatment and little agreement on what constitutes treatment success; insufficient details and descriptions are provided in evaluation studies that look at the effectiveness of specific programs (making it difficult to replicate a particular treatment approach); and there is a need for outcome research to examine the cultural sensitivity of child and adolescent residential treatment (Bettman and Jasperson 2009).	
Shelter Care *ART for Adolescents in a Runaway Shelter*	Shelter Care provides nonsecure, residential placement to both delinquent juveniles and children temporarily in need of services. Youths can be placed in shelter care if they are awaiting adjudication, if they are unable to return home immediately, or if they are waiting to be placed in a more structured residential home. In general, youths are placed in shelter care when they are in some form of a crisis situation or in a state of transition. Shelter care can potentially have positive effects on the recidivism of juveniles, but more research should be carried out in regard to which programs work best for different populations in a shelter care setting.	Promising
Home Confinement	Home confinement or house arrest—with and without electronic monitoring (or EM)—is an intermediate community corrections program designed to restrict the activities of offenders in the community. This sanction allows offenders to remain in their homes, go to work, run errands, attend school, and maintain other responsibilities. However, their activities are closely monitored (either electronically and/or by frequent staff contacts) to ensure that they are complying with the conditions set by the court Several studies have examined the impact of home confinement or electronic monitoring on recidivism. Most of the early research suffered from poor research designs, a lack of program integrity, and an exclusive use of low-risk adult offenders (Sherman et al., 1998). These studies	Effective

	indicated that home confinement programs produce a low rearrest rate of about 5 percent (Petersilia, 1987). More recently, several studies examining both pretrial (Baumer and Mendelsohn, 1991) and post adjudication programs (Bonta, Wallace–Capretta, and Rooney, 2000; Austin and Hardyman 1991) found low recidivism rates using experimental designs but no significant difference in recidivism between offenders under electronic monitoring and under close manual supervision. Similar experimental results have been found for juveniles placed under electronic monitoring or traditional home confinement as alternatives to secure detention. In a randomized experiment involving more than 300 juveniles, Wiebush (1992) found that both regular home detention cases and electronically monitored home detention cases had very low rates of recidivism (4 percent and 3 percent, respectively) while in the program. That is, both EM and traditional home detention served equally well as alternatives to detention.	
Drug Court Maine Juvenile Drug Treatment Court Delaware Juvenile Drug Court Diversion Program	Juvenile drug courts (JDC) are intensive treatment programs established within and supervised by juvenile courts to provide specialized services for eligible drug-involved youth and their families. Although several evaluations have found positive effects on adolescent substance abuse and delinquent behavior, there are still some concerns about JDCs that need to be addressed in future research. For instance, drug court programs may expose first- or second-time juvenile offenders to peers who have more serious substance abuse addictions and therefore might have a negative influence on recovery. Also, there are few studies of JDCs that examined the long-term effects on program participants. The positive results may not last after juveniles are no longer being supervised by the courts (Government Accountability Office 2009).	Promising
Gun Court *Jefferson County* *Juvenile Gun Court*	A gun court is a type of problem-solving court that intervenes with youths who have committed first-time, nonviolent gun offenses that have not resulted in serious physical injury. Unfortunately, because there are a small number of juvenile gun courts in operation, there are only a few evaluations that have examined the effectiveness of the program.	Promising
Mental Health Court	A mental health court is a court with a specialized docket for certain defendants with mental illnesses (Almquist and Dodd 2009). Mental health courts divert select defendants away from the regular criminal courts into judicially supervised, community-based treatment to properly address their overwhelming health needs. In contrast to traditional courts, mental health courts have therapeutic goals, including increasing participants' adherence to treatment and decreasing	Insufficient Information

	future involvement in the justice system (McNiel and Binder 2007). Unfortunately, few studies have evaluated the effectiveness of juvenile mental health courts.	
Probation Services *Repeat Offender Prevention Program* *Reaffirming Young Sister's Excellence (RYSE***)**	**Traditional Supervision** Traditional probation is often accused of providing only a "slap on the wrist" to offenders, rather than accountability. The juvenile courts are portrayed by critics as a revolving door, with youth often rearrested for new crimes while still under court-ordered supervision (Kurlychek, Torbet and Bozynski, 1999). **Intensive Supervision Programs** Although research has not revealed a significant relationship between intensive supervision and recidivism, there is some evidence that ISPs with treatment components may produce a significant reduction in rearrests. Research on adult ISPs (Petersilia and Turner, 1993; Jolin and Stipack, 1991; Latessa, 1993; Byrne and Kelly 1989) finds that when treatment services are combined with increased supervision, rearrests are reduced. However, it is not clear whether the treatment, the supervision, or a combination of the two produced the positive outcomes. **School-based Supervision** Although school-based probation is still a relatively new concept and no comprehensive evaluation has been completed, preliminary evidence suggests that it has a favorable impact on school attendance, day-to-day school conduct and recidivism (Clouser, 1995; Metzger, 1997; Griffin, 1999). There is also some evidence that school-based probation demonstrates improved academic performance (Clouser, 1995) and is cost-effective (Metzger, 1997).	Promising
Restorative Justice *Minneapolis Center for Victim–Offender Mediation* *Wyman's Teen Outreach Program®*	**Family Group Conferences** Although the evidence to date is somewhat limited, the existing research supports the use of group conferences as an alternative to traditional juvenile justice practices. Three formal experiments of group conferences found promising results. **Victim-Impact Panels** Research on victim-impact panels is relatively limited and contradictory, but promising. Fors and Rojek (1999) compared the rearrest rates of 834 DUI offenders who attended a victim-impact panel as part of their sentence to those who did not. **Victim-Offender Mediation** A considerable amount of research demonstrates that the victim–offender mediation process	Promising

	produces several positive effects for both victims and offenders. In general, victims who meet their offenders tend to be more satisfied with the process than victims whose cases are handled in the formal justice system (Umbreit, 1994a and 1994b) and are less fearful of being revictimized (Umbreit and Roberts 1996; Umbreit and Coates 1993; Umbreit 1994a, 1994b). Similarly, offenders who meet their victims through mediation are far more likely to be held directly accountable for their behavior (Umbreit 1994a, 1994b; Marshall and Merry 1990), successfully complete their restitution obligations (Umbreit and Coates 1992), subsequently commit fewer and less serious crimes (Pate 1990; Nugent and Paddock 1995; Schneider 1986; Umbreit 1994a, 1994b), and are satisfied with both the process and outcome of victim–offender mediation (Coates and Gehm 1989; Marshall and Merry 1990; Umbreit and Coates 1993). **Circle Sentencing**-Little research has been done. **Community Reparative Boards**-criticized for low involvement of victims.	
Teen/Youth Court *Independence Youth Court* *Anchorage Youth Court* *Orange County Juvenile Substance Abuse Treatment Court*	Teen (or youth or peer) courts are programs designed to divert young, first-time offenders from formal juvenile court proceedings to an informal process that incorporates components of restorative justice to hold youth accountable for their offenses and prevent future delinquency (Stickle, Connell, Wilson, and Gottfredson 2008). However, not all evaluations have found favorable results. A recent study from Stickle, Connell, Wilson, and Gottfredson (2008) used an experimental design to examine the effectiveness of a teen court diversion program in Maryland to reduce recidivism rates and improve attitudes and opinions of program participants, compared with a control group who were formally processed through the Department of Juvenile Services. The results consistently showed less-favorable outcomes for the youths who participated in teen court, compared with those youths who were formally processed, including significantly more delinquent behavior following teen court and lower values in measurements of beliefs in conventional rules. The authors suggested that the restorative justice elements of the teen court program—such as the use of peers throughout the process—may not reduce or prevent recidivism for youths who commit minor offenses for numerous reasons. For example, youths in the program may be embarrassed by peers witnessing the experience or the program may succeed at shaming but not at reintegrating youths. Finally, some evidence suggests that teen courts may provide other benefits for offending youth. For instance, participation in teen courts may provide a general satisfaction with the experience	Promising

	(McLeod 1999; Swink 1998; Wells, Minor, and Fox 1998), improved attitudes toward authority (LoGalbo 1998; Wells, Minor, and Fox 1998), and greater knowledge of the legal system (LoGalbo 1998; Wells, Minor, and Fox 1998). The research so far has shown mixed results; further research is needed to fully evaluate the effectiveness of teen court programs.	
Wilderness Camps *Project Venture*	Wilderness camps (or challenge programs) are residential placements that provide participants with a series of physically challenging outdoor activities designed to prevent or reduce delinquent behavior and recidivism. Wilderness camps serve as alternatives to traditional detention. Some studies of wilderness camps have found that they are as effective as or more effective than traditional institutionalization at reducing recidivism rates (Roberts, 2004). Despite such promising results, numerous questions about the efficacy of wilderness programs remain unanswered. Wilson and Lipsey (2000) found that the length of wilderness programs seemed to have an inverse effect on treatment results (i.e., the longer the program, the less chance of its achieving statistically significant results on treatment outcomes). Additional studies have also noted that, thus far, the majority of participants in wilderness programs have been white male juvenile offenders. Little is known about the program's effectiveness with African Americans, Hispanics, and females. Additional research is still required to conclusively demonstrate the efficacy of such programs across different treatment types and diverse target populations (Fuentes and Burns, 2002).	Promising

Forum #3- LAW ENFORCEMENT. Focus on the most serious, violent, and chronic youthful offenders and on crime hot spots		Rating
Problem Oriented Policing *Operation Ceasefire* *Richmond Comprehensive Homicide Initiative*	Problem-oriented policing is a departmentwide strategy aimed at solving persistent community problems. MacDonald notes that it differs from COP "through its focus on specific crime problems and achieving crime reduction results rather than on the means of policing" (2002, 598). Police identify, analyze, and respond to the underlying circumstances that create incidents. The Problem-Oriented Policing Project conducted in Newport News, Va., provides evidence suggesting that problem-oriented policing is more effective than traditional policing. The Newport News Task Force designed a four-stage problem solving process: scanning, analysis, response, and assessment. An evaluation of the project revealed that officers and their supervisors identified problems, analyzed, and responded to these problems by applying the process. The number and diversity of the problems tackled showed that officers can solve problems routinely. The evaluation also showed that the problem-solving process is effective. In one case, burglaries in the New Briarfield Apartment complex were reduced by 35 percent. In another example of problem solving, robberies in the central business district were reduced by 40 percent (Eck and Spelman 1987). Other successful examples include using problem-oriented policing to reduce gun carrying in public (Kennedy, Piehl, and Braga 1996; Sherman, Shaw, and Rogan 1995), alcohol consumption (Putnam, Rockett, and Campbell 1993), and prostitution	Effective
Community Oriented Policing *Truant Recovery Program* *Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS)*	At the heart of COP is a redefinition of the relationship between the police and the community, so that the two collaborate to identify and solve community problems. In this relationship, the community becomes a "co-producer" of public safety (Skolnick and Bayley 1988). Evaluations of COP programs have produced mixed results. In fact, Somerville summarizes the evaluation evidence on COP as "far from encouraging" (2008, 267). For example, MacDonald (2002) notes that research does not support a causal connection between the adoption of a community policing plan and officer training and reductions in violent crime. He also discusses the mixed results on studies of particular strategies; for instance, some studies have not found a correlation between foot patrols and reductions in overall or violent crime, while other studies	Promising

	have found that violent crimes or victimizations declined in beats where officers made home visits or door-to-door contacts with citizens. Greene (2002) remarks that since many of the officers in COP programs either volunteer or are "creamed," it is difficult to untangle what results can be attributed to the officers and what to the programs themselves.	

Forum #4- RE-ENTRY. Programs that support youth offenders returning from confinement to the community and begin providing this support prior to their release.		**Rating**
Cognitive Behavioral Therapy *Agression Replacement Training* *Operation New Hope*	The studies reviewed provide consistent empirical evidence that CBT is associated with significant and clinically meaningful positive changes, particularly when therapy is provided by experienced practitioners (Waldron and Kaminer 2004). CBT has been successfully applied across settings (e.g., schools, support groups, prisons, treatment agencies, community-based organizations, churches) and across ages and roles (e.g., students, parents, teachers). It has been shown to be relevant for people with differing abilities and from a diverse range of backgrounds.	Effective
Drug / Alcohol Therapy *Wraparound Milwaulkee* *Linking the Interest of Families and Teachers*	The key to success to many of these treatment initiatives has been promoting buy-in from all stakeholders, staffing with well-trained providers, and encouraging excellent communication between the interested parties (Castellano and Beck, 1991). Further, for treating juvenile offenders, providing adequate aftercare and involving participants' families in the transition is also critical. **Wraparound** Wraparound initiatives have produced promising results in providing support, guidance, and services to at-risk youth and juvenile offenders with substance-use related issues. Wraparound offers a highly structured, integrated services environment that, when well run and staffed by committed individuals, have the potential to offer positive benefits for all. **Treatment Centers** Recent studies have demonstrated that properly implemented treatment programs for juvenile offenders can have a significant impact on both the substance abuse and recidivism rates of incarcerated youth.	Promising
Group Homes *Boys Town* *Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care–Adolescents*	Group homes of many different kinds have been a popular intervention for juvenile offenders ever since Father Flanagan established his famous Boys Town in 1917. However, there is little research to support their overall effectiveness (Daly, 1996). Indeed, many researchers believe that small group settings that encourage fraternization among delinquents may actually promote disruptive and deviant behavior (Dishion et al., 1996).	Promising

	Studies suggest that adolescents placed in therapeutic group homes do experience positive effects on their behavior *while they are in homes ,* but there is little, if any, evidence to suggest that treatment outcomes are sustained over time (Kirigin et al., 1982). In addition, two controlled studies (Rubenstein et al., 1978; Chamberlain and Reid, 1998) comparing the benefits of therapeutic group homes with therapeutic foster homes have clearly demonstrated that foster homes offer several important advantages (lower costs in the first study; fewer criminal referrals and more frequent reunifications with families in the second study).	
Residential Treatment *Mendota Juvenile Treatment Center*	Residential test treatment centers (RTCs) usually house youths with significant psychiatric or substance abuse problems who have proved too ill or unruly to be housed in foster care, day treatment programs, and other nonsecure environments but who do not yet merit commitment to a psychiatric hospital or secure correctional facility. These facilities frequently offer a combination of substance abuse and mental health treatment programs, such as psychoanalytic therapy, psychoeducational counseling, special education, behavioral management, group counseling, family therapy, and medication management, along with 24-hour supervision in a highly structured (often staff-secure) environment. As with most treatment options where there is enormous diversity in the type and quality of services being offered, the literature regarding RTCs shows mixed results. Bettmann and Jasperson (2009) conducted a review of the outcome literature on adolescent residential treatment programs, including RTCs. Examining 13 studies they found to fit their review criteria, they concluded that "the outcome literature of adolescent residential and inpatient treatment indicates that these therapeutic settings are successful interventions for many clients" (2009, 174). However, they also observed several significant deficits in the existing literature that limit any definitive conclusions about the effectiveness of residential treatment programs. They note that there is a lack of research that assesses the effectiveness of specific program elements; there is no consensus in the research on a definition of residential treatment and little agreement on what constitutes treatment success; insufficient details and descriptions are provided in evaluation studies that look at the effectiveness of specific programs (making it difficult to replicate a particular treatment approach); and there is a need for outcome research to examine the cultural sensitivity of child and adolescent residential treatment (Bettman and Jasperson 2009).	Promising
Shelter Care *ART for Adolescents in a Runaway Shelter*	Shelter Care provides nonsecure, residential placement to both delinquent juveniles and children temporarily in need of services. Youths can be placed in shelter care if they are awaiting adjudication, if they are unable to return home immediately, or if they are waiting to be placed	Promising

	in a more structured residential home. In general, youths are placed in shelter care when they are in some form of a crisis situation or in a state of transition Shelter care can potentially have positive effects on the recidivism of juveniles, but more research should be carried out in regard to which programs work best for different populations in a shelter care setting.	
Correctional Facilities	Correctional facilities are comparable with prisons in the adult criminal justice system (Justice Policy Institute 2009). The costs and resources required to keep juveniles in a correctional facility can be substantial. The Justice Policy Institute (2009) found that it costs on average of $240.99 per day (close to $88,000 per year) per youth in state-funded, post-adjudication residential facilities. Because of budget constraints, many states are rethinking how they fund the juvenile justice system and looking for ways to reduce the number of youth incarcerated through expansion of community-based, detention alternatives. Research on juvenile corrections has generally found that confinement can negatively affect youth in custody and can lead to further involvement in the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems rather than interrupting the offending cycle or facilitating rehabilitation. Youths in custody are more likely to recidivate or end up in the adult criminal justice system, compared with youths who are diverted from detention or confinement facilities (Holman and Zidenberg 2006). Studies have generally shown that the most effective secure corrections programs serve only a small number of participants and provide individualized services , 1998). Missouri, for example, has achieved "exceptional" reductions in juvenile recidivism by abolishing its state reform school and replacing it with a network of small group homes emphasizing personal attention and therapeutic treatment (Mendel 2003). Large, congregate-care facilities, such as training schools and boot camps, have not proven especially effective at reducing recidivism (Howell 1998). In the words of one juvenile justice expert, "virtually every study of recidivism among youth sentenced to juvenile training schools finds that at least 50 percent to 70 percent of offenders are arrested within 1 or 2 years after release" (Mendel 2003).	Ineffective
Aftercare	Aftercare can be defined as reintegrative services that prepare out-of-home placed juveniles for reentry into the community by establishing the necessary collaboration with the community and its resources to ensure the delivery of prescribed services and supervision (Altschuler and Armstrong 2001). Intervention strategies in an aftercare model concentrate on changing individual behavior and thereby preventing further delinquency. Despite early skepticism regarding intervention	Promising

	programs, literature reviews and meta-analyses over the past 2 decades demonstrate that intervention programs can be effective in reducing delinquency (Lipsey 2000, 1992; Andrews et al. 1990). The overall research on the effectiveness of juvenile aftercare programs is sparse. Lipsey and Cullen (2007), while accumulating studies to perform a meta-analysis on the effects of interventions with juvenile offenders, found 509 eligible studies for their review. Of those, only 25 studies (4.9 percent) looked at the effects of aftercare interventions (Howell 2009).	
Day Treatment / Evening Reporting Center *AMIkids Community-Based Day Treatment Services*	Day treatment facilities (or day reporting centers) are highly structured, community-based, postadjudication, nonresidential programs for serious juvenile offenders. The goal of day treatment is to provide both intensive supervision to ensure community safety and a wide range of services to the offender to prevent future delinquent behavior. Despite the rapid spread of day treatment programs, to date there are no major impact evaluations examining the effectiveness of the day treatment programs. However, several exploratory studies (Williams and Turnage, 2001; Craddock and Graham, 1996; Howell, 1998) suggest that day treatment is an effective intervention.	Promising
Reentry Court	Reentry courts are specialized courts that help reduce recidivism and improve public safety through the use of judicial oversight. Considered problem-solving courts, they are designed to help youths transition from out-of-home, residential placement back into the community. Considered problem-solving courts, they are designed to help youths transition from out-of-home, residential placement back into the community. Because the emergence of reentry courts is a relatively new phenomenon, little research exists to demonstrate its effectiveness with adult or juvenile populations returning to the community. Few juvenile reentry courts have been evaluated to determine the effectiveness of reducing recidivism and reintegrating youth back into the community.	Promising