

Evidence Based Standards for Juvenile Justice Services

The chart below includes the definitions a select sampling of states use to define evidence based programs and practices for their juvenile justice system. The chart also includes information on how states evaluate programs and practices for compliance with the evidence based standards. In some states, the definitions and evaluation requirements are codified in statute, and in others, they have been adopted through administrative policy.

Definitions and Evaluation Requirements for Evidence Based Programs and Practices	Data Collection/ Reporting Requirements	Resources
Florida		
<p>Definition in Administrative Rules: Evidence-based Delinquency Interventions: Interventions and practices, which have been independently evaluated and found to reduce the likelihood of recidivism or at least two criminogenic needs, within a juvenile offending population. The evaluation must have used sound methodology, including, but not limited to, random assignment, use of control groups or matched comparison groups, valid and reliable measures, low attrition, and appropriate analysis. Such studies shall provide evidence of statistically significant positive effects of adequate size and duration. In addition, there must be evidence that replication by different implementation teams at different sites is possible with similar positive outcomes.</p> <p>Promising Practices: Manualized curricula are those that have been evaluated and found to reduce the likelihood of recidivism or at least one criminogenic need with a juvenile offending population. The evaluation must have used sound methodology, including, but not limited to, random assignment or quasi-experimental design, use of control or comparison groups, valid and reliable measures, and appropriate analysis. Such studies shall provide evidence of statistically significant positive effects. In addition, there must be evidence that replication by different</p> <p>DJJ has established a coordinated strategy for implementing evidence-based practices designed to reduce juvenile crime. This strategy embraces five basic principles of effective interventions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Effective interventions should target the highest risk offenders. 2. Interventions should focus on the dynamic criminogenic needs of youth. 3. Focus on cognitive-behavioral approaches and focus on developing skills. 4. Tailor interventions to the youth’s learning style. 	<p>The Evidence Based Services Module [EBS] within JJIS is used to track many delinquency interventions and mental health/substance abuse treatments a youth receives while under the care/ custody/ supervision of the Department or a contracted provider for the primary purpose of the Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP). The SPEP is designed to compare existing intervention services, as implemented in the field, to the characteristics of the most effective intervention services found in the research.</p>	<p>http://www.djj.state.fl.us/docs/quality-improvement/sourcebook2015.pdf?sfvrsn=4</p> <p>http://www.djj.state.fl.us/docs/jjis-business-rules/evidenced-based-practices-and-services-11-002-(r08-2017).pdf?sfvrsn=2</p> <p>http://www.djj.state.fl.us/docs/quality-improvement/implementationofebp.pdf?sfvrsn=0</p>

Evidence Based Standards for Juvenile Justice Services

Definitions and Evaluation Requirements for Evidence Based Programs and Practices	Data Collection/ Reporting Requirements	Resources
<p>5. Carefully monitor services over time to ensure they are being delivered as intended</p> <p>implementation teams at different sites is possible with similar positive outcomes.</p>		
<p>Nebraska</p>		
<p>Under statute: Funds received under the Community-based Juvenile Services Aid Program shall be used exclusively to assist the aid recipient in the implementation and operation of programs or the provision of services identified in the aid recipient's comprehensive juvenile services plan, including ...contracting with other state agencies or private organizations that provide evidence-based treatment or programs; preexisting programs that are aligned with evidence-based practices or best practices;</p> <p>Evidence-based services classification system –</p> <p>I. Model Program</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The program demonstrated effectiveness with a randomized experimental study (RCT) or two quasi-experimental studies in which the treatment group showed a significant difference on the target outcome as compared to the control group. 2. The effect lasted for no less than 1 year after the intervention. 3. There is at least one independent replication with a RCT or two more quasi-experimental evaluations. 4. The combination of designs adequately addressed all the threats to internal validity (i.e., the design allowed for a strong inference of causality). 5. The program has produced no compromising negative side effects. <p>II. Effective – One RCT or two quasi-experimental designs document the program’s effectiveness. Furthermore, an evaluator has replicated the program’s effectiveness with an RCT design or two quasi-experimental designs but the researcher was not an independent investigator.</p> <p>III. Promising – There has been one successful RCT or two quasi-experiments that document the effectiveness of the program but there was no replication study available OR the program matches the dimensions of a successful meta-analysis practice.</p>	<p>Any recipient of aid under the Community-based Juvenile Services Aid Program shall electronically file an annual report as required by rules and regulations adopted and promulgated by the commission. Any program funded through the Community-based Juvenile Services Aid Program that served juveniles shall report data on the individual youth served. ...data collected shall include, but not be limited to, the following: The type of juvenile service, how the service met the goals of the comprehensive juvenile services plan, demographic information on the juveniles served, program outcomes, the total number of juveniles served, and the number of juveniles who completed the program or intervention.</p> <p>(c) Evaluation of the use of funds and the evidence of the effectiveness of the programs shall be completed by the University of Nebraska at Omaha, Juvenile Justice Institute</p>	<p>https://www.unomaha.edu/college-of-public-affairs-and-community-service/juvenile-justice-institute/files/documents/ebp-white-paper.pdf</p> <p>https://www.unomaha.edu/college-of-public-affairs-and-community-service/juvenile-justice-institute/news-and-events/10-21-14-ebps-in-nebraska.php</p> <p>https://issuu.com/juvenilejusticeinstitute/docs/annual_report_2017_final</p>

Evidence Based Standards for Juvenile Justice Services

Definitions and Evaluation Requirements for Evidence Based Programs and Practices	Data Collection/ Reporting Requirements	Resources
<p>IV. Inconclusive – There has been one successful RCT or two quasi-experimental evaluations of the program but there are contradictory findings in these or additional studies OR the program would be promising or effective but the effects are short in duration.</p> <p>V. Ineffective – The RCT or two quasi-experimental evaluations failed to show significant differences between the treatment and control group.</p> <p>VI. Harmful – The RCT or two quasi-experiments showed that the control group scored higher on the targeted outcome than did the treatment group and the difference is statistically significant.</p> <p>VII. Insufficient Evidence – There is no RCT or less than two quasi-experimental evaluations of the program to date</p>		
Pennsylvania		
<p>Evidence based practices is the use of scientific research to guide and inform efficient and effective justice services. How to determine if intervention is evidence-based:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Was effectiveness demonstrated in rigorous scientific evaluations? 2) Was effectiveness demonstrated in large studies with diverse populations or through multiple replications? 3) Did the study show significant and sustained effects? <p>Eight Principles for Effective Interventions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess risk/needs using actuarial instruments 2. Enhance intrinsic motivation 3. Target interventions 4. Develop skills through directed practice 5. Increase positive reinforcement 6. Engage ongoing support in natural communities 7. Measure relevant processes and practices 8. Provide measurement feedback 	<p>The state's 3-year plan and the SAG's bi-annual report to the governor reiterate the commitment to advancing EBPs. Grantees are required to submit implementation and outcome data and undergo a fidelity verification process in the second year of implementation.</p> <p>The EPISCenter works closely with juvenile probation departments and juvenile justice service providers to conduct the SPEP.</p>	<p>http://www.episcenter.psu.edu/sites/default/files/community/JJSES%20Monograph%20Final%20Draft%204-3-12.pdf</p> <p>http://www.episcenter.psu.edu/sites/default/files/What%20do%20we%20mean%20when%20we%20say%20a%20program%20is%20evidence%20based.pdf</p> <p>http://www.jcjc.pa.gov/Publications/Documents/JJSES/Evidence-Based%20Practice%20in%20Juvenile%20Justice</p>

Evidence Based Standards for Juvenile Justice Services

Definitions and Evaluation Requirements for Evidence Based Programs and Practices	Data Collection/ Reporting Requirements	Resources
		<p>%20%20%E2%80%93%20Bench%20Card.pdf</p> <p>http://www.pccd.pa.gov/Juvenile-Justice/Pages/SPEP-Scores.aspx</p>
Utah		
<p>Evidence-based juvenile justice programs or programs rated as effective for reducing recidivism by a standardized tool</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on higher risk youth • Target criminogenic needs • Use evidence-based interventions • Base program design on proven theoretical model • Match offender to treatment type • Ensure quality delivery of program • Use appropriate rewards and punishers 	<p>Utah utilizes the CPC (Correctional Program Checklist) and has an interactive web based program evaluation tool</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trained assessment team conducts site visit • Through structured interviews, case file reviews, observations, review of documentation, and evaluation of fidelity to the model, the program is scored on a set of indicators related to recidivism • After the evaluation, the assessment team meets with the program to discuss feedback and goals for the year • Assessment results and outcome measures are provided to programs through an interactive website • Programs are reassessed annually, or more frequently if necessary <p>Performance measures: https://justice.utah.gov/Juvenile/HB239/201</p>	<p>https://le.utah.gov/~2017/bills/static/HB0239.html#63m-7-208</p> <p>https://www.utcourts.gov/courts/juv/ebp/docs/Utah_CPC_Overview_Presentation.pdf</p> <p>https://www.utcourts.gov/courts/juv/ebp/docs/CP_C_Web-based_Program_Assessment_Tool.pdf</p>

Evidence Based Standards for Juvenile Justice Services

Definitions and Evaluation Requirements for Evidence Based Programs and Practices	Data Collection/ Reporting Requirements	Resources
	7%20Annual%20Report/Appendix%20D.pdf	
Washington		
<p>Evidence-based: A program or practice that has been tested in heterogeneous or intended populations with multiple randomized and/or statistically-controlled evaluations, or one large multiple-site randomized and/or statistically-controlled evaluation, where the weight of the evidence from a systematic review demonstrates sustained improvements in at least one of the following outcomes: child abuse, neglect, or the need for out of home placement; crime; children’s mental health; education; or employment. Further, “evidence-based” means a program or practice that can be implemented with a set of procedures to allow successful replication in Washington and, when possible, has been determined to be cost-beneficial.</p> <p>Research-based: A program or practice that has been tested with a single randomized and/or statistically-controlled evaluation demonstrating sustained desirable outcomes; or where the weight of the evidence from a systematic review supports sustained outcomes as identified in the term “evidence-based” in RCW (the above definition) but does not meet the full criteria for “evidence-based. Further, ‘research-based’ means a program or practice that can be implemented with a set of procedures to allow successful replication in Washington.</p> <p>Promising practices: A program or practice that, based on statistical analyses or a well-established theory of change, shows potential for meeting the “evidence-based” or “research-based” criteria, which could include the use of a program that is evidence-based for outcomes other than the alternative use.</p>	<p>Determination of evidence-based: For each program where research is available, Washington Institute for Public Policy conducts a meta-analysis and benefit-cost analysis to classify practices as evidence- or research-based according to the above definitions. If outcome evaluations exist but the evidence indicates a non-significant effect (p-value > 0.20) on desired outcomes in the expected direction, then the program is designated as promising.</p>	<p>http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/ReportFile/1672/Wsipp_Updated-Inventory-of-Evidence-Based-Research-Based-and-Promising-Practices-For-Prevention-and-Intervention-Services-for-Children-and-Juveniles-in-the-Child-Welfare-Juvenile-Justice-and-Mental-Health-Systems_Report.pdf</p>

Evidence Based Standards for Juvenile Justice Services

Data Collection for EBP Performance Evaluation

Pennsylvania: Uses the Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol that emphasizes and scores four areas of information that are critical for demonstrating program effectiveness: service category, quality of service delivery, amount of service, and risk level of youth served.

<http://www.episcenter.psu.edu/sites/default/files/community/SPEP%20Scoring%20Form%20-%202013%20May.pdf>

Corrective Action for EBP Service Providers

Washington: Developed standards for implementation of evidence-based juvenile justice programs governing four key elements of quality assurance—program oversight, provider development and evaluation, corrective action, and ongoing outcome evaluation. The standards require statewide specialists to take corrective action when a site is not competently delivering the program and authorize the oversight committee to discontinue provider funding when the corrective actions of the statewide specialist fail to bring a provider into compliance with these standards.

http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/ReportFile/849/Wsipp_Recommended-Quality-Control-Standards-Washington-State-Research-Based-Juvenile-Offender-Programs_Full-Report.pdf

Florida: Developed an accountability system for each provider that contracts with the department for service delivery to youth. Based on reports of the department on child outcomes and program outputs and on the department's most recent cost-effectiveness rankings, the department may terminate a program operated by the department or a provider if the program has failed to achieve a minimum standard of program effectiveness.

http://www.leg.state.fl.us/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=&URL=0900-0999/0985/Sections/0985.632.html

Texas: Data is regularly reviewed through the contractors' submission of annual fiscal and programmatic reports, monthly data provision, and quarterly data reports. If a deficiency or issue is identified regarding performance, a program specialist works with contractors to remedy the situation immediately. Data are analyzed to assess rates of successful completion of programming and the prevention programs' impact on participants' likelihood to be formally referred to the juvenile justice system.

https://www.tjjd.texas.gov/services/prevention/docs/Report_Interagency_Coordination_Youth_Prevention_Intervention_Services.pdf