



**ILLINOIS
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
INFORMATION AUTHORITY**

300 W. Adams Street • Suite 700 • Chicago, Illinois 60606 • (312) 793-8550

**Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition
Second Planning Session**

January 7, 2009
300 West Adams Street
8th Floor Conference Room
Chicago, Illinois
2:00 p.m.

AGENDA

- ▶ Call to Order
- ▶ Executive Director's Remarks

I. Introduction

II. Meeting Minutes: August 19, 2008 and October 7, 2008

III. Sub-grantees site visits

- A. La Salle County
- B. Oak Park
- C. East St. Louis
- D. Evanston
- E. Madison County
 - 1. Overview of program
 - 2. History of funding
 - 3. Site visit outcome
 - 4. Recommendations for future funding

IV. Discussion

- A. Current Initiatives
 - Statewide Initiatives
 - Cook County (pre-employment projects)
 - CJIA funded juvenile re-entry projects
- B. Planning

V. Conclusion

- ▶ Adjourn

This meeting will be accessible to persons with disabilities in compliance with Executive Order #5 and pertinent State and Federal Laws upon anticipated attendance. Persons with disabilities planning to attend and needing special accommodations should contact by telephone or letter Mr. Hank Anthony, Associate Director, Office of Administrative Services, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, 300 West Adams Street, Suite 700, Chicago, Illinois 60606 (telephone 312-793-8550). TDD services are available at 312-793-4170.



**ILLINOIS
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
INFORMATION AUTHORITY**

300 W. Adams Street • Suite 700 • Chicago, Illinois 60606 • (312) 793-8550

MINUTES

JUVENILE CRIME ENFORCEMENT COALITION

August 19, 2008

300 West Adams Street
Suite 700
Chicago, Illinois

Call to Order and Roll Call

The Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition (JCEC) met via teleconference on August 19, 2008, at the Authority's offices located at 300 West Adams Street, Chicago, Illinois. Chairman Sorosky, called the meeting to order at 2:43 p.m. Associate Director John Chojnacki, of the Authority's Federal and State Grants Unit (FSGU), called the roll. Other JCEC members and designees present were: Rodney Ahitow, Patricia Connell, Steven Kossman, and JCEC Co-chairman Gary Leofanti. Also in attendance were Detective William Russell for Sheriff Mark Curran and Diane Walsh for the Honorable Curtis Heaston, Authority Executive Director Lori Levin, Authority General Counsel Jack Cutrone, Program Supervisor Ron Reichgelt, and other Authority staff members.

Quorum was not reached; therefore, at the suggestion of Chairman Sorosky, Director Levin said that the meeting's proceedings would reflect the sentiments of the JCEC members who were present.

Minutes of the April 28, 2008 JCEC Meeting

Due to a lack of a quorum, approval of the minutes of the April 28, 2008 JCEC meeting was deferred to a future JCEC meeting.

Executive Director's Comments

Director Levin said that the reason for the short notice for this meeting was due to a recent receipt of lapsed funds. Given that a Budget Committee meeting is scheduled for August 26, 2008 and that Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grants (JAIBG)

FFY04 funds expire on November 26, 2008, it was necessary to convene the JCEC prior to the Budget Committee meeting in order to allow the proposal for the expeditious use of the lapsed FFY04 funds by the fund expiration date to be presented to the Budget Committee.

FFY04 Juvenile Accountability Block Grant Plan Adjustments

Program Supervisor Ron Reichgelt introduced the memo, dated August 19, 2008, regarding the proposed plan adjustments for JAIBG FFY04. He called attention to the chart on Page 1 of the memo describing funds that had recently been returned to the Authority. There was no discussion regarding those returned funds.

Illinois Violence Prevention Authority (IVPA) - Corazón Community Services Program

Mr. Reichgelt said that staff recommended designating \$107,680 in lapsed FFY04 funds to the IVPA to support the Corazón Community Services program. Based in Cicero, Illinois, Corazón offers culturally sensitive holistic social services in an increasingly Latino community. He said that FFY04 funds expire on November 26, 2008.

Director Levin said that Authority General Counsel Cutrone had met with representatives of both Corazón and the Illinois Violence Prevention Authority. Mr. Cutrone said that Corazón was a participant in the Safety Net Works program. He said that Corazón is an existing JAIBG grantee and the Corazón was one of two programs out of 17 Safety Net Works participants that was able to provide services consistent with JAIBG purpose areas, including the reporting of required performance measures. He said that Corazón provides much-needed services in a high-crime area. Schools in these areas often expel students who are then referred to the court system for further action. Most of these students receive no services whatsoever. Corazón provides services to these at-risk youths who are about to return to school after expulsion. Corazón would form a partnership with Unity Jr. High School to create two new “alternative” classrooms that will serve students in school but out of the mainstream environment. Mr. Cutrone said that the goal of the program is to serve 50 students in these alternative settings.

Mr. Cutrone said that the Corazón program would provide the following services:

- Intake assessment / treatment planning.
- Weekly client contact.
- Life-skills programming.
- Follow-up with school staff.
- Other assistance as needed to ensure that the client completes junior high school graduation requirements.
- Continued tracking of the client into high school.

Mr. Cutrone said that a substantial amount of FFY04 funds is at risk of lapsing, but Corazón is able to use those funds to support its Community Services Program by the FFY04 expiration date.

Mr. Cutrone added that staff is seeking clarification from the Department of Justice (DOJ) as to whether approximately \$9,000 that was originally designated to local units of government can be reallocated to a state agency such as the IVPA. The funds in question have been included in the recommended designation of \$107,680, but that designation might need to be revised downward depending on the DOJ's decision.

Director Levin said that although the memo describes equipment items that would be purchased with these funds, that equipment would support this program specifically.

Ms. Connell said that although the JCEC has emphasized avoiding spending lapsing funds for equipment purchases, given the limited time in which to expend the FFY04 funds, this is a reasonable use of these funds. This underscores the need to plan for the use of these funds before the JCEC is forced to make last-minute less-than-ideal designations.

Director Levin noted that approximately \$70,000 of the proposed designation consists of funds recently returned to the Authority.

Mr. Kossman said that with proper planning, the JCEC could have contingency plans in place to address situations where large amounts of funds are returned to the Authority with relatively little time to expend those funds.

In response to a question by Detective Russell, Mr. Cutrone said that this designation would enable Corazón to increase the overall number of clients in their service by about 50 over the existing number, which he believed to be approximately 200. Program Specialist Lajuana Murphy said that Corazón currently serves approximately 15 students each month, effectively tripling the number of youths the program can serve.

Mr. Leofanti moved to approve the staff recommendations for the FFY04 plan adjustment. Ms. Connell seconded the motion and it was approved by unanimous voice vote. The recommendations will be presented to the Budget Committee at its meeting on August 26, 2008.

New / Old Business

Mr. Leofanti said that at past JCEC meetings there was some discussion pertaining to conducting advanced planning sessions for the future use of JAIBG funds. He said that he still supports such planning and he suggested that the JCEC set a date for such a meeting. After some general discussion, Chairman Sorosky proposed that the planning session be

held on October 7, 2008 at 2:00 p.m., pending confirmation of availability by non-present JCEC members.

Adjourn

There was no vote to adjourn the meeting. Participants exited the teleconference and JCEC-related discussions ended at 3:01 p.m.



**ILLINOIS
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
INFORMATION AUTHORITY**

300 W. Adams Street • Suite 700 • Chicago, Illinois 60606 • (312) 793-8550

MINUTES

JUVENILE CRIME ENFORCEMENT COALITION

Tuesday, October 7, 2008

300 West Adams Street
Suite 700
Chicago, Illinois

Call to Order and Roll Call

The Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition (JCEC) met via teleconference on Tuesday, October 7, 2008, at the Authority's offices located at 300 West Adams Street, Chicago, Illinois. Chairman Sorosky, called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m. Associate Director John Chojnacki, of the Authority's Federal and State Grants Unit (FSGU), called the roll. Other JCEC members and designees present were: Rodney Ahitow, Cheryl Barrett (for Cynthia Cobbs), Patricia Connell, Barbara Engel, Bridget Healy-Ryan, and Director Kurt Friedenauer. Also in attendance were Authority Executive Director Lori Levin, Authority General Counsel Jack Cutrone, Program Supervisor Mike Carter, Rick Krause representing the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC), and other Authority staff members.

Executive Director's Comments

Director Levin said that at the last JCEC meeting on August 19, 2008, the panel elected to conduct two planning meetings, of which this is the first. She said that at this meeting the JCEC would review Juvenile Accountability Block Grants (JABG) program funding requirements and purpose areas, including a review of which purpose areas are currently addressed via the Authority's JABG grants and which purpose areas remain unfunded. At this meeting, staff will also introduce data describing the Authority's JABG grant activities compared to other states' usages of JABG grant funds. Director Levin said that the JCEC is an advisory board and its recommendations are presented to the Budget Committee for approval, but ultimately it is the Authority Board as a whole that wields oversight power over the Budget Committee and may have the final say on any grant funding issues.

Director Levin said that she intended to conduct the second of the two planning meetings by the end of 2008. For that meeting, she said she hoped to present an analysis of current program funding and where any spending flexibility might exist for funding new initiatives. She said that at this time, the Authority has not expended any of its FFY 2008 JABG award, which it received in September, 2008.

JABG Overview (PowerPoint Presentation)

Program Supervisor Mike Carter delivered a PowerPoint presentation detailing the 17 JABG Purpose Areas. He said that the primary goal of the JABG program is to increase accountability among youths for their actions. He said that the OJJDP seeks to reduce juvenile offending through both offender-focused and system focused activities that promote accountability. For the juvenile offender, accountability means an assurance of facing individualized consequences through which he or she is made aware of and held responsible for the loss, damage, or injury that the victim experiences. Such accountability is best achieved through a system of graduated sanctions imposed according to the nature and severity of the offense, moving from limited interventions to more restrictive actions if the offender continues the delinquent activities.

Mr. Carter also noted that a long-term goal of JABG is to have 76 percent of youths process using graduated sanctions and a 30 percent re-offense rate by 2012.

Mr. Carter's PowerPoint presentation described the JABG Purpose Areas as follows:

- 1) Graduated sanctions for juvenile offenders.
- 2) Correctional / detention facilities.
- 3) Effective / expeditious administration.
- 4) Hiring additional (juvenile-specific) prosecutors.
- 5) Prosecution.
- 6) Training.
- 7) Juvenile gun courts.
- 8) Juvenile drug courts.
- 9) Juvenile records management.
- 10) Interagency information sharing.
- 11) Reducing recidivism.
- 12) Risk / needs assessment.
- 13) Accountability-based programs.
- 14) Restorative justice.
- 15) Juvenile courts and probation officers.
- 16) Improving correctional facilities, practices, and programs.
- 17) Juvenile re-entry programs.

Mr. Carter identified programs currently funded by the Authority, including relative Purpose Areas addressed, the number of years of JABG funding administered by the Authority for said programs, and brief program descriptions:

Purpose Area	Grantee / Program	Program Description / Notes	Years / Awards
1	Champaign County – Accountability Program*	Expanding training, collaboration and knowledge base regarding graduated sanctions for the various agencies relevant to the juvenile justice system.	9
11 13 14	City of Chicago – Juvenile Intervention Support Center / Services*	11/14) The JISC, a Balanced and Restorative Justice-based program, refers juveniles to community-based service providers who coordinate programs designed to improve skills and to establish strong family and community ties. 13/14) Educates young children about peaceful conflict resolutions and gun violence prevention. Equips officers assigned to the public schools with computer equipment allowing them to efficiently and effectively process juvenile arrests on site.	9
5 9 10 11 12 14 15	Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office – Project Reclaim	5) Ensures that its juvenile justice practitioners are readily prepared and informed in all aspects related to Juvenile Court proceedings. 9) Employs a data specialist to maintain, analyze and prepare reports from a database of youth served. 10) Provide youths with services designed prevent repeat delinquent behaviors. 11) Focuses on improving the academic performance and positive decision-making skills of at-risk referred youth. 12) Provides one-on-one mentoring services, counseling in individual, group and family modalities and referrals to psychiatric services, as well as inpatient substance abuse. 14) Services include peacemaking circles; parent, teacher and student volunteers training; counseling and life skills management and job readiness training. 15) Juvenile Sex Offender Unit – monitors approximately 120 Juvenile Sex Offenders. Works to build employable skills in juvenile offenders through its Pre-Employment Program.	9
11	Du Page County – Juvenile Crime Intervention and Prevention*	Provides comprehensive evaluations on probation-involved juveniles.	8

11	City of East St. Louis – Offender Monitoring	Provides accountability / rehabilitative programs.	3
11 14	City of Evanston – Community Service and Restorative Justice	Provides counseling services for juveniles who have committed no more than two minor criminal offenses. The number of referrals exceeded program goals and likely speaks to the acceptance and success of the program’s initiatives.	10
9	Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice – Integrated Case Management	IDJJ seeks to implement an integrated case management system that guides critical decisions regarding youth service needs; security requirements; and the probability for recidivism.	3
11 12 17	Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice – Juvenile Parole Improvement Project	11/12/) The IDJJ addresses the needs of potential juvenile parole violators by providing services and programs in the form of parole readjustment programs that provide education, individual and group counseling, intensive case management and a continuum of wrap-around services designed to assist reentry.	9
10 13	Illinois Violence Prevention Authority – Corazon	Community service program works to assist junior high school students who have received long-term school suspensions by providing them with alternative classrooms.	1
1 11 12	Illinois Violence Prevention Authority – Safety Net Works	1) Safety Net Works offers services to youth who have come into contact with the police, courts, and/or have had disciplinary problems at school. Additionally, Safety Net Works provide group skill based services as an alternative to juvenile court or school suspension. 11/12/17) Provides alternatives to juvenile court or school suspension and relies upon referrals from law enforcement, courts, and schools.	1
11	Kane County – Juvenile Accountability Initiative*	Aids the Courts and local police departments by providing structured programming to hold juveniles accountable for minor offenses.	10
4	Lake County - Juvenile Court Services*	Hiring additional juvenile court prosecutor(s). Two senior prosecutors were hired under this funding.	8
11	LaSalle County – Youth Giving Back	Probation Department of the 13 th Judicial Circuit graduated sanctions program.	5
4	Madison County State’s Attorney – Accountability Program*	Reduce the backlog of cases within county’s juvenile division. Funded since 1998. Backlog of 555 juvenile delinquency cases in 1998, backlog averaged 149 cases in 2007.	8

10	Oak Park Police Department – ENUF Program*	ENUF (<i>Education to Nullify Use by First Timers</i>) aims to divert first-time offenders from the court system by offering them the opportunity to attend alcohol and drug education classes.	9
11	Peoria County – Anger Management Services*	Identifies juveniles who demonstrate an inability to manage their anger. Those juveniles are then ordered to participate and successfully complete an anger management program.	8
12	St. Clair County Sheriff’s Department – Accountability Program	The program aims to re-stabilize the juvenile in order for him to re-enter the community. Target population includes male juvenile parolees.	4
10 11	Will County – Juvenile Crime Prevention and Intervention*	10/11) Provides early intervention assessment and therapeutic counseling to youth at risk of entering or progressing through the juvenile justice system.	9

During Mr. Carter’s review of currently funded programs, a discussion began regarding program performance and data-related concerns. LaSalle County, East St. Louis, St. Clair County, and Oak Park were identified as long-time recipients of JABG funding. A question arose as to the effectiveness of these programs and whether these programs were now being funded well beyond the initial efforts to provide those units of government with “seed money.” Ensuing discussion led to a determination that staff should review these and other programs to determine if continued JABG funding would be prudent.

Authority Research Analyst Kimberly Burke provided an explanation of the formula used to calculate formula-funded designation amounts. A discussion followed regarding the disproportionately high grant fund lapses among formula-funded programs versus non-formula-funded programs. Entities that automatically receive JABG funding via formula do not always have programs in place that are compatible with the 17 Purpose Areas. The panel determined that staff should make every effort to identify situations where grantees (formula or otherwise) do not expend grant funds in a timely manner and work with such grantees to either expedite the expenditure of grant funds or arrange for the return of such funds so as to enable strategic reallocation of those funds and/or to avoid lapsing those funds back to the federal government.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Programs (OJJDP) Research Findings

Authority Research Analyst Erica Hughes provided a detailed explanation of OJJDP research findings and related items. She said that:

- I) Learning more about adolescent brain development and the effects of trauma on adolescents has taught us that they behave and think differently than adults and therefore, have to be treated differently.
- II) OJJDP research suggests that non-violent youths are less likely to be involved in subsequent delinquent behavior if they remain in their communities and receive appropriate services that address underlying needs.
- III) A National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) study found that the vast majority of people support community-based sanctions for juveniles.
- IV) The McArthur Foundation and Annie E. Casey led to national movements to change the juvenile justice system
- V) Research results led juvenile justice professionals to take a closer look at who was being detained and why.
- VI) Research and scrutiny of traditional juvenile justice programs revealed that
 - A) Past practices kept kids out of schools, away from families, and disconnected from their communities.
 - B) Often, the wrong youths were being locked up.
 - i) Status offenders
 - ii) Truants
 - iii) Property offenders
 - C) Often youths were not locked them up for the right reasons.
 - i) Evaluations
 - ii) Warrants (miss court date, end up incarcerated)
- VII) Research has led to changes in philosophy over how to deal with juveniles in the juvenile justice system toward the use of community-based sanctions that use evidence-based practices that are research-based and data-driven
- VIII) Research has revealed that not only are community-based programs better for the youths, but community-based options are generally less costly than institutional care in correctional facilities

JABG Initiatives

Ms. Hughes then outlined the basic JABG initiatives and their primary elements:

- I) BARJ – Balanced and Restorative Justice:
 - A) Accountability - Offender incurs an obligation to the victim and affected community. Learns impact of unlawful behavior on all parties and have opportunities to repair the harm.

- B) Community safety - encourages collaboration between citizens, community groups, and justice agencies to empower the community to take responsibility for the well being of its members. Helps prevent and control crime and provide meaningful restrictions.
 - C) Competency development - increases pro-social skills; given opportunities to build on positive strengths and potential to improve their education, work, and social skills.
- II) Models for Change – partners selected to advance reforms:
- A) Hold kids accountable.
 - B) Provide for their rehabilitation.
 - C) Protect them from harm.
 - D) Increase youths’ life chances.
 - E) Manage the risk they pose to themselves and public safety.
 - F) Invest in research.
 - G) Target issues.
 - H) Plan reform efforts.
 - I) Work with locals to implement these efforts.
- III) Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC):
- A) Requires the examination of disproportionality in the juvenile justice system.
 - B) Development of strategies to measure and address disproportionality.
 - C) DMC is a part of every initiative.
- IV) Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI):
- A) Reduce reliance on secure detention by
 - i) Eliminating the inappropriate or unnecessary use of detention.
 - ii) Minimizing re-arrest and failure to appear rates.
 - B) When detention is necessary, ensure appropriate conditions of confinement.
 - C) Improve public safety.
 - D) Reduce disparity.
 - E) Save taxpayers’ dollars by redirecting public finances to sustain reforms.
 - F) Stimulate overall reforms by planning for outreach to counties with detention centers and redeploy sites.
- V) Redeploy – alternatives to incarceration for non-violent youth:
- A) Use of community-based services based on:
 - i) Education.
 - ii) Recreation.
 - iii) Community service.
 - iv) Crisis and health intervention.
 - B) Services include:
 - i) Aggression replacement training for youths.
 - ii) Functional family therapy and multi-systemic therapy.
 - iii) GPS monitoring.

- iv) Substance abuse/mental health treatment.
- v) Life skills education.
- vi) Victim-related services.
- vii) Parent/family support services.

VI) Pathways Partners Group - Held a conference last fall meant to inform and assist local practitioners:

- A) Begin outreach – how to help locals meet their goals and provide data training.
- B) See what is happening in non-initiative sites.

Discussion

Director Levin, in response to a request by Ms. Engel, said that staff would generate graphs detailing the overall JABG funding situation.

Director Friedenauer said that the IDJJ currently has a limited aftercare system. He said that the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC) was in the practice of turning over juveniles to its adult probation/parole system and as a result, the youths in that system are not receiving the appropriate aftercare. The needs of youth are different than adult offenders on parole. Youths are currently not getting what they need and they would be better served if IDJJ had an aftercare system adequate to serve the aftercare needs of juveniles.

Director Friedenauer said that IDJJ had an aftercare plan in the works but funding for it had not been approved in the final state budget. He added that any reentry program must be family and community based.

Regarding court referrals to the IDJJ for evaluation, Director Friedenauer said that in some instances, the juveniles were being held for as much as a year by the IDOC, when IDJJ is able to complete an evaluation in a period of about two weeks.

Adjourn

There was no vote to adjourn the meeting. JCEC-related discussions ended at 4:25 p.m.

OVERVIEW OF SELECTED SUB-GRANTEE PROGRAMS

CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	1
JABG Purpose Areas.....	2
LaSalle County.....	4
Oak Park.....	9
East St. Louis.....	13
Evanston.....	18
Madison County.....	22

Executive Summary

On 07 Oct 2008, the Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition (JCEC) met for the first of two planning meetings. Authority staff presented the JCEC with an overview of the currently funded JABG programs. The JCEC members used this presentation as a platform for discussion and direction. The JCEC then requested the Authority staff to conduct additional program analyses for various programs that are not direct funded. Contained within are the results and recommendations from these analyses. In summary, program analyses were completed for La Salle County, Oak Park, East St. Louis, Evanston, and Madison County. Authority staff recommends that funding be discontinued for each of these programs with exception to Evanston. Authority staff recommends that Evanston be provided one more funding cycle to allow its successful program to overcome the city's budgetary issues. Each grantee has used its JABG funding to the best of its ability and has achieved positive outcomes. Authority staff has attempted to highlight these successes, as well as, the challenges for each of these programs.

Juvenile Accountability Block Grant

The Juvenile Accountability Block Grant (JABG) Program is authorized under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 3796ee et seq) and is under the auspices of The Office of Juvenile Justice Programs (OJJJ). The JABG program aims to bring accountability to the juvenile justice system and juvenile offender through system-focused and offender-focused activities that promote accountability. The JABG program proposes that accountability is best achieved through the following activities:

Juvenile Justice System

- Developing youth competence,
- Efficiently track juveniles through the system,
- Provide enhanced options such as restitution, community service, victim-offender mediation, and other restorative justice sanctions

Juvenile Offender

- Graduated sanctions imposed according to the nature and severity of the offense
- Moving from limited interventions to more restrictive actions if the offender continues delinquent activities

JABG has defined the following, two long-term goals:

- By 2012, 76 percent of youth that sub-grantees serve will be processed using graduated sanctions approaches.
- By 2012, no more than 30 percent of the program youth will reoffend.

In effort to achieve these goals, OJJJ has made funding available to states and units of local government for developing programs that align within any one of the following 17 program purpose areas:

Purpose Area 1: Developing, implementing, and administering graduated sanctions for juvenile offenders;

Purpose Area 2: Building, expanding, renovating, or operating temporary or permanent juvenile corrections, detention, or community corrections facilities;

Purpose Area 3: Hiring juvenile court judges, probation officers, and court-appointed defenders and special advocates, and funding pretrial services (including mental health screening and assessment) for juvenile offenders, to promote the effective and expeditious administration of the juvenile system;

Purpose Area 4: Hiring additional prosecutors, so that more cases involving violent juvenile offenders can be prosecuted and case backlogs reduced;

Purpose Area 5: Providing funding to enable prosecutors to address drug, gang, and youth violence problems more effectively and for technology, equipment, and training to assist prosecutors in identifying and expediting the prosecution of violent juvenile offenders;

Purpose Area 6: Establishing and maintaining training programs for law enforcement and other court personnel with respect to preventing and controlling juvenile crime;

Purpose Area 7: Establishing juvenile gun courts for the prosecution and adjudication of juvenile firearms offenders;

Purpose Area 8: Establishing drug court programs for juvenile offenders that provide continuing judicial supervision over juvenile offenders with substance abuse problems and the integrated administration of other sanctions and services for such offenders;

Purpose Area 9: Establishing and maintaining a system of juvenile records designed to promote public safety;

Purpose Area 10: Establishing and maintaining interagency information-sharing programs that enable the juvenile and criminal justice systems, schools, and social services agencies to make more informed decisions regarding the early identification, control, supervision, and treatment of juveniles who repeatedly commit serious delinquent or criminal acts;

Purpose Area 11: Establishing and maintaining accountability-based programs designed to reduce recidivism among juveniles who are referred by law enforcement personnel or agencies;

Purpose Area 12: Establishing and maintaining programs to conduct risk and need assessments of juvenile offenders that facilitate the effective early intervention and the provision of comprehensive services, including mental health screening and treatment and substance abuse testing and treatment to such offenders;

Purpose Area 13: Establishing and maintaining accountability-based programs that are designed to enhance school safety;

Purpose Area 14: Establishing and maintaining restorative justice programs;

Purpose Area 15: Establishing and maintaining programs to enable juvenile courts and juvenile probation officers to be more effective and efficient in holding juvenile offenders accountable and reducing recidivism;

Purpose Area 16: Hiring detention and corrections personnel and establishing and maintaining training programs for such personnel to improve facility practices and programming; and,

Purpose Area 17: Establishing, improving, and coordinating pre-release and post-release systems and programs to facilitate the successful reentry of juvenile offenders from state or local custody in the community.

Each purpose area has a corresponding set of performance metrics which must be reported annually to OJJDP. Historically, JABG grantees have reported these measures directly to the ICJIA; ICJIA has routed then to OJJDP. In addition, JABG funding recipients are required to establish a local Advisory Board composed of members from the police, sheriff, prosecutor, state or local probation services, juvenile court, schools, business, and religious, fraternal, nonprofit, or social services organizations involved in crime prevention. The ICJIA requires that these Advisory Boards approve all JABG funding for their programs; as well as, convene on a basis of no less than one time per year.

La Salle County

La Salle County is located in north central Illinois. According to the US Census' 2006 American Community Survey, the county's population is 113,065. The population's racial demographic is 95 percent white. The remaining population is near equally divided between black and other. The county claims 45,941 total households with an average household size of 2.4. The average family size is 2.97 and the total population between the ages of 5 and 19 is approximately 23,000 (21 percent); more than 9,500 of these youth are males. Approximately 6 percent of the households (2,800) are headed by single mothers with children under 18 years old. More than 85 percent of La Salle County's population over 25 years old have attained a high school diploma or higher and 15 percent have a bachelor's degree or higher.

The leading industries in La Salle County are educational services, health care, social assistance and manufacturing. Its median household income is \$46,670 and approximately 8.7 percent of its families live below the poverty level. Twenty-three percent of families with a female householder and no husband present had incomes below poverty level.

Table 2: Sex by Age, 2000

Sex by Age	Population
Male	53,694
5 to 9	3,708
10 to 14	4,012
15 to 19	1,833
20 to 24	631
Female	54,765
5 to 9	3,626
10 to 14	3,922
15 to 19	5,963
20 to 24	224

Source: US Census, 2000

La Salle County's reported drug arrests in 2007 totaled 489.1 per 100,000. The majority of these arrests were for cannabis offenses – 46 percent – and drug paraphernalia offenses – 34 percent. Approximately 18 percent of these drug arrests were for controlled substances. There were no reported Crimes against School Personnel or Hate Crimes.

Table 3: Uniform Crime Report Index, La Salle County

YEAR	TOTAL CRIME INDEX ARRESTS	MURDER	CRIMINAL SEXUAL ASSAULT	ROBBERY	AGGRAVATED ASSAULT/BATTERY	BURGLARY	THEFT	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	ARSON
2007	624	0	12	4	135	114	345	14	0
2006	608	2	10	13	143	77	338	20	5

Source: Illinois Uniform Crime Index Report, 2007

Table 1: La Salle County Population Characteristics, 2006

Population Characteristic	Estimate, 2006
Total Population	113,065
Total households	45,941
Average household size	2.4
Family households (families)	30,360
with own children under 18	13,477
Average family size	2.97
Female householder, no husband present	5,028
with own children under 18	2,800

Source: US Census, American FactFinder, 2006

There are 16 law enforcement agencies in La Salle County that participate in Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR). The data reported by these agencies for Index Offenses in 2007 indicates a Total Crime Index of 2,688.7 Index Crimes per 100,000 people and Total Crime Index Arrests of 551.9 per 100,000. The most frequently reported offense is Theft – 1,895.4 per 100,000, followed by Aggravated Assault/Battery – 215.8 per 100,000. There were no reported Murders in 2007. Reported Domestic Crimes totaled 607 and Crimes against Children totaled 60.

La Salle County – *Youth Giving Back*

La Salle County is a part of the 13th Judicial Circuit, which includes Bureau and Grundy counties. The La Salle County Court Services, Department of Probation, provides JABG services strictly to La Salle County residents under JABG Purpose Area 11. The program services specifically seek “to hold offenders accountable, prevent further infractions of the law and assist in making them productive citizens” through the implementation of a community service restitution project called *Youth Giving Back*. The *Youth Giving Back* program has operated continuously since 1999 and has received periodic JABG funding throughout these years. Since 2006, La Salle County Court Services has received a total of \$66,600 in JABG funding. La Salle County’s last 12 month period of funding consisted of \$29,700. They lapsed \$6,871 (23 percent). Their most current 12 months of funding (\$22,337) is scheduled to end on 27 August 2009.

The following are the stated goals and objectives of *Youth Giving Back*:

Goals

1. To provide meaningful and concrete consequences to non-violent delinquencies in lieu of referral to probation and placement on informal supervision.
2. To sustain the impact of our short term program by increasing the number of identified youth in other positive activities within their community.

Objectives

1. To reduce the number of non-violent juvenile offenders to probation through successful completion of community service restitution.
2. Ten percent of the *Youth Giving Back* program youths will be involved in new activities three months after exiting the program as a result of linkages and referrals made by program staff.

To help achieve these goals, the La Salle County Court Services sub-contracts the services of the Youth Service Bureau of Illinois Valley (YSB). In addition, the La Salle County Juvenile Justice Council provides advisement to YSB and the county; facilitates efforts between components of the La Salle County Juvenile System as they relate to achieving the program’s stated goals; and approves all program spending.

In La Salle County, all juvenile referrals are sent to the probation department for screening. The probation department may respond to juveniles with a warning letter, place them on informal supervision with conditions, or refer the case to the State’s Attorney. Cases that are referred to court may be placed on deferred prosecution, court supervision or probation. Juveniles who have made their first contact with the juvenile justice system may be referred for public service – as provided under *Youth Giving Back*, counseling or treatment. Only serious offenses, violations of probation, or re-offending juveniles are referred to juvenile detention.

As part of these efforts, La Salle County Probation referred 112 juveniles, during the last funding period, to YSB for public service activities. La Salle County Probation reported that 88 participants successfully completed the program, four failed to complete the program, four were still enrolled, and the remainder dropped-out to arrange their own public service hours. La Salle County does not track the number of juveniles who have completed their program; thus, they cannot provide data for those who have become repeat offenders or what new activities they engaged in three months following.

La Salle County Site Visit

On 02 December 08, Authority staff conducted a pre-arranged site visit with the La Salle County Court Services and YSB personnel. The purpose of this site visit was to discuss the *Youth Giving Back* program processes, reported data, and to seek an overall understanding of the program's function within the county's juvenile justice system. Authority staff met with William D. Pfalzgraf – Director of LaSalle County Court Services; Dave Conrad – YSB Fiscal Manager; Sue Charleston – Community Service Supervisor; and Reggie Riley – YSB Supervisor. The meeting took place at the YSB office.

Mr. Pfalzgraf explained his role as one of providing oversight for the county's probation department and coordinating between that

department and YSB. He has served in this position for approximately one-year. Mr. Pfalzgraf did not know how many juvenile referrals the probation department received per year; however, he estimated that the total number of cases the probation officers carried per year was 150 – 200. Mr. Pfalzgraf explained that the probation department seeks to identify, through a screening process, the best possible routing for a juvenile referral. He named counseling, substance abuse treatment, peer jury, and community service as the typical paths for routing and estimated that nearly 100 juveniles, per year, were recommended for community service. Mr. Pfalzgraf stated that battery, truancy, delinquency, smoking and drinking were the most common offenses for community service referrals. Mr. Pfalzgraf explained that YSB Community Service Supervisor, Ms. Charleston is his YSB contact and she reports the progress of each juvenile participating in the *Youth Giving Back*.

Ms. Charleston explained that she supervises the two part-time YSB employees who coordinate the community service tasks. The funds from this grant are used solely to pay for these two employees. Ms. Charleston related that it is the job of these employees to conduct an initial meeting with the juvenile and his/her parents. During this meeting, the workers arrange for community service performance sites and develop an intake and employment schedule that details the days and shifts a juvenile will perform community service. Ms. Charleston explained that the primary determinant in assigning a juvenile to a worksite is schedule compatibility.

The part-time YSB employees accompany the juveniles to their worksites and supervise them to ensure compliance. Ms. Charleston explained that most community service hours are fulfilled working on projects such as city gardening, homeless shelter cleaning, and food pantry assistance. Ms. Charleston confirmed data previously provided by YSB that indicated 112 juveniles served community services and 88 (78 percent) successfully completed the program. Ms. Charleston indicated that YSB also provides this service for the Ottawa and Streator Peer Juries via other funding sources. She did not know how many juveniles are referred from Ottawa or Streator.

Table 4: YSB Youth Served, 2007

Outcome	Number
Youth Referred to the Program	112
Youth who Completed the Program	88
Youth who Failed to Complete Required Hours	4
Youth who were terminated for various reasons	16
Number of order community service hours	3,389

Source: La Salle County 2007 final data

None of the participants had any questions, suggestions or statements of issues with the program. Authority staff pointed out to Mr. Pfalzgraf that the county's most recent data reports indicated that the county's Juvenile Advisory Board has not met since 26 April 2007 and no future meetings were scheduled. Mr. Pfalzgraf explained that the Board's chairperson, the county state's attorney, devoted several months to his re-election campaign and could not make time for such a meeting. Mr. Pfalzgraf expressed that a meeting could not take place unless the state's attorney called one to order. Authority staff stressed to Mr. Pfalzgraf that these meetings were a requirement of the county's funding. He replied that nothing could be done by anyone other than the state's attorney to coordinate the meeting.

Each JABG purpose area has a corresponding list of performance measures to be used throughout the grant period. JABG grantees are required to report on several of these measures. One specific measure mandates that grantees collect the number and percent of program youth who re-offend. The significance of this measurement is that it directly relates to JABGs stated long-term goal that no more than 30 percent of juveniles will re-offend by 2012. La Salle County has not reported data for this mandated measure in any of its funding periods. Authority staff's repeated urging to Mr. Pfalzgraf and his predecessor to comply with this reporting have been met with negative results. Authority staff explained to each site visit participant the importance of measuring repeat offenders. Mr. Pfalzgraf laughingly replied that the county would need another grant to find a method for collecting such data. Mr. Pfalzgraf further stated that his staff informed him they did not have the capability to identify and report repeat offenders.

Authority staff asked Mr. Pfalzgraf if the county could sustain *Youth Giving Back* without JABG funding. Mr. Pfalzgraf speculated that the La Salle County Board would elect to keep the program funded with county funds and the fees received from local peer juries. Mr. Pfalzgraf's comments support information provided in the county's program narrative that indicates anticipation that the City of Ottawa - *Youth Giving Back's* most frequent user – will financially support the program. *Youth Giving Back* has since partnered with the Streator and Peru peer juries and has scheduled user fees with them. In addition, YSB currently receives and plans for regular funding from the United Way. Each of these funding sources represents La Salle County's opportunity to sustain *Youth Giving Back* – in the absence of Authority provided JABG funds.

Conclusion

La Salle County's current funding ends in August 2009, at which time they will have received \$66,600 in total JABG funding. The county has used this funding to sub-contract the YSB to create two part-time jobs to coordinate a community service restitution project entitled, *Youth Giving Back*, for La Salle County's non-violent juvenile offenders. The program serves La Salle County's first-time juvenile referrals by allowing them to perform community service hours in lieu of routing to other components of the juvenile justice system. These coordinators also oversee the juveniles' participation in the program, locate, build and sustain relationships between the county and the entities that serve as a community service restitution outlet.

The JABG funding provided to La Salle County has allowed the YSB to enhance the capacity and quality of their program services. YSB has since begun to provide community service restitution options for the Ottawa and Streator communities. These services, although seemingly benefitting from the JABG funded program, are not combined with the JABG program itself. Additionally, YSB receives service based fees from the Ottawa and Streator peer jury funds for their efforts. La Salle County indicated in their program narrative that an overall goal was to sustain the entire program by using peer jury fees. YSB representatives indicated they were near being able to sustain the *Youth*

Giving Back program with these fees. Mr. Pfalzgraf indicated La Salle County could likely make up the difference. All agreed that such occurrences could keep *Youth Giving Back* in operation. Authority staff has detected no deficiencies in La Salle County's ability to meet its most basic goals. In the past year, La Salle County referred 112 youth to this community service restitution program. Seventy-eight percent of this youth completed the program for a total of 3,389 work hours performed. Authority staff however has taken issue with La Salle County's inability to execute an Advisory Board meeting for more than one-year. In addition, La Salle County's representatives have continued to fail in counting and reporting the number of juveniles who have committed arrestable offenses following their routing to or completion from YSB. This data reporting is a JABG-mandated metric. Mr. Pfalzgraf suggested that his agency did not have the capability to track such data.

It is evident that La Salle County has benefitted from this JABG funding. Perhaps, more encouraging, is this JABG funding allowed La Salle County to further develop its program into one that serves additional communities. In return, those communities pay user fees to La Salle County's sub-contractor, YSB; thereby, contributing to the program's future sustainability. Additionally, Mr. Pfalzgraf expressed confidence that the county board would continue to fund the program should JABG funding be discontinued. Mr. Pfalzgraf clearly stated that this JABG funding was welcomed by the program and county; however, his county's repeated disregard to convene for mandated Advisory Board meetings and adopt specific reporting measures suggests that this funding is not highly valued. Based upon these facts, Authority staff recommends that La Salle County's JABG funding be discontinued.

Oak Park

Oak Park is a suburb located in Cook County. The town's eastern boundary borders Chicago's far-west Austin community. According to the US Census' 2005 – 2007 American Community Estimate, the village's population is 53,000. The population's racial demographic is 68 percent white; 22 percent black or African American; and, 6 percent Asian. Approximately 6 percent are identified as Hispanic or Latino of any race. The city claims 22,120 total households with an average household size of 2.4. The average family size is 3.12 and the total population between the ages of 5 and 19 is approximately 12,592 (23 percent); males and females are near evenly split. Approximately 7 percent of the households (1,620) are headed by single mothers with children under 18 years old. Nearly 95 percent of Oak Park's population over 25 years have attained a high school diploma or higher and 62 percent have a bachelor's degree or higher.

The most common occupations for Oak Park residents are: Management or professional – 63 percent; Sales – 21 percent; and Service – 8 percent. Its median household income is \$74,614 and approximately 5 percent of its families live below the poverty level. Nine percent of families with a female householder and no husband present had incomes below poverty level.

Table 6: Sex by Age, 2000

Sex by Age	Population
Male	24,414
5 to 9	1,814
10 to 14	1,812
15 to 19	1,500
20 to 24	1,235
Female	28,110
5 to 9	1,633
10 to 14	1,752
15 to 19	1,432
20 to 24	1,414

Source: US Census, 2000

Oak Park's reported drug arrests in 2007 totaled 271 per 100,000. The majority of these arrests were for cannabis offenses – 43 percent and controlled substance violations – 39 percent. Data for Crimes against School Personnel or Hate Crimes was not obtained.

Table 7: Uniform Crime Report Index, Oak Park

YEAR	TOTAL CRIME INDEX ARRESTS	MURDER	CRIMINAL SEXUAL ASSAULT	ROBBERY	AGGRAVATED ASSAULT/BATTERY	BURGLARY	THEFT	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	ARSON
2007	3,939	1	8	113	37	343	1,389	14	3
2006	3,984	0	12	153	41	351	1,365	20	2

Source: Illinois Uniform Crime Index Report, 2007

Table 5: Oak Park's Population Characteristics, 2005 – 2007 3 year estimate

Population Characteristic	Estimate, '05-'07
Total Population	53,000
Total households	22,120
Average household size	2.4
Family households (families)	13,712
with own children under 18	6,972
Average family size	3.12
Female householder, no husband present	2,646
with own children under 18	1,620

Source: US Census, American FactFinder, 2007

Oak Park participates in Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR). The data reported by these agencies for Index Offenses in 2007 indicates a Total Crime Index of 3,939 Index Crimes per 100,000 and Total Crime Index Arrests of 568 per 100,000. The most frequently reported offense is Theft – 1,389 offenses, followed by Burglary - 343. There was one reported Murder in 2007. Data for reported Domestic Crimes or Crimes against Children was not obtained

The Oak Park Police Department publishes juvenile crime data on its official webpage. The data reported for juvenile offense and drug arrests indicates a total of 220 juvenile arrests in 2007; up 9 percent from 201 in 2006. The most frequent arrest in 2007 was for Theft – 75, followed by “Other” – 41, and Robbery – 37. Juveniles arrested in 2007 for cannabis totaled 13 and none was arrested for controlled substance violations.

Table 8: Total Juvenile Arrests by Offense in Oak Park, '06 - '07

Offense Arrest	2006	2007
Murder	0	0
Criminal Sexual Assault	0	0
Robbery	39	37
Aggravated Assault/Battery	16	22
Burglary	13	13
Theft	56	75
Motor Vehicle Theft	2	0
Arson	0	0
Criminal Damage to State Property	1	1
All other Criminal Offenses	30	41
All Other Disorderly Conduct	13	14
Violation of the Cannabis Act	20	13
Violation of Controlled Substance	1	0
Violation of Paraphernalia Act	10	4

Source: Oak Park Police Department, Informational Release, 1/28/2008

Oak Park – Education to Nullify Usage by first-time offenders (ENUF)

The Village of Oak Park has received JABG funding from ICJIA since 1999. During the past two funding years, the Oak Park Department of Public Health was awarded a total of \$51,290 for the *ENUF* program under Purpose Area 10. The purpose of the *ENUF* program is to provide alcohol and drug education for teens 13 to 17 who have committed offenses in Oak Park. *ENUF* aims to divert first-time offenders from the court system by offering them the opportunity to participate classes through the use of class-room style techniques, audio-visual, didactic, guest speakers and at-home assignments designed to educate youth and their families about the risks and consequences associated with illegal substances. *ENUF* receives youth referrals from the Oak Park Police Department and the Oak Park Municipal Court Division.

The following are the stated goals and objectives of *ENUF*:

Goals

1. To increase targeted youth's knowledge about the risk and consequences of alcohol, drugs, co-occurrence of mental health and substance abuse issues.
2. To increase parental understanding/knowledge of adolescent substance use, mental health disorders and potential co-occurrence of the two.
3. To reduce risky behavior among high-risk youth.

Objectives

1. To provide 12 hours of educational services per month to targeted youth.
2. To administer pre- and post-tests to all participating youth.
3. To compare pre-and post-test scores.
4. To invite all families of participants to the family session and provide three hours of educational services, monthly to all families that participate.
5. To increase parental involvement in the Family Session.
6. To prevent recidivism into the justice system among *ENUF* participants as measured by police recidivism checks.
7. To develop, maintain and cultivate community relationships that would increase referrals of appropriate youth to the *ENUF* program.

As part of these efforts, Oak Park reported that 40 of 58 referrals (69 percent) completed the program in 2007. In 2007, the *ENUF* program received approximately \$25,000 in JABG funds. Since its inception in 2000, the *ENUF* program received a total of \$159,004 JABG funds for paying personnel costs. In addition to JABG funding, the *ENUF* program receives funding from United Way and various community service organizations such as Rotary International and Zonta International.

Oak Park Site Visit

On 12 Nov 08, Authority staff conducted a pre-arranged site visit with the Oak Park Community Health Services Department and the service providers for the *ENUF* program. The purpose of this site visit was to discuss the *ENUF* program processes, reported data, and to seek an overall understanding of the program's function within the city's juvenile justice system. Authority staff met with Margaret Provost-Fyfe – Community Health Services Supervisor; Eric Williams – Interim Director of Community Health Services; Gayle Spencer – Director of *ENUF*; and Susan Stearns – Coordinator of The Volunteer Center; and Abby Schmelling – Director of the Volunteer Center. The meeting took place at the Oak Park Village Center.

Table 9: *The ENUF Program – Served, 2007*

Outcome	Number
Youth Referred to the Program	58
Youth who Completed the Program	40

Source: Oak Park 2007 final data

Ms. Provost-Fyfe explained that the Oak Park Community Health Services Department sub-contracts The Volunteer Center to implement *ENUF* for juveniles from Oak Park, River Forest and Forest Park. She conceded having little knowledge about *ENUF* and explained that the Department's former director had oversight of the program and he recently left for new employment. Ms. Provost-Fyfe further explained that she and the Interim Director were learning about *ENUF* and could not provide much insight. Ms. Provost-Fyfe then directed attention to personnel from The Volunteer Center – Ms. Spencer and Ms. Stearns.

Ms. Stearns explained that The Volunteer Center receives juvenile referrals from local law enforcement, judges and schools for offenses such as curfew, possession, graffiti, and underage possession or use of alcohol, tobacco or drugs. Staff then administers a comprehensive test designed to identify the individual or social needs of at-risk juveniles. Ms. Stearns stated that juveniles identified as high-risk for alcohol, tobacco or drug use and who are first-time offenders are referred to the *ENUF* program.

Ms. Spencer stated that she is the director and facilitator of the *ENUF* program. She explained that she provides 12 hours of educational services to approximately six to eight referrals per month. Ms. Spencer further explained that the educational services go beyond the focus on alcohol, tobacco and drugs and segue into topics that are ancillary to substance abuse. These topics include infectious diseases, teen pregnancy, violence, anger, mental health issues, refusal strategies, problem solving and decision making. Movies and pop-culture are often used to facilitate group discussion and serve as topical attention grabbers for the juvenile audience. In addition, Ms. Spencer organizes a monthly meeting for juvenile offenders and their parents to discuss life issues and relevant barriers to success.

Ms. Spencer identified the quality of the *ENUF* program as its primary strength. She expressed desire to improve the program by making it more gender and age specific, initiate home visits, and become more involved in the area's schools. Ms. Spencer conceded that funding is always a barrier to making such improvements.

Each JABG purpose area has a corresponding list of performance measures to be used throughout the grant period. JABG grantees are required to report on several of these measures. One specific measure mandates grantees to collect the number and percent of program youth who re-offend. The significance of this measurement is that it directly relates to JABGs stated long-term goal that no more than 30 percent of juveniles will re-offend by 2012. Oak Park has not reported data for this mandated measure in any of its funding periods.

Authority staff asked those present in the meeting if the *ENUF* program has developed into sustainable program and would continue without JABG funding. Ms. Schmelling speculated that The Volunteer Center would need to make some adjustments; as well as, seek funding from additional sources and would make efforts to do so. Ms. Provost-Fyfe stated that she could not speculate; therefore, she could not answer the question.

Conclusion

Oak Park will have received \$159,004 in total JABG funding by late 2009. The city has used this funding to sub-contract The Volunteer Center to create an educational program – *ENUF* – that attempt to divert first-time offenders from the unhealthy life choices of alcohol, tobacco and drugs. The program has established itself as one of value to its community and it has expanded beyond educating on alcohol, tobacco and drugs into areas of mental and social well-being that are often affected by abuse of the others. Moreover, the program’s leaders project that the need for *ENUF* is soon becoming greater than ever due to a population and economic shift in Oak Park.

The Oak Park Police Department reported 220 juvenile arrests were made in 2007. Approximately 6 percent of these arrests were related to cannabis or controlled substance violations. Theft (34 percent), “other” (20 percent), and robbery (17 percent) were the top three offense arrests. It is unknown whether “other” includes offenses related to the *ENUF* program, although it is likely many of these arrests were alcohol, tobacco, or drug related. Authority staff has detected no deficiencies in Oak Park’s ability to meet its most basic goals and it appears that Oak Park has benefitted from this funding.

Oak Park is not a community without means. It is recognized as a prosperous community. Its median household income is \$74,614 and only 5 percent of the population is below the poverty line. Additionally, the community is well-educated – more than 60 percent have a bachelor’s degree or higher – and it is a community with low crime; particularly, in crimes involving violence. The city and its partners have made the most out of this JABG funding by developing and establishing the *ENUF* program to target juveniles who come in contact with the criminal justice system due to alcohol, tobacco or drug violations. It was apparent from this site visit that the *ENUF* program is directed by a staff of qualified and dedicated professionals working together to make a difference in the community; thus, adding to the difficulty of making a recommendation for future funding. However, Authority staff cannot overlook that Oak Park has received funding for this program for nearly nine years. These funds have been intended to serve as “seed money” that allows a program to develop from nothing and into a sustainable and quality program. Authority staff believes that the *ENUF* program has reached that level. Based upon this information, Authority staff recommends that funding for the *ENUF* program be discontinued.

East St. Louis

East St. Louis is a city located in St. Clair County, directly across the Mississippi River from St. Louis, Missouri. According to the US Census' 2007 American Community Estimate, the city's population is 28,996. In 2000, the city's racial demographic was 98 percent black or African American. The city claims 10,691 total households with an average household size of 2.47. The average family size is 3.20 and the total population between the ages of 5 and 19 is approximately 10,712 (37 percent); males and females are near evenly split. Approximately 25 percent of the households (2,695) are headed by single females with children under 18 years old. Approximately 70 percent of East St. Louis' population over 25 years have attained a high school diploma or higher and 11 percent have a bachelor's degree or higher. Nearly 30 percent of its population is high school drop-outs.

The most common occupations for East St. Louis residents are: Service occupations – 34 percent; Sales and office occupations – 24 percent; and Management related occupations – 22 percent. Its median household income is \$22,139 and approximately 37 percent of its families live below the poverty level. Forty-six percent of families with a female householder and no husband present had incomes below poverty level.

Table 11: Sex by Age, 2000

Sex by Age	Population
Male	14,166
5 to 9	1,586
10 to 14	1,504
15 to 19	1,291
20 to 24	900
Female	17,376
5 to 9	1,473
10 to 14	1,413
15 to 19	1,327
20 to 24	1,218

Source: US Census, 2000

East St. Louis' 2007 reported Drug Arrests, Crimes against School Personnel, or Hate Crimes also were not obtained.

Table 12: Uniform Crime Report Index, East St. Louis

YEAR	TOTAL CRIME INDEX	MURDER	CRIMINAL SEXUAL ASSAULT	ROBBERY	AGGRAVATED ASSAULT/BATTERY	BURGLARY	THEFT	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	ARSON
2007	4,492	30	77	387	1,762	657	808	709	62
2006	4,487	25	75	402	1,745	729	850	617	44

Source: Illinois Uniform Crime Index Report, 2007

Table 10: East St. Louis' Population Characteristics, 2005 – 2007 3 year estimate

Population Characteristic	Estimate, '05-'07
Total Population	28,996
Total households	10,691
Average household size	2.47
Family households (families)	6,856
with own children under 18	3,372
Average family size	3.2
Female householder, no husband present	4,352
with own children under 18	2,695

Source: US Census, American FactFinder, 2007

East St. Louis participates in Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR). The data reported by these agencies for Index Offenses in 2007 indicates a Total Crime Index of 4,492 Index Crimes per 100,000. The most frequently reported offense is Aggravated Assault/Battery – 1,762 offenses, followed by Theft – 808. East St. Louis' 30 reported Murders in 2007 put it near the top of America's highest murder rates of 102 murders per 100,000 residents. Data for reported Domestic Crimes or Crimes against Children was not obtained

East St. Louis – *Juvenile Crime Reduction Program*

The City of East St. Louis Police Department's *Juvenile Crime Reduction* program is an attempt to provide appropriate sanctions for juvenile offenders. This program has received \$276,184.36 since 2000; approximately \$60,000 of this total has been awarded during the past two calendar years for purpose area numbers 11 and 13. The funding is used to contribute to the salary of one juvenile analyst. This juvenile analyst assists two East St. Louis Police Juvenile Staff Officers and six School Resource Officers to sustain the city's juvenile accountability rehabilitative program – the *Juvenile Crime Reduction* program. This program offers social services, behavior modification and conflict resolution strategies to first-time juvenile offenders in East St. Louis.

The following are the stated goals and objectives of the *Juvenile Crime Reduction Program*:

Goals

1. To analyze and assess juvenile crime statistics.
2. To reduce and deter repeat juvenile delinquents from becoming further engaged in the juvenile justice system.
3. To reduce the number of fights in school.

Objectives

1. Identify the types of crimes committed.
2. Identify problem areas.
3. Identify and monitor habitual juvenile offenders.
4. Conduct criminal investigations.
5. Administer and refer juveniles to the proper rehabilitation services.
6. Provide students with alternatives to violence and positive ways to reduce conflicts.
7. Provide peer mediation and conflict resolution classes.
8. Increase police presence in and around schools in an effort to reduce and deter violence.

To help achieve these goals, the East St. Louis Police Department works in partnership with the city's school district to implement strategies that will help reduce the district's more than 2,000 student suspensions per year. One of these partnership agreements allows East St. Louis Police Officers to work in the schools as resource officers. Additional partnerships with the department include the Leslie Bates Neighborhood House, The Child Center for Behavioral Development Conflict Resolution Program, the Chestnut Drug Rehabilitation Center and the Youth Services House.

In addition, East St. Louis works to achieve its program goals by “identifying and investigating offenses committed by the juvenile offender; sanction the juvenile offender into an appropriate rehabilitative service; and decrease juvenile delinquent behavior.” The police department's two juvenile staff officers are responsible for these tasks. As part of these efforts, East St. Louis referred 44 juveniles for sanctions during the last funding period. The city reported that only 14 participants successfully completed the program and three of those 14 re-offended.

East St. Louis Telephone Interview

On 23 Dec 08, Authority staff conducted a pre-arranged site telephone interview with the lead Juvenile Officer of the East St. Louis Police Department. A telephone interview was chosen over an on-site visit due to the long travel and unpredictability of December weather. The purpose of this site visit was to discuss the *Juvenile Crime Reduction* program processes, reported data, and to seek an overall understanding of the program's function within the framework of East St. Louis' needs. Authority staff spoke with Gilda Johnson – Sergeant/Juvenile Staff Officer, East St. Louis Police Department.

Sgt. Johnson explained her role as one of providing oversight for the city's juvenile division and coordinating all juvenile related services. She has served in this position for more than 10 years. Sgt. Johnson could not confirm how many juvenile sanctions her division issued in the past year; she explained that another juvenile officer was responsible for collecting and analyzing such data.

Sgt. Johnson explained that the juvenile division reviews all police reports in which contact with a juvenile has been documented. These reports are analyzed to determine what, if any, intervention a juvenile might need. Sgt. Johnson stated that juvenile intervention specific to this program focuses on juveniles who are first-time offenders for offenses such as assault, battery, and robbery. She also stated that most of these types of juvenile offenses occur within the schools or following school dismissals.

Sgt. Johnson explained that this program attempts to use peer mediation and conflict resolution strategies. These programs are led by Sgt. Johnson and several other officers, as well as, several of the social service providers partnered with the police department. In addition, the program has allowed for the assignment of six school resource officers who seek to deter violence in the schools. Sgt. Johnson could not articulate the specific impact that such efforts have had on East St. Louis' juvenile incidents occurring at the schools; however, she believed the outcome has been positive in reducing incidents. The Juvenile Analyst – the personnel funded by this grant – is the person charged with compiling such data and was unavailable for this meeting.

Sgt. Johnson conceded that the number of juveniles who have failed to successfully complete the program is high. She attributed this to the small staff and allocation of many duties within the juvenile division. Sgt. Johnson further explained that many of the juvenile problems in East St. Louis go beyond the scope of this program. She speculated that programs focusing on juvenile mental health issues could better serve the population. Sgt. Johnson said that East St. Louis is historically high, compared to all cities, in sexual assault crimes involving juveniles as both victims and offenders. According to Sgt. Johnson, East St. Louis does not have the resources to address these issues. Authority staff asked Sgt. Johnson if the East St. Louis could sustain *Juvenile Crime Reduction* without JABG funding. Sgt. Johnson speculated the city could not.

Conclusion

Table 13: East St. Louis Youth Served, 2007

Outcome	Number
Youth Referred to the Program	44
Youth who Completed the Program	14
Youth who Failed to Complete Required Hours	30
Youth who Completed the Program and later Re-offended	3

Source: East St. Louis County 2007 final data

East St. Louis has received approximately \$60,000 in total JABG funding since 2007. The city has applied this funding to the salary of one Juvenile Analyst position to oversee its JABG *Juvenile Crime Reduction* program. The program attempts to serve East St. Louis' first-time juvenile offenders by providing them with peer mediation and conflict resolution strategies and programs. In fiscal year 2008, the *Juvenile Crime Reduction* program attempted to serve 44 juveniles. Fourteen (31 percent) completed the program. Three of these 14 (21 percent) were later identified as re-offenders. East St. Louis was unable to provide any additional data related to the *Juvenile Crime Reduction* program.

Sgt. Johnson is charged with overseeing the *Juvenile Crime Reduction* program. It was clear when speaking with Authority staff that she was passionate about her role and the potential impact this program could have on East St. Louis youth. Sgt. Johnson's passion balanced her inability to provide data that went beyond accounting for the number of juveniles the program has served. However, the combined inability to provide such data, along with her explanation that the program lacked the appropriate number of staff – two juvenile staff members, six school resource officers, one funded analysts – for more effective implementation, suggests that the East St. Louis Police Department does not have a well established program in place. It seems that funding is not being used to implement a JABG related program; rather, it is simply contributing to typical law enforcement standards related to managing juvenile offenders.

Authority staff recognizes that East St. Louis ranks as one of the nation's most crime ridden cities. It suffers from one of the highest murder and criminal sexual assault rates, per 100,000, in the country. Authority staff could not obtain data to illustrate the city's juvenile crime; however, based upon conversation with Sgt. Johnson, it seems that juvenile crime keeps pace with reported adult crimes. Yet, the assignment of eight juvenile division officers and one analyst in a city with approximately 10,700 juveniles suggests that the division is adequately staffed and, perhaps, better implementation strategies are needed.

It is evident that East St. Louis has a need for both funding – nearly 40 percent of its population is below poverty – and program implementation strategies. Based on conversation with Sgt. Johnson and the Authority's past experience with East St. Louis, it is also evident that the juvenile division does the best it can with its limited resources. If the Authority no longer funded the *Juvenile Crime Reduction* program, it is possible that the Juvenile Analyst position would be eliminated. However, the fact that it is unclear whether this analyst has helped impact the city's efforts on juvenile crime might be indicative of the city's inability to implement the *Juvenile Crime Reduction* program. Authority staff recommends that East St. Louis' JABG funding be discontinued.

Evanston is a city located in Cook County. The city is bordered by Chicago to the south; Lake Michigan to the East; Skokie to the west; and Wilmette to the north. According to the US Census' 2007 American Community Estimate, the city's population is 75,905. The city's racial demographic is 67 percent white; 19 percent black or African American; and 7 percent Asian. The city claims 27,000 total households with an average household size of 2.3. The average family size is 3.1 and the total population between the ages of 5 and 19 is approximately 22,837 (30 percent); males and females are near evenly split. Approximately 10 percent of the households (2,182) are headed by single females with children under 18 years old. Approximately 93 percent of Evanston's population over 25 years have attained a high school diploma or higher and 64 percent have a bachelor's degree or higher.

The most common occupations for Evanston residents are: Management related occupations – 60 percent; Sales and office occupations – 22 percent; and Service occupations – 10 percent. Its median household income is \$63,407 and approximately 11 percent of its families live below the poverty level. Fourteen percent of families with a female householder and no husband present had incomes below poverty level.

Table 15: Sex by Age, 2000

Sex by Age	Population
Male	34,967
5 to 9	2,179
10 to 14	2,071
15 to 19	3,229
20 to 24	3,877
Female	39,272
5 to 9	2,037
10 to 14	1,998
15 to 19	3,477
20 to 24	3,969

Source: US Census, 2000

Evanston's 2007 reported Drug Arrests, Crimes against School Personnel, or Hate Crimes were not obtained.

Table 16: Uniform Crime Report Index, Evanston

YEAR	TOTAL CRIME INDEX	MURDER	CRIMINAL SEXUAL ASSAULT	ROBBERY	AGGRAVATED ASSAULT/BATTERY	BURGLARY	THEFT	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	ARSON
2007	3,107	2	12	141	127	861	1,827	137	0
2006	4,186	1	10	135	98	853	1,953	123	13

Source: Illinois Uniform Crime Index Report, 2007

Table 14: Evanston's Population Characteristics, 2005 – 2007 3 year estimate

Population Characteristic	Estimate, '05-'07
Total Population	75,905
Total households	27,000
Average household size	2.3
Family households (families)	15,963
with own children under 18	8,101
Average family size	3.1
Female householder, no husband present	3,226
with own children under 18	2,182

Source: US Census, American FactFinder, 2007

Evanston participates in Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR). The data reported by these agencies for Index Offenses in 2007 indicates a Total Crime Index of 3,107 Index Crimes per 100,000. The most frequently reported offense is Theft – 1,827 offenses, followed by Burglary – 861. Evanston had 2 reported Murders in 2007. Data for reported Domestic Crimes or Crimes against Children was not obtained. The City of Evanston reported 362 juvenile arrests in 2005 and 449 juvenile arrests in 2006.

Program

The City of Evanston has received JABG funding from ICJIA since 2001 for a total of \$155,693. During the last two years, approximately \$42,000 has been awarded to contribute to the salary of a Youth Services Advocate employed, in part, to oversee Evanston's *Community Service* and *Restorative Justice* programs. These programs are under Purpose Areas 11 and 14, respectively.

The purpose of the *Community Service* program is to provide accountability-based sanctions for juvenile offenders in an attempt to deter them from engaging in future criminal activity. This program requires referred youth to complete community service hours and participate in a comprehensive family counseling assessment. The *Community Service* program has the following four primary goals.

1. Decrease the number of youth having police contact and/or entering the Juvenile Court System
2. Hold youth accountable for their delinquent behaviors
3. Reduce the recidivism rate of juvenile offenders
4. Provide needed counseling and referral services to youth and families

The purpose of the *Restorative Justice* program is to encourage responsibility, accountability, reparations, and community safety among referred juvenile offenders. The *Restorative Justice* program attempts to accomplish these objectives through the facilitation of Peacemaking Circles, Family Group Conferences, and Victim-Offender Mediation while attempting to involve all who have a stake in the particular offense. The *Restorative Justice* program has the following four goals:

1. Address the harm done
2. Address the needs of the victim, community, and offender
3. Come to a consensus about offender obligations and reparations
4. Support the offender to reduce the possibility of recidivism and provide opportunities for competency development

Oversight of these program components is provided by the Evanston Police Department's Social Services Bureau. This bureau is staffed with personnel clinically trained in social work or counseling. Cooperative efforts from the police department's juvenile division, as well as, the city's school district, local businesses, community activists, and various outsourced social service agencies are cited as integral stakeholders in the effectiveness of both programs..

In Evanston, all juvenile related crimes are reviewed by juvenile officers. Juveniles who have been involved in no more than two offenses are eligible for the *Community Service* or *Restorative Justice* programs. The assigned program is dependent upon the offense type. Eligible juveniles are then referred to the Social Services Bureau and the program processes are initiated. Juveniles who fail to complete the program may be petitioned for a court appearance or other services.

In the past funding year, Evanston received 63 referrals for the *Community Service* program and a total of 1,372 community service hours were provided. Six months following completion of the program, seven youths were identified as re-offenders. After one year, two youths were identified as re-offenders. Evanston also received 26 referrals for the *Restorative Justice* program. No participants have been identified as re-offenders.

Evanston Site Visit

On 03 Sep 2008, Authority staff conducted a pre-arranged site visit with the Evanston Social Service Bureau. The purpose of this site visit was to discuss the *Community Service* and *Restorative Justice* programs processes, reported data, and to seek an overall understanding of the program's function within the county's juvenile justice system. Authority staff met with Arica Barton – Youth Service Program Coordinator; as well as, several members of the Evanston Police Department, the Social Services Bureau, and community activists. The meeting took place at the Evanston Police Department.

Mr. Barton explained that the *Community Services* and *Restorative Justice* programs receives juvenile referrals from the police department, schools, or any other community group or member seeking to improve the quality of life of the city's youth. As the programs have become established and locally renowned as successful, referrals have increased. The *Restorative Justice* program was implemented less than two years ago with the intent to better enhance accountability that was not being achieved through *Community Services* alone. Evanston has reported that 100 percent of the *Restorative Justice* participants have not re-offended.

Ms. Barton explained that the *Restorative Justice* program is currently being implemented at the Evanston High School, as well as the local middle schools and community centers. Additionally, efforts have been made to implement the program's practices to address the school districts truancy problems. Evanston has taken a proactive approach in taking its *Restorative Justice* program to the places where juvenile conflicts are likely to occur and become criminal offenses. In doing so, Evanston is not only working to keep juveniles from re-offending, they are working to keep juveniles from become offenders.

Conclusion

Evanston has received more than \$150,000 in JABG funded programs during the past eight years. Recently, the city improved its JABG program services by adding a *Restorative Justice* component to its established *Community Service* program. Consequently, the city has expanded its ability to provide quality juvenile services while maintaining another proven component. Evanston has set lofty goals and objectives for its programs. These objectives have not been clearly met; however, those responsible for overseeing this program have demonstrated the desire to improve upon the areas that have not achieved desired success. Moreover, their efforts in creating such a quality program have provided Authority staff with the confidence that Evanston will achieve each of its objectives.

Evanston is a racially, culturally and economically diverse community. Although it is a suburb, it is a highly urban area that benefits and suffers from all of the characteristics associated with urban areas. Evanston is not immune from criminal activity, particularly, involving juveniles. In response, the city

Table 17: Evanston Youth Served, 2007

Outcome	Number
Youth Referred to the <i>Community Service</i> Program	63
Youth who re-offended after 1 year	2
Youth Referred to the <i>Restorative Justice</i> Program	26
Youth who re-offended after 1 year	0
Number of order community service hours	1,372

Source: Evanston 2007 final data

remains proactive and innovative in its efforts to contain and reduce juvenile criminal activity. It appears that Evanston has benefitted from this JABG funding. In addition, Evanston has shown the ability to grow and produce advanced strategies that remain in accordance with and further strengthen the JABG purpose.

Evanston indicated in its most recent funding application that city budget problems have prohibited the Social Services Bureau from sustaining these programs without JABG funding. The application cites shrinking personnel, unfilled vacancies and increased administrative duties as symptoms of the city's budgetary issues that have forced the Social Services Bureau to seek and train volunteers. Authority staff acknowledges the significant amount of long-term JABG funding Evanston has received. Yet, based upon their innovation and successes, consideration must be given to the city's stated budget issues in making a future funding recommendation. Without this funding, it is possible that these JABG programs would be terminated. Based upon these facts, Authority staff recommends that Evanston be considered for one more year of funding with the understanding that these programs be sustained, pending their success, at the end of that funding year. Consideration for future funding will be given at that time.

Madison County

Madison County is located in southwest Illinois along the Mississippi River. The county is part of the St. Louis Metro Area. According to the US Census' 2005 – 2007 American Community Estimate, the county's population is 266,142. The population's racial demographic is 89 percent white and 7.9 percent black or African American. The county claims 107,271 total households with an average household size of 2.41. The average family size is 2.93 and the total population between the ages of 5 and 19 is approximately 72,440 (27 percent); males and females are near evenly split. Approximately 7 percent of the households (7,985) are headed by single mothers with children under 18 years old. Nearly 88 percent of Madison County's population over 25 years have attained a high school diploma or higher and 23 percent have a bachelor's degree or higher.

Table 18: Madison County Population Characteristics, 2005 – 2007 3 year estimate

Population Characteristic	Estimate, '05-'07
Total Population	266,142
Total households	107,271
Average household size	2.41
Family households (families)	71,945
with own children under 18	32,571
Average family size	2.93
Female householder, no husband present	13,084
with own children under 18	7,985

Source: US Census, American FactFinder, 2007

The most common occupations for Madison County residents are: Management or professional – 33 percent; Sales and office occupations – 26 percent; Service occupations – 17 percent; Production, and transportation and material moving occupations – 14 percent. Its median household income is \$50,356 and approximately 11 percent of its families live below the poverty level. Twenty-six percent of families with a female householder and no husband present had incomes below poverty level.

Table 19: Sex by Age, 2000

Sex by Age	Population
Male	129,074
5 to 9	9,218
10 to 14	9,631
15 to 19	9,418
20 to 24	7,825
Female	137,068
5 to 9	8,683
10 to 14	9,208
15 to 19	9,413
20 to 24	9,044

Source: US Census, 2000

There are 27 law enforcement agencies in Madison County that participate in Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR). The data reported by these agencies for Index Offenses in 2007 indicates a Total Crime Index of 9,694 Index Crimes per 100,000 and Total Crime Index Arrests of 2,596 per 100,000. The most frequently reported offense is Theft – 6,165 offenses, followed by Burglary – 1,801. There were 10 reported Murders in 2007. There were 2,915 reported Domestic Crimes and 545 reported Crimes against Children in 2007.

Madison County's reported drug arrests in 2007 totaled 2,072. The majority of these arrests were for cannabis offenses – 41 percent and drug paraphernalia offenses – 30 percent. There were 71 reported Crimes against School Personnel and 3 reported Hate Crimes in 2007.

Table 20: Uniform Crime Report Index, Madison County

YEAR	TOTAL CRIME INDEX ARRESTS	MURDER	CRIMINAL SEXUAL ASSAULT	ROBBERY	AGGRAVATED ASSAULT/BATTERY	BURGLARY	THEFT	MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	ARSON
2007	9,694	10	153	163	807	1,801	6,165	555	40
2006	9,039	10	191	201	690	1,789	5,528	573	57

Source: Illinois Uniform Crime Index Report, 2007

Madison County – *Madison County State’s Attorney’s Office*

The County of Madison has received \$245,577 in JABG funding from ICJIA since 1999. During the past two funding years, the Madison County State’s Attorney’s Office was awarded \$24,285 to fund, in part, the salary of an assistant state’s attorney’s salary; specifically, in effort to reduce the backlog of cases in the county. This funding was awarded under Purpose Area 4. The Madison County State’s Attorney’s Office, like many state’s attorney’s offices throughout the state, work under a backlog of a pending caseload. This backlog can create issues not only in the courts, but also in the detention facilities that are forced to house juveniles awaiting their hearing. To reduce backlog, the county has defined a simple goal and objective.

Goal

1. The goal of the program is to reduce and maintain a backlog of delinquency cases while improving the efficiency of this process.

Objective

1. To accomplish this goal, the objective of the State’s Attorney’s Office is more adjudication.

To help achieve this goal and objective, the Madison County State’s Attorney’s Office assigned an additional prosecutor to handle juvenile abuse and neglect cases. This allowed the lone juvenile prosecutor to focus specifically on delinquency cases; thus, helping to reduce backlog. The reduced caseload has allowed for cases to move through the system more quickly and efficiently.

Madison County telephone interview

On 23 Dec 08, Authority staff conducted a pre-arranged telephone interview with the Madison County State’s Attorney’s Office. A telephone interview was chosen over an on-site visit due to the long travel and unpredictability of December weather. The purpose of this telephone interview was to discuss the county’s program processes, reported data, and to seek an overall understanding of the program’s function. Authority staff spoke with Stephanie Smith – Office Administrator.

According to Ms. Smith, the Madison County State’s Attorney’s office serves approximately 30 law enforcement agencies. In 2007, those agencies presented 537 juvenile petitions for delinquency adjudication. Ms. Smith estimated the current juvenile adjudication backlog is 100 cases and the average number of days between a charge and disposition is 132 days. In comparison, prior to this funding, the county’s juvenile backlog was 430 cases and as recent as 2005, the average number of days between a charge and disposition was 213 days.

Authority staff asked Ms. Smith if the county could sustain its current assignments to the juvenile court without JABG funding. Ms. Smith replied that the amount of funding is so small that there would be little impact if it ended. She then offered that the funding causes more work than it is worth as it requires the county to track data that it normally would not track.

Conclusion

Madison County was awarded JABG funding to help alleviate juvenile delinquency adjudication backlog. The county used the funding to hire and assign a prosecutor to the juvenile division; thus, reallocating duties and improving efficiency. The result has been positive and the county has continued to move toward achieving minimal backlog. According to the grant's contact person, Ms. Smith, the funding amount has become so small that the county would be able to sustain its current and effective organization should funding be eliminated. Based upon these facts, Authority staff recommends that Madison County's JABG funding be discontinued.

Cook County – *Project Reclaim* Pre-employment Program

Summary

The Cook County Juvenile Probation and Court Services Department manages a population of approximately 5,000 juvenile probationers per year. The county proactively seeks and develops programs aimed at helping these juveniles establish themselves as non-delinquents. Many of these programs are directed under Cook County's *Project Reclaim* and receive funding assistance through the Juvenile Assistance Block Grant (JABG). One such program is the *Pre-Employment Program (P.E.P. – U)*.

In 2006, Cook County initiated the *P.E.P. – U* as an extension of its previously implemented *Street Dreams Employment Program*. The purpose of *P.E.P. – U* is two-fold: 1) to provide screened and selected juvenile probationers from the Lawndale and Englewood communities with the basic job-employment skills; 2) to place hireable participants into gainful employment with a partnering employer. The county uses the JABG funding to compensate the juveniles' hourly pay-rate.

The *P.E.P. – U* receives enough JABG funding, approximately \$30,000 per year, to support the participation of 10 juveniles in this program. County officials estimate that their staff can manage up to 60 participating juveniles if funding was available. *P.E.P. – U* is still in its infancy and has several operational components that need improvement. In particular, *P.E.P. – U* would benefit by implementing better data collection methods focused on measuring specific program performance outcomes.

The *P.E.P. – U* is the only known program in the nation providing a pre-employment service that links juvenile delinquents to actual paying jobs. Cook County's continued and successful implementation of this program, potentially, can propel it to become a model program in juvenile justice. It is the recommendation of Authority staff to further explore the feasibility of expanding and strengthening the *P.E.P. – U* through additional funding and research-oriented guidance.

Juvenile Justice Re-entry programs that are, or have been, funded by ICJIA

Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice *Young Offender Reentry*

Period of performance: 09/30/2007 to 09/30/2008

Designated: \$563,926

Awarded: \$563,926

Expended: \$249,677

Most recent designation: 10/1/2008 to 9/30/2009

Designated: \$510,000

Awarded: \$510,000

Expended: \$0

Primary goal: To reduce drug use/abuse and criminal behavior through community-based reentry programming.

Statement of the problem: IDJJ administrators continue to maintain high standards in institutional management and operations despite severe crowding and antiquated facilities. Youth between the ages of 13 and 20 years are held in juvenile facilities. IDJJ has custody while the juvenile male offender is incarcerated in a facility and jurisdiction over those on parole. Youth committed to IDJJ may be adjudicated by the Juvenile Court (delinquents) or sentenced in Criminal Court (juvenile felons). Delinquents have indeterminate lengths of stay subject to review by IDJJ administrators. Juvenile felons have determinate sentences established by law.

Courts are faced with limited alternatives for responding to juvenile crime. The IDJJ is the placement of last resort for Illinois' most serious, chronic, and violent juvenile male offenders. IDJJ administrators continue to maintain high standards in institutional programs, management, and operations despite crowded conditions, tightening budgets and limited program space.

Goals & Objectives: The overall goal of this project is to break the cycle of recidivism that plagues the successful return of parolees to their communities. Reducing the recidivism rate will go a long way in freeing up bed space for Part I violent offenders.

Another goal of this program is reduce drug use/abuse and criminal behavior through community-based reentry programming. It is expected that this program will help restore ex-offenders to full citizenship, including participation in and responsibility for their families and fellow community residents. The ultimate goal will be to restore the ex-offenders' sense of self-worthiness, revitalize family ties and obligations and bring about social reintegration.

In order to heal individuals and communities that have been impacted by criminal behavior, the IDJJ program approach provides a comprehensive process that, when implemented, balances the ex-offender's needs with community accountability, responsibility and reparations, thus ensuring for the overall safety of the community and its residents. This program is designed to close the gaps that youths face through a seamless service delivery system designed and tailored to each youth's needs.

Accomplishments: During the grant period ending 9/30/2008, the program averaged 116 participants per month. TASC referred youth to services that included GED programs, high school and college programs, substance abuse services, mentoring, and job readiness. They also assisted youth with procuring State ID cards, driver's licenses, birth certificates, completing job applications, obtaining suitable interview clothing, and accompanying them to appointments with schools.

There was an average of 30 participants for the halfway back component of the program – a parole intervention program. Thirty-one were re-incarcerated and 221 were returned to the community after successfully receiving counseling and being assigned to a TASC case manager to help them stay in school or obtain their GED.

Juvenile Justice Re-entry programs that are, or have been, funded by ICJIA

Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice *Parole Readjustment Program*

Period of performance: 08/01/2008 to 1/29/2009

Designated: \$85,997

Awarded: \$85,997

Expended: \$35,000

New grant designation scheduled: \$73,315 beginning 1/30/2009

Primary goal: To preserve public safety while successfully reintegrating high-risk youth back into the community.

Statement of the Problem: In response to record-high recidivism rates for juvenile parole violators, IDJJ is addressing the needs of this population by providing intermediary services to reduce the number of violators returning to IYC facilities. IYC Joliet's 90 day Parole Readjustment Program (PRP) is designed to provide enhanced reentry services to 48 medium security technical violators through a variety of programs including education, individual and group counseling, intensive case management, and a continuum of wrap-around services directed for reentry. Successful outcomes from PRP participation will be measured by discharge from parole without further violations or new offenses and, as a result, communities will be safer, victimizations will be reduced, and juveniles will have the opportunity to redirect their lives in pursuance of law-abiding activities.

Participant Criteria: The PRP program targets male technical parole violators from the northern region who have been classified at Reception & Classification as medium security youth or who are reclassified to Medium security at IYC Joliet. As these violators may be presented to the PRB before transfer to IYC Joliet, they will be docketed for the soonest IYC-Joliet PRB. All parole violators (including those youth who meet the eligibility requirements for PRP) will have their administrative review dates (ARD) reset at 90 days from the date of admission to IDJJ in accordance with current procedures.

Youth who have sex offender convictions or special mental health needs are not eligible for the PRP program and will be diverted to alternative facilities designed to provide appropriate care and programs for special populations. Also, violators who have new charges pending and youth who are within 90 days of discharge will not be accepted into this program as the program is designed to meet the needs of technical violators by providing a 12-week, structured course of programs and services.

Program Criteria: PRP will provide a comprehensive package of assessment, programming, and pre-release processes designed to address the specific needs of the violator population in preparation for reentry into communities. 90-day program modules will be coupled with intensive and clinical case management professionals working closely with juvenile parole staff to ensure successful program completion and community reentry. Participants will have a one-week orientation phase, followed by a nine-week programmatic regimen, concluding with an intensive two-week pre-release/re-integration period.

Accomplishments:

The following accomplishments were for the program period 11/14/2006 thru 5/31/2008

TASC Clinical Reentry Managers provided services for life skills training, substance abuse training, self-esteem building, leadership development, and cognitive orientation processes. These services were provided in several venues. Youth were assigned to a resource room, once a week, and completed an employment application and resume for when they return to the community. Additionally, they were provided materials to assist in job searches, character development, substance abuse education, self responsibility, and anger management. Additional services included a pre-release, peer leadership and mentorship program, including GED tutors. TASC also coordinated guest speakers and special events to provide youths with the learning opportunities and motivation to succeed following reentry.

TASC continued to meet regularly with youth following their release. TASC used these meetings to assist youth in seeking employment and providing life skills guidance. Additionally, TASC worked with parole agents to provide training, information, and create buy-in of the reentry program.

Juvenile Justice Re-entry programs that are, or have been, funded by ICJIA

Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice *Transitional Housing*

Period of performance: 07/01/2007 to 6/30/2008

Designated: \$22,320

Awarded: \$22,320

Expended: \$22,320

Primary goal: To develop a viable, specialized reentry system for youth. This pilot program will provide transitional housing and supportive services to youth at IYC Joliet who have no reentry options.

Statement of the problem: At any given time, the Illinois Youth Center (IYC) Joliet has up to 20 youth (ages 16 - 20) remaining in custody for 9 to 24 months past their parole date because they have no placement options. Their families are unable or unwilling to house and care for their children. Not only does this create a financial strain on the corrections system but also places both the community and the youth at risk when they are finally released without any support system or services in place necessary for successful reintegration into the community.

Re-entry services will be provided over an 18-month period for each youth to facilitate the transition for youth reentering the community with clients being able to move through three phases at a pace that supports their success, in a time frame that meets their needs. Each of the three phases includes prioritized, customized services beneficial to the client at that stage in the program.

Programming will include:

Phase I

- Housing, Supervision and Monitoring
- Case Management Services
- Individual and group counseling
- Interpersonal skills development
- Education and Employment needs
- Transportation
- Health Services
- Psychiatric Services
- Specialized Services

Phase II

Focus on employment, financial preparation, life skills, and independent living

Phase III

Supports youths' achievement and maintenance of independent living, sustain employment, and increase capacity for future earnings. Demonstrate capacity to manage self, home, and money.

Accomplishments:

Transitional housing was provided to a total of 3 youth, 1 at a time, over the grant period. These services were provided by Aunt Martha's.

One youth participated in the program for approximately nine months and successfully completed the program by attaining independent housing, a job, and continuing his education.

One youth abandoned his placement group home and his whereabouts were unknown to the program and parole agent at the time of IDJJs final funding report.

One youth was immediately placed into a transitional living program in preparation for entry into an independent living situation. The youth was later linked with the Safer Foundation and attended GED classes.



**ILLINOIS
CRIMINAL JUSTICE
INFORMATION AUTHORITY**

300 W. Adams Street • Suite 700 • Chicago, Illinois 60606 • (312) 793-8550

MEMORANDUM

TO: Juvenile Crime Enforcement Coalition Members

FROM: Lori G. Levin, Executive Director

DATE: December 30, 2008

RE: **Juvenile Court Evaluations / Call-Backs**

At the October 7, 2008 JCEC meeting, the panel requested a county-by-county breakdown of Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice (IDJJ) court evaluation/call-back order detainees, their lengths of stay, and the per diem costs for the detainees' stay at IDJJ facilities.

The following charts detail two types of information: 1) Juvenile Court Evaluation Admissions by Committing County; and 2) Number of Prison Exits and Lengths of Stay by Committing County. For purposes of comparison, data is provided for state fiscal years 2005 through 2008.

Staff will be available at the meeting to answer any questions.

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Juvenile Court Evaluation Admissions by Committing County
FY05

Committing County	Number	Percent
Adams	2	0.4%
Alexander	2	0.4%
Bond	0	0.0%
Boone	8	1.6%
Brown	0	0.0%
Bureau	2	0.4%
Calhoun	0	0.0%
Carroll	1	0.2%
Cass	3	0.6%
Champaign	17	3.5%
Christian	8	1.6%
Clark	0	0.0%
Clay	0	0.0%
Clinton	1	0.2%
Coles	0	0.0%
Cook	98	20.1%
Crawford	1	0.2%
Cumberland	1	0.2%
DeKalb	0	0.0%
DeWitt	2	0.4%
Douglas	2	0.4%
DuPage	2	0.4%
Edgar	2	0.4%
Edwards	1	0.2%
Effingham	0	0.0%
Fayette	1	0.2%
Ford	1	0.2%
Franklin	0	0.0%
Fulton	1	0.2%
Gallatin	0	0.0%
Greene	0	0.0%
Grundy	1	0.2%
Hamilton	0	0.0%
Hancock	0	0.0%
Hardin	0	0.0%
Henderson	0	0.0%
Henry	2	0.4%
Iroquois	4	0.8%
Jackson	1	0.2%
Jasper	1	0.2%
Jefferson	4	0.8%
Jersey	0	0.0%
Jo Daviess	3	0.6%

Committing County	Number	Percent
Livingston	4	0.8%
Logan	0	0.0%
McDonough	0	0.0%
McHenry	3	0.6%
McLean	10	2.0%
Macon	13	2.7%
Macoupin	2	0.4%
Madison	21	4.3%
Marion	0	0.0%
Marshall	0	0.0%
Mason	2	0.4%
Massac	0	0.0%
Menard	0	0.0%
Mercer	7	1.4%
Monroe	0	0.0%
Montgomery	6	1.2%
Morgan	1	0.2%
Moultrie	0	0.0%
Ogle	4	0.8%
Peoria	7	1.4%
Perry	2	0.4%
Piatt	1	0.2%
Pike	2	0.4%
Pope	0	0.0%
Pulaski	0	0.0%
Putnam	2	0.4%
Randolph	1	0.2%
Richland	4	0.8%
Rock Island	9	1.8%
St. Clair	60	12.3%
Saline	0	0.0%
Sangamon	0	0.0%
Schuyler	2	0.4%
Scott	0	0.0%
Shelby	2	0.4%
Stark	1	0.2%
Stephenson	7	1.4%
Tazewell	7	1.4%
Union	0	0.0%
Vermilion	8	1.6%
Wabash	0	0.0%
Warren	2	0.4%
Washington	0	0.0%

Johnson	1	0.2%
Kane	11	2.3%
Kankakee	0	0.0%
Kendall	1	0.2%
Knox	2	0.4%
Lake	1	0.2%
LaSalle	16	3.3%
Lawrence	2	0.4%
Lee	6	1.2%

Wayne	0	0.0%
White	2	0.4%
Whiteside	0	0.0%
Will	25	5.1%
Williamson	3	0.6%
Winnebago	52	10.7%
Woodford	4	0.8%
Unknown	0	0.0%
Total	488	100.0%

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Juvenile Court Evaluation Admissions by Committing County
FY06

Committing County	Number	Percent
Adams	2	0.4%
Alexander	0	0.0%
Bond	2	0.4%
Boone	4	0.8%
Brown	1	0.2%
Bureau	1	0.2%
Calhoun	0	0.0%
Carroll	0	0.0%
Cass	0	0.0%
Champaign	23	4.7%
Christian	6	1.2%
Clark	1	0.2%
Clay	0	0.0%
Clinton	0	0.0%
Coles	2	0.4%
Cook	200	40.7%
Crawford	0	0.0%
Cumberland	1	0.2%
DeKalb	1	0.2%
DeWitt	6	1.2%
Douglas	0	0.0%
DuPage	0	0.0%
Edgar	1	0.2%
Edwards	0	0.0%
Effingham	3	0.6%
Fayette	2	0.4%
Ford	1	0.2%
Franklin	0	0.0%
Fulton	2	0.4%
Gallatin	0	0.0%
Greene	0	0.0%
Grundy	1	0.2%
Hamilton	0	0.0%
Hancock	0	0.0%
Hardin	0	0.0%
Henderson	0	0.0%
Henry	3	0.6%
Iroquois	1	0.2%
Jackson	2	0.4%
Jasper	1	0.2%
Jefferson	2	0.4%
Jersey	4	0.8%
Jo Daviess	1	0.2%

Committing County	Number	Percent
Livingston	4	0.8%
Logan	5	1.0%
McDonough	0	0.0%
McHenry	5	1.0%
McLean	13	2.6%
Macon	0	0.0%
Macoupin	2	0.4%
Madison	13	2.6%
Marion	1	0.2%
Marshall	2	0.4%
Mason	4	0.8%
Massac	0	0.0%
Menard	0	0.0%
Mercer	4	0.8%
Monroe	1	0.2%
Montgomery	3	0.6%
Morgan	3	0.6%
Moultrie	0	0.0%
Ogle	1	0.2%
Peoria	2	0.4%
Perry	2	0.4%
Piatt	0	0.0%
Pike	1	0.2%
Pope	0	0.0%
Pulaski	0	0.0%
Putnam	1	0.2%
Randolph	0	0.0%
Richland	4	0.8%
Rock Island	13	2.6%
St. Clair	34	6.9%
Saline	2	0.4%
Sangamon	0	0.0%
Schuyler	2	0.4%
Scott	0	0.0%
Shelby	0	0.0%
Stark	0	0.0%
Stephenson	6	1.2%
Tazewell	1	0.2%
Union	0	0.0%
Vermilion	6	1.2%
Wabash	0	0.0%
Warren	1	0.2%
Washington	0	0.0%

Johnson	1	0.2%
Kane	7	1.4%
Kankakee	0	0.0%
Kendall	1	0.2%
Knox	3	0.6%
Lake	0	0.0%
LaSalle	16	3.3%
Lawrence	0	0.0%
Lee	3	0.6%

Wayne	0	0.0%
White	1	0.2%
Whiteside	0	0.0%
Will	15	3.0%
Williamson	0	0.0%
Winnebago	35	7.1%
Woodford	0	0.0%
Unknown	0	0.0%
Total	492	100.0%

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Juvenile Court Evaluation Admissions by Committing County
FY07

Committing County	Number	Percent
Adams	3	0.6%
Alexander	2	0.4%
Bond	0	0.0%
Boone	4	0.9%
Brown	0	0.0%
Bureau	2	0.4%
Calhoun	0	0.0%
Carroll	1	0.2%
Cass	0	0.0%
Champaign	21	4.5%
Christian	8	1.7%
Clark	0	0.0%
Clay	0	0.0%
Clinton	0	0.0%
Coles	2	0.4%
Cook	215	46.2%
Crawford	0	0.0%
Cumberland	0	0.0%
DeKalb	2	0.4%
DeWitt	2	0.4%
Douglas	0	0.0%
DuPage	0	0.0%
Edgar	2	0.4%
Edwards	0	0.0%
Effingham	1	0.2%
Fayette	0	0.0%
Ford	0	0.0%
Franklin	0	0.0%
Fulton	1	0.2%
Gallatin	0	0.0%
Greene	0	0.0%
Grundy	0	0.0%
Hamilton	0	0.0%
Hancock	1	0.2%
Hardin	0	0.0%
Henderson	0	0.0%
Henry	0	0.0%
Iroquois	1	0.2%
Jackson	1	0.2%
Jasper	0	0.0%
Jefferson	2	0.4%
Jersey	0	0.0%
Jo Daviess	1	0.2%
Johnson	1	0.2%
Kane	18	3.9%

Committing County	Number	Percent
Livingston	2	0.4%
Logan	2	0.4%
McDonough	0	0.0%
McHenry	2	0.4%
McLean	12	2.6%
Macon	0	0.0%
Macoupin	0	0.0%
Madison	12	2.6%
Marion	0	0.0%
Marshall	2	0.4%
Mason	4	0.9%
Massac	0	0.0%
Menard	0	0.0%
Mercer	4	0.9%
Monroe	1	0.2%
Montgomery	2	0.4%
Morgan	0	0.0%
Moultrie	1	0.2%
Ogle	5	1.1%
Peoria	1	0.2%
Perry	7	1.5%
Piatt	0	0.0%
Pike	0	0.0%
Pope	0	0.0%
Pulaski	0	0.0%
Putnam	1	0.2%
Randolph	0	0.0%
Richland	3	0.6%
Rock Island	10	2.2%
St. Clair	1	0.2%
Saline	1	0.2%
Sangamon	0	0.0%
Schuyler	0	0.0%
Scott	0	0.0%
Shelby	2	0.4%
Stark	0	0.0%
Stephenson	18	3.9%
Tazewell	0	0.0%
Union	0	0.0%
Vermilion	4	0.9%
Wabash	0	0.0%
Warren	0	0.0%
Washington	0	0.0%
Wayne	0	0.0%
White	0	0.0%

Kankakee	0	0.0%
Kendall	1	0.2%
Knox	6	1.3%
Lake	4	0.9%
LaSalle	18	3.9%
Lawrence	0	0.0%
Lee	2	0.4%

Whiteside	0	0.0%
Will	11	2.4%
Williamson	4	0.9%
Winnebago	29	6.2%
Woodford	2	0.4%
Unknown	0	0.0%
Total	465	100.0%

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Juvenile Court Evaluation Admissions by Committing County
FY08

Committing County	Number	Percent
Adams	2	0.4%
Alexander	1	0.2%
Bond	1	0.2%
Boone	7	1.5%
Brown	0	0.0%
Bureau	2	0.4%
Calhoun	0	0.0%
Carroll	0	0.0%
Cass	1	0.2%
Champaign	17	3.7%
Christian	6	1.3%
Clark	1	0.2%
Clay	0	0.0%
Clinton	0	0.0%
Coles	1	0.2%
Cook	243	52.5%
Crawford	0	0.0%
Cumberland	1	0.2%
DeKalb	3	0.6%
DeWitt	2	0.4%
Douglas	0	0.0%
DuPage	1	0.2%
Edgar	2	0.4%
Edwards	0	0.0%
Effingham	5	1.1%
Fayette	0	0.0%
Ford	1	0.2%
Franklin	0	0.0%
Fulton	1	0.2%
Gallatin	0	0.0%
Greene	0	0.0%
Grundy	0	0.0%
Hamilton	0	0.0%
Hancock	0	0.0%
Hardin	0	0.0%
Henderson	2	0.4%
Henry	1	0.2%
Iroquois	0	0.0%
Jackson	0	0.0%
Jasper	0	0.0%
Jefferson	2	0.4%
Jersey	3	0.6%
Jo Daviess	1	0.2%

Committing County	Number	Percent
Livingston	1	0.2%
Logan	0	0.0%
McDonough	1	0.2%
McHenry	3	0.6%
McLean	2	0.4%
Macon	0	0.0%
Macoupin	0	0.0%
Madison	15	3.2%
Marion	0	0.0%
Marshall	2	0.4%
Mason	3	0.6%
Massac	0	0.0%
Menard	0	0.0%
Mercer	2	0.4%
Monroe	0	0.0%
Montgomery	0	0.0%
Morgan	0	0.0%
Moultrie	0	0.0%
Ogle	3	0.6%
Peoria	2	0.4%
Perry	3	0.6%
Piatt	0	0.0%
Pike	0	0.0%
Pope	0	0.0%
Pulaski	1	0.2%
Putnam	0	0.0%
Randolph	2	0.4%
Richland	1	0.2%
Rock Island	13	2.8%
St. Clair	0	0.0%
Saline	1	0.2%
Sangamon	0	0.0%
Schuyler	0	0.0%
Scott	0	0.0%
Shelby	3	0.6%
Stark	0	0.0%
Stephenson	6	1.3%
Tazewell	2	0.4%
Union	0	0.0%
Vermilion	5	1.1%
Wabash	0	0.0%
Warren	0	0.0%
Washington	0	0.0%

Johnson	1	0.2%
Kane	8	1.7%
Kankakee	1	0.2%
Kendall	1	0.2%
Knox	7	1.5%
Lake	1	0.2%
LaSalle	9	1.9%
Lawrence	0	0.0%
Lee	1	0.2%

Wayne	0	0.0%
White	0	0.0%
Whiteside	0	0.0%
Will	9	1.9%
Williamson	2	0.4%
Winnebago	42	9.1%
Woodford	3	0.6%
Unknown	0	0.0%
Total	463	100.0%

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Number of Prison Exits and Length of Stay by Committing County
Court Evaluation: FY05 Exits

Committing County	Number of Exits	Mean Length of Stay (Months)
Adams	1	0.6
Alexander	2	1.4
Bond	0	----
Boone	11	2.7
Brown	0	----
Bureau	2	1.8
Calhoun	0	----
Carroll	0	----
Cass	2	1.9
Champaign	17	1.8
Christian	10	2.9
Clark	0	----
Clay	1	2.0
Clinton	1	1.4
Coles	1	23.3
Cook	93	4.4
Crawford	1	1.3
Cumberland	0	----
DeKalb	0	----
DeWitt	0	----
Douglas	1	1.8
DuPage	2	2.3
Edgar	2	2.1
Edwards	1	3.6
Effingham	2	6.9
Fayette	0	----
Ford	1	2.3
Franklin	0	----
Fulton	0	----
Gallatin	0	----
Greene	0	----
Grundy	1	2.9
Hamilton	0	----
Hancock	0	----
Hardin	0	----
Henderson	0	----
Henry	2	1.5
Iroquois	9	4.6
Jackson	1	3.5
Jasper	1	1.4
Jefferson	7	8.5

Committing County	Number of Exits	Mean Length of Stay (Months)
Livingston	1	2.2
Logan	0	----
McDonough	1	5.9
McHenry	1	3.0
McLean	11	2.7
Macon	25	5.5
Macoupin	0	----
Madison	9	2.8
Marion	0	----
Marshall	0	----
Mason	4	2.7
Massac	0	----
Menard	0	----
Mercer	7	1.4
Monroe	0	----
Montgomery	7	2.9
Morgan	1	2.2
Moultrie	0	----
Ogle	1	0.8
Peoria	5	1.9
Perry	2	2.6
Piatt	1	3.8
Pike	2	2.5
Pope	0	----
Pulaski	0	----
Putnam	1	3.7
Randolph	1	1.1
Richland	4	7.4
Rock Island	10	1.5
St. Clair	51	3.1
Saline	0	----
Sangamon	0	----
Schuyler	0	----
Scott	0	----
Shelby	2	2.0
Stark	1	1.0
Stephenson	4	3.1
Tazewell	7	2.2
Union	0	----
Vermilion	5	2.6
Wabash	0	----

Jersey	2	2.9
Jo Daviess	0	----
Johnson	0	----
Kane	9	1.4
Kankakee	0	----
Kendall	1	1.5
Knox	1	1.9
Lake	0	----
LaSalle	15	2.3
Lawrence	2	1.4
Lee	2	1.5

Warren	1	2.2
Washington	0	----
Wayne	0	----
White	2	2.9
Whiteside	0	----
Will	12	5.3
Williamson	1	0.9
Winnebago	51	3.5
Woodford	2	1.3
Unknown	0	----
Total	437	3.5

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Number of Prison Exits and Length of Stay by Committing County
Court Evaluation: FY06 Exits

Committing County	Number of Exits	Mean Length of Stay (Months)
Adams	2	3.2
Alexander	0	----
Bond	1	0.5
Boone	5	2.4
Brown	1	1.7
Bureau	1	2.7
Calhoun	0	----
Carroll	1	1.2
Cass	1	8.8
Champaign	17	1.8
Christian	3	2.5
Clark	1	1.5
Clay	0	----
Clinton	0	----
Coles	2	2.0
Cook	140	3.9
Crawford	0	----
Cumberland	2	2.7
DeKalb	1	2.5
DeWitt	3	1.9
Douglas	0	----
DuPage	0	----
Edgar	2	2.5
Edwards	0	----
Effingham	4	4.2
Fayette	2	2.6
Ford	1	1.8
Franklin	0	----
Fulton	2	8.2
Gallatin	0	----
Greene	0	----
Grundy	0	----
Hamilton	0	----
Hancock	0	----
Hardin	0	----
Henderson	0	----
Henry	1	1.8
Iroquois	0	----
Jackson	1	2.5
Jasper	0	----
Jefferson	2	6.5
Jersey	4	3.5
Jo Daviess	4	1.0

Committing County	Number of Exits	Mean Length of Stay (Months)
Livingston	2	2.2
Logan	2	2.9
McDonough	0	----
McHenry	4	2.8
McLean	10	2.2
Macon	1	3.0
Macoupin	2	7.0
Madison	7	2.2
Marion	1	1.1
Marshall	1	3.0
Mason	3	2.7
Massac	0	----
Menard	0	----
Mercer	2	2.9
Monroe	0	----
Montgomery	1	2.6
Morgan	3	4.6
Moultrie	0	----
Ogle	1	0.9
Peoria	2	2.9
Perry	1	7.7
Piatt	0	----
Pike	1	1.1
Pope	0	----
Pulaski	0	----
Putnam	1	3.0
Randolph	0	----
Richland	1	7.8
Rock Island	9	1.4
St. Clair	37	2.1
Saline	0	----
Sangamon	0	----
Schuyler	1	2.9
Scott	0	----
Shelby	1	1.6
Stark	0	----
Stephenson	4	2.6
Tazewell	3	1.7
Union	0	----
Vermilion	8	6.1
Wabash	0	----
Warren	2	4.5
Washington	0	----

Johnson	2	3.3
Kane	6	1.4
Kankakee	0	----
Kendall	1	1.5
Knox	2	2.7
Lake	0	----
LaSalle	12	2.5
Lawrence	0	----
Lee	3	1.8

Wayne	0	----
White	1	2.2
Whiteside	0	----
Will	16	3.4
Williamson	1	1.5
Winnebago	39	4.4
Woodford	1	0.8
Unknown	0	0.0
Total	399	3.3

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Number of Prison Exits and Length of Stay by Committing County
Court Evaluation: FY07 Exits

Committing County	Number of Exits	Mean Length of Stay (Months)
Adams	1	2.9
Alexander	2	3.9
Bond	1	3.3
Boone	3	3.1
Brown	0	----
Bureau	2	1.8
Calhoun	0	----
Carroll	1	1.5
Cass	0	----
Champaign	16	1.9
Christian	5	4.4
Clark	0	----
Clay	0	----
Clinton	0	----
Coles	2	1.6
Cook	179	3.9
Crawford	0	----
Cumberland	0	----
DeKalb	1	2.3
DeWitt	4	1.8
Douglas	0	----
DuPage	0	----
Edgar	2	2.0
Edwards	0	----
Effingham	0	----
Fayette	0	----
Ford	0	----
Franklin	0	----
Fulton	0	----
Gallatin	0	----
Greene	0	----
Grundy	1	2.9
Hamilton	0	----
Hancock	0	----
Hardin	0	----
Henderson	0	----
Henry	2	5.4
Iroquois	1	5.6
Jackson	1	1.7
Jasper	0	----
Jefferson	2	4.8
Jersey	0	----
Jo Daviess	1	1.0

Committing County	Number of Exits	Mean Length of Stay (Months)
Livingston	3	5.2
Logan	1	2.7
McDonough	0	----
McHenry	2	2.4
McLean	14	2.4
Macon	0	----
Macoupin	0	----
Madison	10	4.8
Marion	0	----
Marshall	0	----
Mason	2	2.9
Massac	0	----
Menard	0	----
Mercer	6	5.2
Monroe	2	5.1
Montgomery	2	3.0
Morgan	0	----
Moultrie	1	2.9
Ogle	4	0.9
Peoria	0	----
Perry	4	7.7
Piatt	0	----
Pike	0	----
Pope	0	----
Pulaski	0	----
Putnam	2	2.4
Randolph	0	----
Richland	3	6.9
Rock Island	8	2.2
St. Clair	0	----
Saline	2	2.0
Sangamon	0	----
Schuyler	0	----
Scott	0	----
Shelby	2	2.2
Stark	0	----
Stephenson	14	2.6
Tazewell	0	----
Union	0	----
Vermilion	2	2.5
Wabash	0	----
Warren	0	----
Washington	0	----

Johnson	1	14.5
Kane	11	1.4
Kankakee	0	----
Kendall	1	1.8
Knox	3	3.5
Lake	1	2.7
LaSalle	22	2.6
Lawrence	0	----
Lee	2	1.4

Wayne	0	----
White	0	----
Whiteside	0	----
Will	13	4.6
Williamson	3	1.9
Winnebago	27	2.9
Woodford	2	1.1
Unknown	0	----
Total	397	3.4

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Number of Prison Exits and Length of Stay by Committing County
Court Evaluation: FY08 Exits

Committing County	Number of Exits	Mean Length of Stay (Months)
Adams	2	2.6
Alexander	1	1.7
Bond	0	----
Boone	6	1.7
Brown	0	----
Bureau	2	2.1
Calhoun	0	----
Carroll	0	----
Cass	1	3.2
Champaign	16	1.9
Christian	6	3.6
Clark	0	----
Clay	0	----
Clinton	0	----
Coles	1	2.6
Cook	204	3.9
Crawford	0	----
Cumberland	1	3.6
DeKalb	2	1.8
DeWitt	3	2.0
Douglas	0	----
DuPage	0	----
Edgar	1	2.9
Edwards	0	----
Effingham	5	3.0
Fayette	0	----
Ford	1	1.3
Franklin	0	----
Fulton	1	12.8
Gallatin	0	----
Greene	0	----
Grundy	0	----
Hamilton	0	----
Hancock	1	5.6
Hardin	0	----
Henderson	1	1.8
Henry	1	1.9
Iroquois	0	----
Jackson	0	----
Jasper	0	----
Jefferson	2	3.0

Committing County	Number of Exits	Mean Length of Stay (Months)
Livingston	2	3.0
Logan	1	4.7
McDonough	1	4.7
McHenry	3	2.1
McLean	3	2.3
Macon	0	----
Macoupin	0	----
Madison	7	2.5
Marion	0	----
Marshall	2	2.4
Mason	4	2.8
Massac	0	----
Menard	0	----
Mercer	1	1.2
Monroe	0	----
Montgomery	0	----
Morgan	0	----
Moultrie	0	----
Ogle	3	1.0
Peoria	2	2.3
Perry	1	4.3
Piatt	0	----
Pike	0	----
Pope	0	----
Pulaski	0	----
Putnam	0	----
Randolph	0	----
Richland	0	----
Rock Island	8	1.2
St. Clair	0	----
Saline	0	----
Sangamon	0	----
Schuyler	0	----
Scott	0	----
Shelby	2	0.9
Stark	0	----
Stephenson	3	1.2
Tazewell	2	2.0
Union	0	----
Vermilion	5	1.7
Wabash	0	----

Jersey	2	2.9
Jo Daviess	1	1.1
Johnson	1	3.9
Kane	11	1.7
Kankakee	0	----
Kendall	0	----
Knox	10	3.3
Lake	1	10.9
LaSalle	8	2.7
Lawrence	0	----
Lee	1	0.9

Warren	0	----
Washington	0	----
Wayne	0	----
White	0	----
Whiteside	0	----
Will	9	4.0
Williamson	1	2.7
Winnebago	31	2.2
Woodford	3	1.0
Unknown	0	----
Total	387	3.2