

Youth Court:


A Community Solution for Embracing At-Risk Youth

A National Update



Sarah S. Pearson and Sonia Jurich
2005

BRIDGING YOUTH POLICY, PRACTICE AND RESEARCH



AMERICAN YOUTH POLICY FORUM

WITH

NATIONAL YOUTH COURT CENTER

AMERICAN PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE



The American Youth Policy Forum (AYPF), a nonprofit, nonpartisan professional development organization, provides learning opportunities for policy-makers, practitioners, and researchers working on youth issues at the national, state, and local levels. AYPF's goal is to provide participants with information, insights, and networks on issues related to the development of healthy, successful young people as productive workers, and educated and participating citizens in a democratic society. Our work focuses on: secondary and postsecondary education, out-of-school and at-risk youth, juvenile justice, national and community service, service-learning, and related forms of youth development, transition to careers and career development. AYPF publishes policy reports and material on youth and youth policy issues. AYPF events and policy reports are made possible through the support of a consortium of philanthropic foundations. The views reflected in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the funders. AYPF publications may be found on our website at www.aypf.org.

Funds for this publication were supported under cooperative agreement award number #2003-MU-MU-K003 from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice or other funding agencies.



The National Youth Court Center (NYCC) serves as an information clearinghouse, provides training and technical assistance through conferences, regional training seminars, onsite technical assistance, and workshops, and serves as an informational clearinghouse for new and established Youth/Teen Court programs. The Center also provides resources to allied agencies that support Youth Court programs, including the American Bar Association, the Street Law, Inc, and The Constitutional Rights Foundation/Chicago.



The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) provides national leadership, coordination, and resources to prevent and respond to juvenile delinquency and victimization. OJJDP supports states and communities in their efforts to develop and implement effective and coordinated prevention and intervention programs and to improve the juvenile justice system so that it protects public safety, holds offenders accountable, and provides treatment and rehabilitative services tailored to the needs of juveniles and their families.

© American Youth Policy Forum, Washington, DC, 2005.

This publication is copyrighted, but may be cited without permission providing the source is identified as: *A National Update: Communities Embracing Youth Courts for At-Risk Youth*, Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum, 2005. Reproduction of any portion of this report for commercial sale is prohibited. For additional copies of this publication, please send \$5 (shipping/handling) per copy to AYPF, 1836 Jefferson Place, NW, Washington, DC 20036, or call 202-775-9731. Visit our website, www.aypf.org for an online version of this report.

For more information on youth or teen courts, please contact:

National Youth Court Center
c/o American Probation and Parole Association
P.O. Box 11910
Lexington, KY 40578-1910
Phone: (859) 244-8193
Fax: (859) 244-8001
Email: nycc@csg.org

ISBN 1-887031-90-1

Youth Court:


A Community Solution for Embracing At-Risk Youth

A National Update



Sarah S. Pearson and Sonia Jurich
2005

BRIDGING YOUTH POLICY, PRACTICE AND RESEARCH



AMERICAN YOUTH POLICY FORUM

WITH

NATIONAL YOUTH COURT CENTER

AMERICAN PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION

OFFICE OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

BLANK

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
INTRODUCTION	7
OVERVIEW	8
What Are Youth Courts?	8
Where Are Youth Courts Located?	9
Whom Do They Serve?	10
<i>Youth Offenders</i>	10
<i>Youth Volunteers</i>	11
How Do Youth Courts Operate?	12
LOOKING AT RESULTS	15
Program Completion	15
Estimating Costs	16
Program Benefits/Impact	16
<i>Reducing the Backlog in the Juvenile Justice System</i>	16
Providing Youth with Educational and Civic Opportunities	17
Helping Communities	19
Program Sustainability	20
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	21
Recommendations	21
A Path to Civic Engagement	22
REFERENCES	23
APPENDIX A: STUDY METHODOLOGY	24
 LIST OF FIGURES	
Figure 1: Distribution of youth court programs by census regions	9
Figure 2: Age of operation of youth court programs	10
Figure 3: Number of youth offenders seen per program in one year	11
Figure 4: Number of youth volunteering per program per year	12
Figure 5: Distribution of programs by model of youth court adopted by survey participants	13
Figure 6: Operating agencies for youth courts in the study	14
Figure 7: Alternatives to youth courts	17
Figure 8: Youth courts' characteristics contributing to future social behavior among youth offenders	19

QUOTES

Quotes featured in this report come from program directors or coordinators who participated in the study.

BLANK

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Youth court is a rapidly expanding alternative to the juvenile justice system for young people who have committed non-violent offenses, growing from 78 programs in 1994 to 1,035 in March 2005. Youth volunteers, under the supervision of adult volunteers, work as bailiffs, clerks, jury and judges, questioning the offender, debating and imposing sentences. The program's goal is to intervene in early antisocial, delinquent, and criminal behaviors to reduce incidents and prevent the escalation of such behaviors.

The American Youth Policy Forum (AYPF), with support from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and the National Youth Court Center (NYCC), managed by the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA), conducted a nationwide review of youth court programs between November 2004 and January 2005. A total of 365 youth court coordinators from across the United States participated in the study.

This report reflects the study findings. The report's goal is to provide policymakers and the public with an overview of youth court programs, their characteristics and benefits. Note: youth courts may be called "teen court" or "peer jury" in different jurisdictions.

Findings from the AYPF study indicate that:

- An estimated 110,000 to 125,000 youth offenders are served in youth court programs each year.
 - On average, nine percent of juvenile arrests in a jurisdiction are being diverted from the formal juvenile justice system to youth courts.
 - Another 100,000 youth per year are benefiting from their participation in the program as volunteers.
- Returns to investment are immediate, as even in programs with only two years of operation, more than 80% of the youth offenders have completed their sentences successfully.
 - In 30% of the participating programs, 1 in 5 youth offenders returns to the program as a volunteer.
 - The average costs of youth court programs are estimated as \$430 per youth served and \$480 per youth successfully completing a sentence. These low operation costs are maintained through the programs' reliance on adult and youth volunteers.
 - Youth court benefits include:
 - *To the juvenile justice system*—Reduced court backlogs without increasing recidivism;
 - *To youth offenders*—An outlet to confront the consequences of their actions and protection from contact with "hard core" offenders as well as avoidance of a juvenile court record that may jeopardize their future;
 - *To youth offenders and volunteers*—Opportunities to learn about responsible citizenship and law, and to develop skills in public speaking, mediation,

and pro-social leadership through hands-on experience;

- *To families*—A chance to re-engage in a positive dialogue with their children, and to learn with them more about the justice system;
- *To communities*—Recovering losses due to juvenile crime and regaining confidence and pride in local youth.

- Reduced funding and uncertainty about continuing funding were major concerns expressed by youth court coordinators regarding program sustainability.

It is AYPF's hope that this study will provide policymakers and citizens with a better understanding of youth courts and their role as an effective component of the country's network for delinquency prevention, early intervention, and civic engagement.

INTRODUCTION

Youth court is not a new initiative. Two programs participating in this study were established in the 1970s: Naperville, IL, founded in 1972, and Oneida, NY, founded in 1974. Yet, in the past ten years, youth courts have grown by more than 1,300% and expanded into 48 states and the District of Columbia. This significant expansion in the number of youth courts nationwide has attracted public attention. What are youth courts? Whom do they serve? How do they work? What is their impact on youth? And why are they growing so rapidly now?

Publications on youth courts have also grown with the program, and the National Youth Court Center (NYCC), at the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA), includes a number of recent articles on its web site (<http://www.youthcourt.net>). In 2002, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) funded a national evaluation of youth courts conducted by the Urban Institute. The evaluation integrated a review of previous research, a nationwide survey of youth courts, and an in-depth analysis of programs in four states using a quasi-experimental approach. The evaluators concluded that youth courts represent “a promising alternative for the juvenile justice system” . . . above all in “jurisdictions that do not, or cannot, provide meaningful sanctions and services for these offenders.” Moreover, the fact that the programs operate with “largely volunteer labor and very low budgets suggests that they may be a particularly cost-effective alternative for some juvenile offenders.”¹

In November 2004, the American Youth Policy Forum (AYPF), with support from OJJDP and APPA, through NYCC, contacted youth courts across the nation to update and expand the findings from the Urban Institute’s initial survey. A total of 365 youth courts (including those called “teen court” and “peer jury”) participated in a study focused on program operation and outcomes. Information on participating programs was complemented with a review of the NYCC database. Appendix A details the study methodology.

This report summarizes the study findings, raises questions for further research, and proposes recommendations to improve program quality and sustainability. It is AYPF’s hope that this study will provide policymakers and citizens with a better understanding of youth courts and their role as an effective component of the country’s network for delinquency prevention, early intervention, and youth civic engagement.

OVERVIEW



What are Youth Courts?

Youth court, also called teen court, peer jury, or student court, is an alternative to the traditional juvenile justice system and school disciplinary proceedings that empower youth and communities to take an active role in addressing the early stages of youth delinquency. The program provides communities with an opportunity to ensure immediate consequences to first-time youth offenders through a peer operated sentencing mechanism that constructively allows the offender to take responsibility, be held accountable, and make restitution for violating the law. In addition, the program offers young people in the community the opportunity to participate in the decision-making process for dealing with juvenile delinquency, while gaining “hands-on” knowledge of the juvenile and criminal justice systems.

Youth courts offer an alternative program to the basic juvenile department, which is overburdened with cases and sometimes the offense is overlooked with no action taken. [Stayton, OR]

A typical path for a young offender through youth court is as follows: The juvenile court judge, the law enforcement officer, the probation officer or the school offers the first-time youth offender (some youth courts handle repeat offenders), to go through youth court as a voluntary alternative to the formal juvenile justice system. If the youth accepts, a referral is sent to the local youth court coordinator. Most youth courts (about 92%) require an admission of guilt and function as a sentencing hearing only, while about 8% will allow offenders to plead “not guilty.”

Youth court proceedings may be similar to that of regular juvenile courts; that is, the defendant may go through an intake process, a preliminary review of charges, a court hearing, and sentencing. The main difference is that in youth court, youth volunteers, under adult supervision, are responsible for much of the process normally handled by adults, such as: clerk/bailiffs, prosecutors, defenders, jury, and sometimes judge. Another important characteristic of youth courts is the rapid response time. From the time a youth is charged with an offense to the time the case is heard varies from two to four weeks.² Most hearings take 15 minutes to one hour and completion of the disposition requirements may take 30 – 90 days (on average).

Sentences levied by youth courts vary from essays, oral or written apologies to victims, restoration of damages through community service or restitution, and mandatory attendance at workshops related to crime and victimization, alcohol and drugs, safe driving, and more. Some sentencing options

used, although less frequently, include curfews, tutoring, counseling, drug testing, victim offender mediation, peer mediation, jail tours, observation of youth court hearings, mentoring, and suspension of driver's licenses.³ Youth court focuses on youth accountability, education, and positive youth development.


Where Are Youth Courts Located?

Youth courts have operated in a variety of locations throughout the United States for more than 25 years but gained particular popularity in the last decade. In 1994, there were 78 programs nationwide. The 2002 Urban Institute evaluation mentioned 800 courts in operation.⁴ The NYCC list used for the AYPF study, dated October 2004, included 927 programs, but by March 2005, the NYCC database expanded to 1,035 programs. Youth courts have grown by 1,330% within a ten-year period, and since participation in the NYCC database is voluntary, it is likely that the actual number of youth courts nationwide is even higher.

Youth courts are located in 48 states and the District of Columbia, the exceptions being Connecticut and New Jersey. The numbers of programs vary considerably in each state. For

instance, New York, Texas, Illinois, Florida, California and Arizona have more than 50 youth courts each, while the NYCC database registered only one program in Rhode Island, Vermont, and Virginia, respectively. Figure 1 displays the distribution of youth court programs by Census region.⁵

Figure 1: Distribution of youth court programs by census regions



Youth courts are located in rural and urban areas, small and large communities. The 365 programs participating in this study were distributed through 42 states reflecting a diversity of environments that included: (a) large urban areas with over one million residents, such as Manhattan, NY, and Los Angeles, CA; (b) small towns with fewer than 10,000 residents, such as Chehalis, WA, or Sitka,



Most of the kids are not bad kids. They were in the wrong place at the wrong time.


They seem to realize what they did was wrong. They do not wish to repeat what they did. Many of the kids come back to volunteer after completing sanctions. [Crestview, FL]



AK; (c) localities where more than 80% of the population is of minority background, such as Miami, FL, and Hilo, HI; (d) localities where the population is 95% white, such as Lewiston, ME, or Bismarck, ND; and (e) tribal communities, such as the Gila River Indian Community, AZ or the Choctaw Tribal Teen Court, Choctaw, MS. Youth courts have become an integral component of the country's network of delinquency prevention and early intervention regardless of location or type of community.

The expansion of youth courts is reflected in the age of operation of the programs participating in the study. As seen in Figure 2, 40% of the programs had been in operation for five years or less (three had just opened), and almost 50% had been operating for 6 to 10 years.

Figure 2: Age of operation of youth court programs



Whom Do They Serve?

Youth Offenders


Typically, the programs serve youth between 11 and 17 years of age. Most frequently, youth coming to youth courts are first-time offenders charged with misdemeanor or status offenses which include theft, vandalism,



disorderly conduct, assault, and possession of marijuana. Some youth courts may address school disciplinary issues, such as being tardy to class or being disrespectful to a teacher. Under-age drinking or tobacco possession is also commonly handled by youth courts. Some programs serve repeat offenders and non-violent felony cases. Among the study participants, 59% indicated serving only first-time offenders, and misdemeanor, status and/or school-based offenses, while 41% indicated receiving youth who had committed prior offenses and/or youth accused of non-violent felony cases.

From October 2003 to October 2004, 327 programs participating in the AYPF study had served a total of 37,277 youth, for an average of 114 youth (± 10.5) per program.⁶ Numbers varied from as low as one participant in a program that had just opened and received its first case, to 1,579 youth in a five-year old program in Texas. Almost half of the participating programs were small, serving fewer than 50 youth per year, while five were large programs with more than 500 cases a year. Florida and Texas had the largest programs in the study, followed by Arkansas and Michigan. Figure 3 displays the number of youth offenders served between October 2003 and October 2004 by the youth courts participating in the AYPF study.

Figure 3: Number of youth offenders seen per program in one year



As youth courts rely heavily on voluntary participation, keeping statistics is a secondary and generally difficult task to maintain. The 2002 Urban Institute evaluation estimated 100,000 as the number of youth diverted yearly to youth courts.⁷ Considering the current sample as representative of the youth court population (see Appendix A), the estimated numbers of youth served yearly by the current programs may be as high as 110,000 to 25,000.⁸

Of the programs studied, 198 (54%) had information regarding numbers of juvenile arrests in their jurisdiction.⁹ They reported a total of 250,691 juvenile arrests in their



Youth who are referred to the program learn more about the law. Using the youth judge model gives them a sense of control and teaches them leadership skills. They also learn public speaking skills, work in teams and develop a better understanding of the law and the judicial process. (Cleveland, OH)

jurisdictions, of which 9.2% (22,953 youth) were diverted to them. The number of youth offenders diverted to the programs is directly related to numbers of arrests in jurisdictions. Programs in jurisdictions with more than 10,000 juvenile arrests served more than 1,000 youth in the previous year.¹⁰


In 2000, there were nearly 2.3 million arrests of juveniles nationwide, and the courts with juvenile jurisdiction processed more than 1.6 million delinquency cases, or 70% of the juvenile arrests. Of the disposed cases, 303,200 (19%) were larceny-theft and 106,800 (7%) were vandalism, two offenses frequently diverted to youth courts.¹¹ Considering that youth courts may absorb as much as nine percent of the juvenile arrests in a jurisdiction, their presence in any jurisdiction will have an important impact in ensuring that more juveniles who are arrested face consequences for their actions while avoiding a backlog in the juvenile courts, and preserving the courts' ability to process the most severe cases.

Youth Volunteers

Volunteers, both adults and youth, are the backbone of youth courts. Youth between 13 and 18 years of age are accepted as volunteers and undergo training before joining the courts. According to Godwin Mullins (2003), the topics most often covered in initial training include: the roles and expectations of youth volunteers; an overview of youth court process; youth court hearing procedures; case preparation and questioning techniques; and explanation of program services and sentencing options.¹² A total of 34,097 youth volunteers were involved in the programs participating in the AYPF study, for an average 99 (± 12.3) volunteers

per program. As seen in Figure 4, approximately 80% of the programs indicated having 100 or fewer youth volunteers, while 3% estimated having 500 or more.

Figure 4: Number of youth volunteering per program per year



The numbers of youth volunteers in a program strongly relates to program size, meaning that programs serving more youth, which are located in jurisdictions with large numbers of juvenile arrests, also count on large numbers of youth volunteers for help, regardless of court model used or operating agency.¹³ Extrapolating these results to the current numbers of youth court programs now reported in existence, it is possible that more than 100,000 youth are benefiting each year from their participation as volunteers in youth courts nationwide.

Youth volunteers become involved in the program for different reasons. Some schools use the programs as a tool to provide students with lessons in civics; most, if not all, students will serve in the youth courts at least once during their high school years.¹⁴ Civic groups, such as Boy Scouts and Girls Scouts, participate in the program to earn their badges.

Volunteers may also be young people who look for opportunities to learn and serve by providing community service hours or a more in-depth experience involving academic connections through service-learning. Defendants (or respondents) may serve in the youth court proceedings as a juror which may also be part of their sentencing. Finally, former defendants may also return to the programs as volunteers, after successfully completing their sentences. Approximately 30% of the programs participating in the AYPF study reported that one in five program graduates returned to serve as a volunteer.

How Do Youth Courts Operate?

Michelle Heward (2002) observed that 25 states had passed legislation addressing youth courts in some manner.¹⁵ In some states, the legislation is limited to providing appropriations for the programs; in others, it simply lists youth courts as dispositional options for other formal courts; while a few states have a more comprehensive legislation that addresses specific pro-

Our program is now entering its 6th year and has diverted 300 youths from the standard juvenile services intake process. Teen court allows them to be held accountable and receive serious consequences [for their crime or offense], which typically would not receive action from juvenile services. Our overall recidivism rate on a 5-year study is below 13%, which goes to prove that the program works and is beneficial to our community. Over 6000 hours of community service has been assigned and performed during these years [Easton, MD]

gram areas. Discretionary guidelines have also been promulgated by national, state or local organizations or sponsoring entities to ensure that the programs follow acceptable standards. Some youth courts operate under written or verbal permission from judges or school districts.¹⁶ The National Youth Court Guidelines are available at the NYCC web site for those wishing to pursue formation of a youth or teen court.¹⁷


There are four general models of youth courts: adult judge, youth judge, youth tribunal, and peer jury. In the *adult judge* model, youth volunteers serve in the roles of defense attorneys, prosecuting attorneys, clerks, bailiffs, and jurors, while the adult volunteer, either an attorney or judge, serves in the role of judge. The *youth judge* model has youth volunteers serving in all roles, including that of judge, under the monitoring of an adult volunteer, usually an attorney. The *youth tribunal* model usually adopts a panel of three youth judges and has no peer jury. Finally, the *peer jury* model has an adult or youth volunteer serving in the role of judge, while youth volunteers serve as jurors and question the defendant directly; sometimes youth advocates are involved.¹⁸

Frequently, youth courts adopt one of the four models or a combination of them. Among study participants, the adult judge was the most frequently adopted model, as seen in Figure 5. This finding is also reflected in an

I am amazed at the number of young people who are willing to help the young offenders get back on track. With all the negative publicity the youth get, I think there should be a positive emphasis on youth for serving as role models for others. [Syracuse, NY]

analysis of the NYCC database, where 53% of the programs reported using the adult judge model.¹⁹ Programs may also adopt different models depending on the offense.²⁰ For instance, they may use the adult judge model for most cases, except truancy cases, where the youth tribunal is used. The most common combination found in the study was the mix of adult judge and peer jury.

Figure 5: Distribution of programs by model of youth court adopted by survey participants



Most youth courts are held in actual courtrooms, using the environment to emphasize the seriousness of the proceedings. One program described a mobile process, whereby area schools are visited at different times during the year and courts are held on school campuses. According to the program coordinator, this process facilitates the involvement of larger numbers of youth as volunteers.


All the offenders through the [program] have shown a better attitude for their involvement in the process as seen by a constant number that return as members and a zero recidivism rate [Niagara Falls, NY]

Our teen court program teaches a great amount of community involvement and responsibility both to the offender and especially to the teen court juror volunteers. They get a better understanding of how behavior affects others and contributes to the view of teenagers. I am always impressed at the way the jurors take their jobs seriously and give a lot of thought to the consequences they impose. [Alexandria, MN]

Youth courts can be operated by a variety of agencies, including law enforcement (police and sheriff offices), organizations within the justice system (District Attorney's Office, Circuit Court, Superior Court, Municipal Court, and Probation Departments), other government agencies, private nonprofit organizations, and school districts. They can be either self-contained, or involve partners in the community or the justice system. For instance, some of the school-based courts in this study reflected a partnership between law enforcement and the school district. Figure 6 displays the distribution of participating programs by operating agency, according to data from the NYCC database. "Juvenile justice" reflects youth courts operated by the courts (juvenile, municipal, superior, district, and circuit courts, including clerk of the court), district or county attorney office, probation departments, and law enforcement agencies (police and sheriff offices). "Schools" include middle

and high schools. "Local government" represents youth courts operated by town, county or city agencies not related to law enforcement or the court system. "Other" includes programs with more than one operating agency (e.g. law enforcement and schools).

Figure 6: Operating agencies for youth courts in the study



Of the youth courts operated by an agency within the juvenile justice system, 37% are operated by law enforcement agencies and probation departments operate another 30%. Juvenile or municipal courts operate 15% of the programs, and superior, district courts, and clerk of the courts operate the remaining 18%. A comparison between years of program operation and operating agency indicates an expansion on the number of youth courts operated by non-juvenile justice agencies in the past five years, particularly school-based programs, and also a growth on programs operated by a combination of agencies.²¹

LOOKING AT RESULTS

Program Completion

The study participants indicated that a total of 34,083 youth had completed the peer-imposed sanction successfully within the previous year, for an average completion rate of 89%. A comparison between completion rates and court models had no statistical significance; that is, the court model adopted by the program does not appear to influence program completion. Also, years of program operation were not related to success rates. By the second year of operation, programs were already registering successful completion of sentencing for all or most of the youth offenders. In other words, return of investment in youth courts can be immediate.

Comparing sentence completion rates by operating agency is not reliable, as the agencies tend to specialize in types of offenders. For instance, school-based programs deal mostly with truancy and other school-based offenses and rates of success are expectedly high. Some of the governmental programs are specific for traffic violations, while law enforcement and court programs tend to work with riskier types of behavior, such as burglaries, theft, or weapons possession.

Some program coordinators volunteered information about the percentage of youth

who re-offend after finishing the program. A coordinator from a program in New York noted that, “In 2001-02 only 10.7% of youth followed for one year after termination had offended. In 2002-03 that rate dropped to 8.9%.” A number of youth court coordinators indicated recidivism rates of 10%. In the Urban Institute’s 2002 report featuring comparison data between teen courts and the traditional juvenile justice system in four states (AK, AZ, MD, MO), teen courts showed promise. The report revealed that in two of the four states studied, teen court youth had significantly lower rates of recidivism than the comparison group. In the other two states, differences did not reach statistical significance, yet one of the sites favored teen court by a slight margin.²²

Comparisons of recidivism rates between youth court programs and traditional juvenile court programs are not reliable, since youth court programs serve first-time offenders committing less severe crimes, while the traditional juvenile court system is geared toward the repeated offender and/or youth committing more severe crimes. Also, offenders diverted to youth courts are aware that, if they do not complete their program, they may return to the courts or to the juvenile probation department and risk more severe sanctions. However, the recidivism rate is still an important measure of success in juvenile justice programs and to better understand the deterrence power of youth courts on delinquent behavior, research is needed that compares the trajectory of youth with similar offending history randomly assigned to different programs. In fairness to youth courts, an 89% completion rate for

We receive many letters from youth offenders and their parents stating how grateful they are that the county has teen courts. . . . teen court gives youth an important role in their communities. They are real leaders with a voice for change. [Oconto, WI]

programs that handle teenagers with risky behaviors is still impressive.

Estimating Costs

Funding for youth court programs comes from states or local communities. The U.S. Department of Justice, through OJJDP, funds the National Youth Court Center (NYCC), whose purpose is to provide training and develop technical assistance materials to support the quality implementation of programs.

Budget information for participating programs in the NYCC database was used to estimate the average costs for youth court programs. Since most information was outdated (2002 or older), a 5% yearly increase was calculated for each program to attain a more precise estimation. This process probably led to an over-estimation of actual program costs, as many programs indicated cuts in budget from one year to another. Within these caveats, the average yearly budget for youth courts is about \$49,000,²³ the program cost per youth served would be

Youth court benefits are so many. For example, volunteers build important skills and are treated like responsible young adults; offenders get a second chance and the means to start again. Working through their sanctions gives the offenders an increased feeling of control over their lives. The families also find the process healing. The parents need to hear their child express remorse and take responsibility. The community has lower rates of recidivism and a feeling of pride in the program's volunteers. [Falls, WI]

Since 1995 [this program] has handled 412 cases for the local police department. By taking on the cases we have diverted from the County Family Courts, freeing the juvenile section to manage more serious crime cases. [Mt. Pleasant, SC]

approximately \$430, and cost per youth completing sanctions was \$480.²⁴

Comparisons with other juvenile justice programs are unreliable, as costs vary considerably across localities and severity of cases. A 2001 article estimated probation costs at \$1,635 per youth, and a 1998 article estimated processing costs in criminal justice for juveniles between \$21,000 and \$84,000 per case.²⁵ Although claims of cost effectiveness can be made only after careful research that goes beyond the scope and design of this study, youth courts are certainly less expensive than the traditional court process, as it relies heavily on volunteer work from both adults and youth.

Program Benefits and Impact

Reducing the Backlog in the Juvenile Justice System

If youth courts divert about 9% of the arrests that may end up in the juvenile





court system, while achieving high completion rates, reducing backlog at the juvenile courts without increasing recidivism may be the greatest impact of youth courts for the juvenile justice system.

To understand the role that youth courts play within the broader system, AYPF asked youth court coordinators to indicate alternatives for the youth offender in case the program was no longer available. Figure 7 summarizes their responses. Almost all (93%) coordinators agreed that the youth would be involved in some type of program within the system, such as traffic courts, family courts, probation departments, or other. For school-related cases, the alternative was the loss of learning time due to suspensions or expulsions. A common observation among pro-


The youth in our county have shown an increased understanding of the law, why the law is in place and the consequences for breaking these laws. They have worked together to find solutions to juvenile crime and restoration concepts. These concepts help to instill empathy,



compassion and justice principles to teens. [Eureka, CA]

gram coordinators was that, by entering the system in a more formal way, via juvenile courts, youth risk remaining in the system and carrying the label of offender, or become lost in an overburdened system as is the case with some of the larger states and experiencing no consequences for his or her offense. Seven percent of the respondents considered that the delinquent behavior would go unpunished (“no consequences”), mostly due to the backlog in the juvenile courts and the courts’ focus on the more severe cases.

Figure 7: Alternatives to youth courts



* Includes criminal court, family court, or programs other than probation or community service

According to Scott Peterson, from OJJDP, there is a substantial need in the juvenile justice system to provide alternative sentencing options that sanction the juvenile offender while allowing for that young person to be held accountable in a constructive manner to him/herself and to the community. A model, graduated sanctions system combines treatment and rehabilitation with reasonable, fair, and appropriate sanctions, and offers a continuum of care consisting of



diverse programs. The continuum includes immediate sanctions with the community for first time, nonviolent offenders. The youth court intervention ensures that both needs—immediate sanctions and personal accountability—are satisfied.²⁶

Providing Youth with Educational and Civic Opportunities

A review of the comments from study participants highlights a shared concern with youth education and civic development, as a complement to the intervention focus of more traditional juvenile justice programs. A theme that weaves through the coordinators' comments is that youth courts provide youth offenders with an opportunity to learn that their actions have consequences, while limiting the damage to their future, since by successfully completing the program most youth courts will dismiss the young person's case or the youth may request that their juvenile record be sealed or expunged. The programs also offer opportunities for youth, both offenders and volunteers, to learn about the law, the juvenile justice system, and the responsibilities of a citizen in a democratic society, while developing skills in public speaking, leadership, and mediation.


As one coordinator in Asheboro, NC, observed, the program functions as prevention even for youth volunteers by giving them the “opportunity to learn appropriate behaviors

and be good law abiding citizens.” The goal of the program, explained another coordinator in New Ulm, MN, is “to educate the community’s youth,” helping “youth volunteers and youth offenders to gain respect for the legal system . . . through hands-on experience.” An unintended but positive consequence of the program is that “youth who do not have special athletic or academic skills” are given an opportunity to be leaders and increase their self-confidence through volunteer work in the program [Kissimmee, FL].

Study participants were asked to rate five factors that characterize youth court programming and might work as prevention to offending behavior among youth. As seen in Figure 8, more than 90% of the study participants “agreed” or “strongly agreed” that positive peer pressure, a better understanding of the law, and increasing knowledge of the responsibilities inherent to citizenship, were characteristics of the youth court process most strongly related to recidivism prevention. About 80% of the coordinators also emphasized the role of youth courts in providing a safe place where youth offenders can share their thoughts and feelings, and the fact that youth courts prevent the offenders from gaining a label as criminal and coming in contact with more hard core offenders.

The teens have given thousands of hours of community service to local non-profit agencies, elderly in the community and assisted with community special events. This experience allows the youth the opportunity to be held accountable, but also they feel the rewards of giving back to the community. [Deadwood, SD]

Figure 8: Youth courts' characteristics contributing to future social behavior among youth offenders



Learning by doing and preventing anti-social behavior through positive role modeling and community service are two essential characteristics of youth court, as indicated in this study. Indeed, if negative peer pressure can induce adolescents to anti-social behavior,²⁷ the exposure to peers in positions of leadership who model positive behaviors provide the young offender with a new perspective about their role in society, and a peer support group for times of need. Furthermore, for youth raised in environments characterized



by violence and/or neglect,²⁸ better understandings of the law and of accepted behaviors, together with increased knowledge of the responsibilities inherent to citizenship are essential types of information to which they may have never been exposed.

Helping Communities

The benefits of youth courts extend beyond the youth who participate in the process and reach to parents and community members. For parents, their involvement with the process provides a chance to re-engage in a dialogue with their children and learn positive ways to help their children avoid anti-social behaviors. As a coordinator observed, “I have heard many comments from parents and teens that youth court has turned their life around.” [Bloomfield, NM]

Communities also benefit from the program in two ways: (a) directly, through the services that the youth offenders provide as part of their sanctions; services include cleaning up places they have vandalized, volunteering in nursing homes, etc; and (b) indirectly, through the expanded opportunities offered to youth to volunteer and learn.

A coordinator from a Pennsylvania program emphasized this broad reach of youth courts

Because of funding issues this year, we have spent so much time raising funds and generating support from politicians that the program itself has suffered. Our referrals have gone down. Usually we have 200-250 youth processed a year, this year we had 100. We had less time to focus on volunteer training so the quality of volunteers is different. [Green Bay, WI].



The youth participating in our program, both respondents and volunteers agree

that the youth court program encourages positive peer pressure. Youth learn from their mistakes and learn about the law that affects juveniles daily. Public speaking skills, court procedures, and preparation are skills that are stressed in the program. Many young participants have expressed their interest in furthering their education in the law field. [Pottstown, PA]

explaining that in her program, “500 students are trained as attorneys and jurors yearly, [and] local Boy Scout and Girl Scout groups have come in to serve on a jury to receive their legal badges.”

As reported in a recent AYPF publication, “The evidence shaping America’s civic future highlights three major areas of concern—the knowledge, skills, and dispositions (attitudes) of our youth.”²⁹ Youth courts combine community service (service activities performed for community betterment)

with service learning (a teaching methodology that links learning to service to academic curriculum), thus offering communities with a fertile ground for civic engagement.

Program Sustainability

Program sustainability was a concern shared by program coordinators in this study. “Funding for youth courts continue to be the most pressing issues [we face] from one year to another,” explained a coordinator from a program in Maryland. It appears that funding for preventive programs is less available than funding for “reactive programs.”[La Crosse, WI] Although many states provide grants for youth courts, the grant process can be cumbersome for programs that may have no more than one part-time paid staff. “We wish we had a full time staff to address the serious issues [lack of funding] in a more systematic manner.”[Sulphur Springs, TX]

A program in South Dakota was able to establish significant relationships with the community, “the city and county support [us] by allowing law enforcement officers to flex their time to work with the program; several civic organizations in our area support the program through cash donations and members volunteering with us.” Yet, establishing these relationships is also time-consuming.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement (CIRCLE) released a report in 2003 entitled *The Civic Mission of Schools*, which defined guidelines for programs aiming to help youth acquire skills, knowledge and attitudes that prepare them to be competent and responsible citizens. According to the CIRCLE report, competent and responsible citizens must: (1) be informed and thoughtful, (2) participate in their communities, (3) act politically, and (4) have moral and civic virtues.³⁰ Through its focus on education and positive development, youth courts are promoting competent and responsible citizens who are at the foundation of a successful democratic society.

Facing decisions about limited resources and ever growing needs, policymakers may be interested in three basic questions regarding youth courts:

- *Are they cost effective?* Concurring with the Urban Institute, this study suggests that youth courts are cost effective programs. They are serving an estimated 110,000 to 125,000 youth offenders across the nation each year, while offering hands-on leadership and citizenship training for more than 100,000 youth volunteers. Furthermore, they are diverting about 9% of the juvenile arrests that would otherwise have to be handled by the traditional court system, already overburdened with more severe cases. All this, on an average budget of less than \$50,000., seems reasonably cost effective for jurisdictions.
- *Are they successful?* This study suggests that youth courts provide benefits that extend beyond the youth offender, to embrace their families, the youth volunteers, and the community. The program ensures that youth offenders assume responsibility for, and deal with the consequences of their acts. Youth courts offer youth a safe place to serve and learn, and opportunities

to develop pro-social leadership skills. They provide youth offenders and volunteers with foundations for competent and responsible citizenship, and help families and communities to assume responsibility for their young people's behavior while creating a network of support (in other words, building social capital).

- *Are they viable?* With more than 1,000 programs across the nation, in urban and rural areas, small and large communities, youth courts have become an integral part of the country's network for prevention and early intervention of juvenile crime. Yet, programs need funding to survive. As a program coordinator explained, "Federal and state recognition of the importance of youth courts by helping to find sustainable funding would be a great step in the building of youth court programs nationally."

Recommendations

- *For policymakers:* Championing local and statewide youth court programs can increase visibility and support within the community. Increasing funding and facilitating access to funds by simplifying the funding process are two important steps on strengthening communities'

resources to address delinquency prevention and early intervention.

- *For researchers:* A next step for this study is to build on NYCC’s work toward defining best practices by employing rigorous research design in comparative cross-program analyses; comparative analyses are also needed to understand issues related to program completion and recidivism.
- *For program coordinators:* The effective use NYCC professional development and technical assistance resources is essential to promote high quality, successful programs. In addition, the NYCC network is an important resource for ideas on program sustainability.
- *For communities:* Supporting youth courts may be a cost effective way to provide young people with opportunities for civic engagement, while providing immediate response to juvenile offending behavior.

A Path to Civic Engagement

The youth court initiative leans on youth to become civic-minded. The program holds offenders accountable for their actions, placing their peers in control of the disposi-

tional process, building competency through training and exposure to courtroom procedures, and repairing harm done to the victims of juvenile crime. While building ties with the community, the program offers both offenders and youth volunteers opportunities to exercise and increase important life skills such as decision-making, problem-solving, listening, and communicating. As a community-based and community-operated program, youth court addresses the immediate needs of the youth involved in the program as they learn and practice stewardship of the community.

By fostering a culture of service, citizenship, and responsibility, existing youth court programs have already helped many young people understand the justice system and prevent and reduce crime in their communities. All this is achieved almost entirely through volunteer work. To strengthen this pathway to civic engagement for youth and communities—citizens and policymakers could champion the program at the local, state and federal levels, offering not only support and resources through funding, but their own personal involvement as well.

REFERENCES

- Asher, S. & Coie, J. (eds.). *Peer rejection in childhood*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Butts, J.S. & Buck, J. (October 2000). Teen courts: A focus on research. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*.
- Butts, J.S., Buck, J., & Coggeshall, M.B. (2002). *The impact of teen court on young offenders*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, Justice Policy Center.
- Boston, B.O. (2005). *Restoring the balance between academics and civic engagement in public schools*. Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum and Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development
- Cohen, M. (1998). The monetary value of saving a high-risk youth. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 14(1) 5–33.
- Godwin, T.M. (Spring/Summer 2003). A national overview of youth courts. *In Session*, 3 (2):3.
- Godwin, T.M., Heward, M.E. & Spina, T., Jr. (2000). *National youth court guidelines*, available at <http://www.youthcourt.net/publications/guidelines.pdf>.
- Godwin, T.M., Steinhart, D.J., & Fulton, B.A. (1998). *Peer justice and youth empowerment: An implementation guide for teen court programs*. Revised. Available at <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/publications/peerjustice.html>.
- Heward, M. (Winter 2002). The organization and operation of teen courts in the United States: A comparative analysis of legislation. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 19-35.
- Kupersmidt, J., Coie, J., & Dodge, K. (1990). The role of poor peer relations in the development of disorder, pp. 274-305, in Asher, S. & Coie, J. (eds.). *Peer Rejection in Childhood*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press
- Miller, T.R., Fisher, D.A., & Cohen, M.A. (2001). Costs of juvenile violence: policy implications. *Pediatrics*, 107(1), p.e3. Retrieved February 25, 2005 at <http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/cgi/content/abstract/107/1/e3>.
- O'Donnell, C. (2003). *Culture, peers, and delinquency*. New York, NY: Haworth Press.
- Patterson, G., DeBaryshe, B. & Ramsey, E. (1989). A developmental perspective on antisocial behavior. *American Psychologist*, 44, (2): 328-335.
- Pearson, S. S. (September 2003). Youth court: A path to civic engagement. *Policy Brief*, National Youth Court Center.

APPENDIX A: STUDY METHODOLOGY

Description: The study was based on a feedback form mailed to youth courts in November 2004. AYPF developed the feedback form in consultation with the National Youth Court Center (NYCC) and the Office of Juvenile Justice Programs (OJJDP), Demonstration Division. The form consisted of a front page with explanations about the study, the organization conducting the study, and directions on how to respond to the questions. The back page contained the questionnaire. As requested by the sponsoring organizations, the feedback form was kept small with only three main questions that could be answered in less than 10 minutes.

Question 1 collected data on program's participation and outcomes. Program coordinators were asked to look at data from the previous fiscal year (October 2003–2004) and provide numbers for juvenile arrests in the jurisdiction, youth served in the program, youth completing the sanctions successfully, those returning to the program as volunteers, and overall numbers of volunteers in the program. *Question 2* focused on the role of youth courts within the broader system of juvenile justice, and asked program coordinators about the alternatives for the youth offender if the program did not exist. For *Question 3*, program coordinators were asked to rate the factors contributing to youth court's outcomes using a 5-point Likert scale and five options: (1) positive peer pressure, (2) increased understanding of the law, (3) opportunities to discuss thoughts and feelings, (4) protecting youth from being labeled criminal and interacting with hard core offenders, and (5) increased knowledge of citizenship's responsibilities. A sixth option

(youth courts have no positive impact on youth) was offered with the dual purpose of providing the respondents with an opportunity to vent their opposition to youth courts and checking for level of attention, as this option contradicted the other five and could not receive the same rate. Only one respondent rated five in all options and therefore, the response was not counted in the analysis. Respondents were also encouraged to make comments using space left at the front page, and 104 respondents (30%) used this option. A copy of the study document is included at the end of this appendix.

Method: The feedback form was mailed to youth court programs registered with the NYCC database and addressed to the program coordinator. A self-addressed stamped enveloped was included in the mailing to expedite responses. After two weeks from the initial mailing, messages were placed at the NYCC web site calling attention to the study and encouraging program coordinators to participate. The OJJDP Demonstration Division also sent reminders to the diverse jurisdictions. Another two-week interval was given before the programs were contacted a second time via e-mail or telephone. The process from the first mailing wave, the reminders via sponsoring organizations, and the second wave of reminders took approximately 40 days to accommodate for the holidays. Data on agencies operating the programs, model of youth court, years of operation, types of offenses served, and budget were obtained directly from the NYCC database.

Statistics: The feedback form was mailed to 927 programs. Of these, 24 (2.6%) were

returned for wrong address or program closure. Of the 903 sites with live addresses, 365 participated in the study for a response rate of 40.4%. The study's margin of error is $\pm 3.96\%$ for a confidence interval of 95%. This means that there is a 95% probability that the responses from the sample fall within ± 3.96 percentage points of the true population of youth courts.

A randomly selected sample of non-respondents was surveyed to assess the differences between the two population sub-groups (respondents and non-respondents). To organize the sample, every 23rd program in a list of non-respondents was contacted via telephone. The number 23 was an arbitrary number corresponding to the square root of the total non-respondent group. Program coordinators were asked the numbers of youth served, numbers of youth completing successfully their sanctions, and options for the youth in case the program did not exist. Responses from this sample were compared to respondents and no statistically significant differences were found. The assumption that the respondent sample was representative of the overall population was proved correct, thus reinforcing generalization of findings within the study's margin of error.

An analysis of response rates per item was also conducted. In Question 1, only half of the respondents (54.2%) provided information on numbers of juvenile arrests and 70% indicated the numbers of youth returning to the program as volunteers, while a 90% or better response rate was obtained for the items related to numbers of juvenile served, completing sanctions successfully and overall numbers of program volunteers. All respondents addressed Question 2 for a total

of 398 answers, as programs could indicate more than one option. Response rate for Question 3 was 98% per item. No statistical adjustments were made for non-responses. A description of participants is provided in the body of the report.

Limitations of the study: The study was proposed as an overview, or "snapshot" of youth courts nationwide rather than an in-depth description of the program's activities and outcomes. Therefore, in *Question 1*, program coordinators were welcomed to provide estimated numbers of arrests and program participation, and were not requested to show evidence for their responses. In five cases, the coordinators mentioned that numbers were from October 2002-2003, rather than October 2003-2004 as requested, and these answers were included in the analysis. Three coordinators mentioned that the programs had opened recently and they were just receiving their first cases; so, no outcomes could be provided. Budget information was based on data from the NYCC, which is about two years old. A five percent increase a year was estimated to obtain more actual numbers. The estimated is probably higher than reality, since not all programs received increases. Indeed, a number of programs indicated cuts in budgets that were not included in the calculation.

Findings in this study must be seen as an initial step in understanding the diversity of youth courts and their role within the juvenile justice system. It updates and broadens the information obtained by Butts, Bucks and Coggeshall (2002), and provides a voice to a diversity of youth court programs across the nation.

SURVEY/FEEDBACK SAMPLE



FEEDBACK ON YOUTH COURT/ TEEN COURT/PEER JURY

Conducted by the American Youth Policy Forum—
www.aypf.org

Please return by November 23, 2004

November 2004,

Dear Program Coordinator,

What is the impact of youth courts/teen courts/peer juries on youth in your community?

American Youth Policy Forum is an educational non-profit based in Washington, DC that provides nonpartisan learning events and publications to policymakers to help them stay on top of current issues affecting youth policy. We are engaged in a nationwide effort to gather current feedback on the question above to share in a report to national, state, and local policymakers to bring them up to speed with what is happening in the field. The purpose of the report is to provide a better understanding of the possible benefits of this program to our nation's young people. When completed in early 2005, the report will be distributed to policymakers and appear on the American Youth Policy Forum and National Youth Court Center websites, and possibly others.

Your participation in providing feedback is important. For the most accurate information possible, we ask that this feedback form be completed by the project coordinator or administrator. A return envelope has been provided for you, or just fax it to us at **202-775-9733**. Please feel free to use the space below to share your comments, experiences, or concerns regarding your program. Thank you for your time in filling out and returning this form to us.

Sarah S. Pearson
Project Director
American Youth Policy Forum—www.aypf.org

SURVEY/FEEDBACK SAMPLE



FEEDBACK ON YOUTH COURT/ TEEN COURT/PEER JURY

Conducted by the American Youth Policy Forum—
www.aypf.org

Please return by November 23, 2004

Organization, City, State, Zip _____

1. In the past 12 months (Oct 2003 – Oct 2004), or your most recent fiscal year:
 - a. How many juvenile arrests were made in your jurisdiction? _____
 - b. How many of these cases were directed or diverted to your youth court? _____
 - c. How many youth volunteered to assist in the various roles of youth court? _____
 - d. How many young offenders completed their sentence/sanction successfully? _____
 - e. How many youth returned to the program to volunteer after sanctions? _____

2. If your program did not exist, what would happen to youth offenders/respondents? [Check all that apply]
 - They would be referred to another type of juvenile justice program
 - They would be assigned community service by judge
 - Don't know
 - Other (please specify): _____

3. What aspects of youth court do you think are particularly important to help youth offenders maintain law-abiding behavior in the future? (Please check the option that best expresses your opinion)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. Positive peer pressure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Increased understanding of law	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. An opportunity to discuss their thoughts and feelings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Avoiding being labeled a criminal and interacting with hard core offenders	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Increased knowledge of the responsibilities of being a citizen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Youth courts offer no opportunities for youth to learn law-abiding behaviors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

THANK YOU

ENDNOTES

¹ Butts, Buck, & Coggeshall, (2002), p. 34.

² Godwin (spring/summer 2003), p. 3; and Butts & Buck (October 2000), p.2.

³ Godwin, op. cit.

⁴ Butts, Buck, & Coggeshall, (2002), p.2.

⁵ This review is based on 903 programs with confirmed address at the NYCC database by November 2004; for more information, see Appendix A.

⁶ A Standard Error of the Mean (SEM) rather than standard deviation is being used as the population does not have a normal distribution.

⁷ Butts, Buck & Coggeshall, *ibid*, p.2.

⁸ One estimate used the data provided by study participants, and multiplied the mean number of youth served per program (114±10.5) by the actual number of existing programs. Estimates are 117,990 or, using a 95% confidence interval, from 96,255 to 139,725. Another estimate updates the numbers provided in the Urban Institute study (if 800 programs were handling 100,000, 1,000 programs will be handling 125,000. The totals were rounded to the lowest thousand. The estimates make two important assumptions: (a) The sample is representative of the universe of programs in the 2004 NYCC database, and (b) The programs entered in the NYCC database after October 2004 are similar in size to the programs in the 2004 list.

⁹ The hypothesis that low response rate for this question reflected access (or lack of access) to information on arrests was tested using a simple Chi Square test for “reporting” vs. “not reporting” the information according operating agency. Results were statistically significant ($\chi^2= 26.299$; $df=8$; $p<. 001$), meaning that reporting arrest data is strongly related to type of operating agency. Programs operated by agencies in the juvenile justice system are more likely to provide information on arrests than school-based, community-based or local government agencies. For instance, 86% of court-managed programs reported data on arrests, compared to 36% of school-managed programs.

¹⁰ Pearson Correlation for number of arrests in jurisdiction and number of youth served in the program was $r(190) = .534$, $p<.01$.

¹¹ *OJJDP Statistical Briefing Book*. Online. Retrieved February 25, 2005 at <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/crime/qa05101.asp?qaDate=20040801> and <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/ojstatbb/court/qa06201.asp?qaDate=20030811>

¹² Mullins (spring/summer 2003).

¹³ Pearson Correlation for number of youth volunteers and number of youth served was: $r(313) = .226$, $p<.01$ and for number of youth volunteers and number of juvenile arrests in the jurisdiction was $r(190) = .534$, $p<.01$.

¹⁴ According to Godwin Mullins, op. cit., in 2002, 11% of the programs offered volunteer training as part of a class during school hours.

¹⁵ Heward, M. (Winter 2002), p.19

¹⁶ National Youth Court Center, unpublished report dated January 12, 2005.

¹⁷ Goodwin, Heward & Spina (2000).

¹⁸ Godwin, Steinhart, & Fulton (1998).

¹⁹ See Endnote 17.

²⁰ See Butts & Buck (October 2002), p.6.

²¹ $\chi^2= 32.723$; $df=16$; $p<. 01$

²² Butts, Buck, & Coggeshall, (2002), p. 26-28).

²³ According to the NYCC, 2002 average budget was \$40,059.76 (NYCC, *ibid*)

²⁴ Using SEM and for a 95% confidence interval, estimations vary from \$362 to \$526 per youth served (114±10.5), and from \$395 to \$612 per youth completing sentence successfully (112±11.9).

²⁵ Miller, Fisher & Cohen (2001); Cohen (1998).

²⁶ Scott Peterson, Demonstration Programs Division, Program Manager; personal communication, 3/7/2005.

²⁷ See, for instance, Kupersmidt, Coie & Dodge (1990); O'Donnell (2003).

²⁸ See, for instance, Patterson, DeBaryshe, & Ramsey (1989); Bandura (1986).

²⁹ Boston, B. *Restoring the Balance Between Academics and Civic Engagement in Public Schools* (2005), p.10.

³⁰ Available on www.civicyouth.org

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Sarah S. Pearson oversees a variety of AYPF events, including organizing roundtable discussions on youth policy issues and writing policy briefs. She is connected with leaders, researchers, and practitioners in service-learning, juvenile justice and education reform, and has served as a peer reviewer for programs under the Corporation for National and Community Service, U.S. Department of Education, and the National Youth Employment Coalition. Sarah served as the Board President, National and Community Service Coalition (2002-2004). Before joining AYPF, she worked with the National Center on Education and the Economy focusing on standards-driven curriculum and the National Center's school reform model, America's Choice. Sarah recently co-edited a national report, *Restoring the Balance Between Academics and Civic Engagement in Public Schools* (2005). She is the author of *In Service to Our Nation: A Guide to Members of the National and Community Service Coalition* (2004),

Finding Common Ground: Service-Learning and Education Reform (2002), *Leveling the Playing Field: Technology as an Equalizer in Education, Transition to Careers, and Daily Life* (2001) and co-author of *Building an Effective Citizenry* (2003). Sarah received a B.A. from Marymount University and M.Ed. from the University of Virginia.

Sonia Jurich served as Senior Research Advisor to AYPF for many years and co-authored three AYPF publications: *More Things That Do Make a Difference for Youth, Raising Academic Achievement* (1999), and *Raising Minority Academic Achievement* (2001). An MD with a specialization in community psychiatry, she held professorships at Catholic and Federal Universities in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. She also has a Doctor in Education Degree from The George Washington University with a focus on special needs populations. She is currently a Research Associate at RMC Research Corporation, Arlington, VA.

AMERICAN YOUTH POLICY FORUM PUBLICATIONS

Following is a sampling of American Youth Policy Forum publications. Prepaid orders only, please. Price includes shipping and handling in the contiguous United States. Send orders to: American Youth Policy Forum, 1836 Jefferson Place, NW, Washington, DC 20036. Call (202) 775-9731 for rates on bulk orders. Please also see our website for additional and on-line publications: www.aypf.org

Building an Effective Citizenry: Lessons Learned from Initiatives in Youth Engagement

This report shares lessons learned about the development of civic engagement among youth. Researchers, program leaders and youth present recommendations regarding efforts to engage youth in education reform, service-learning and community activism. Youth Court is featured as one promising program.

2003, 32 pages \$5

Do You Know the GOOD NEWS About American Education?

This booklet highlights major improvements in American public education since the early 1980s. Solid evidence is presented in a straightforward way that can dispel widely-held misconceptions about public schools. Also, honestly addresses the work that remains to be done in schools to achieve academic excellence for all. (Co-published with the Center for Education Policy).

32 pages \$2

Essentials of High School Reform: New Forms of Assessment and Contextual Teaching and Learning

Research shows that we learn in a variety of ways and that when new information is set in a familiar context or applied to actual problem solving, the learning process is more successful. This report reviews the close connection between contextual teaching and learning and alternative assessments. Policy recommendations and practical advice are provided on how to structure this connection.

2003, 87 pages \$5

Finance and Resource Issues in High School Reform

A summary of discussions with secondary education policymakers and practitioners on issues related to the financing and resources needed to support comprehensive high school reform. This report provides a realistic view of many of the challenges facing

school leaders and policymakers as they implement standards-based reform with tight budgets, as well as some strategies to use existing resources more effectively and intentionally.

2003, 27 pages \$5

***Finding Common Ground: Service-Learning and Education Reform*, by Sarah Pearson**

Reveals areas of compatibility between leading Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) programs and key elements of service-learning. Report reveals most CSR models provide opportunities for students to apply their knowledge and skills to real-life situations, address local community issues and interests, and develop civic skills and competencies.

137 pages \$10

Finding Fortune in Thirteen Out-of-School-Time Programs

Evaluation summaries of out-of-school-time programs profiled within this report make the compelling case that out-of-school-time programs improve outcomes in academic achievement. The 13 program evaluations were chosen because they meet rigorous research standards and share innovative strategies to engage young people.

2003, 72 pages Available only online at www.aypf.org

***Guide to the Powerless—and Those Who Don't Know Their Own Power*, by Samuel Halperin**

Acquire essential political skills to engage both elected and appointed officials at all levels of government. This guide is a perfect introduction to effective citizenship for community leaders, educators, students, youth workers and other human service providers. Recommended by policymakers.

60 pages \$5

High Schools of the Millennium: A Report of the Workgroup

This report argues for a new vision of high school, one that uses all the resources of the community to create smaller learning environments, to engage youth in their striving for high academic achievement, to support them with mentors and role models, and to provide them with opportunities to develop their civic, social, and career skills.

50 pages **only available online**

Looking Forward: School-to-Work Principles and Strategies for Sustainability

This report offers Ten Essential Principles to assist policymakers, practitioners, and the community to sustain successful school-to-work approaches. These principles represent a distillation of critical elements of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act used by the field in: improving the school experience for young people; expanding and improving work-based learning opportunities; and building and sustaining public/private partnerships. The report identifies a variety of federal legislation and national programs that could support these gains.

52 pages **\$4**

MORE Things That DO Make a Difference for Youth, Vol. II, Donna Walker James, editor

A compendium of more evaluations of youth programs. Summarizes 64 evaluations of career academies, school-to-work, Tech Prep, school reform, juvenile justice and related areas of youth policy.

194 pages **\$10**

No More Islands: Family Involvement in 27 School and Youth Programs

Given the importance of families to a variety of positive youth outcomes and the emphasis placed on family involvement in federal law, young people should not be treated as “islands” by school and youth programs, separate from the context of their families. No Child Left Behind, the Workforce Investment Act and other federal laws now require family involvement in both school and youth programs. This report reveals the benefits achieved when families are actively engaged in their children’s learning.

2003, 152 pages **\$8**

Raising Minority Academic Achievement: A Compendium of Educational Programs and Practices, Donna Walker James, editor

An accessible resource for policymakers and practitioners interested in improving the academic success of racial and ethnic minorities from early childhood through postsecondary study. The report provides strategies used in successful programs and recommendations to the field. Includes summaries of evaluations of 38 school and youth programs with data on minority academic achievement.

206 pages **\$10**

Rigor and Relevance: A New Vision for Career and Technical Education

A white paper developed to help inform discussion of the reauthorization of the Carl Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act. Presents a new vision of how federal funding for career and technical education should be used.

2003, 24 pages **\$5**

Shaping the Future of America’s Youth: Youth Policy in the 21st Century

This youth policy retrospective also provides visions for the future from leaders in high school reform, civic and youth development, and career preparation. Featured leaders include: Roberts Schwartz, Harvard Graduate School of Education; Hilary Pennington, CEO and vice chair of Jobs for the Future; Dorothy Stoneman, president of YouthBuild USA; and Alan Khazei and Michael Brown, co-founders of City Year.

2003, 76 pages **\$8**

Some Things DO Make a Difference for Youth: A Compendium of Evaluations of Youth Programs and Practices, Donna Walker James, editor

This guide summarizes 69 evaluations of youth interventions involving education, employment and training, mentoring, service-learning and youth development. Suggests effective strategies for supporting our nation’s youth, particularly disadvantaged young people.

196 pages **\$10**

The Forgotten Half Revisited: American Youth and Young Families, 1988-2008, by Samuel Halperin, editor

A ten-year update of the report of the William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship. Includes essays and the latest data on a range

of topics—employment, youth and community development, school reform, higher education, service—by a number of the nation’s leading scholars and youth policy advocates. Essayists include: Thomas Bailey (Teachers College, Columbia University), Martin Blank (Institute for Educational Leadership), Carol Emig (Child Trends), Lawrence Gladieux and Watson Scott Swail (The College Board), Samuel Halperin (American Youth Policy Forum), Harold Howe II (former U.S. Commissioner of Education), John F. Jennings and Diane Stark Rentner (Center on Education Policy), Karen Pittman (International Youth Foundation), Shirley Sagawa (The White House) and Daniel Yankelovich (Public Agenda).

200 pages

\$15

Photography Credits

All images courtesy of the National Youth Court Center.

AMERICAN YOUTH POLICY FORUM



1836 Jefferson Place, NW

Washington, DC 20036

www.aypf.org

ISBN: 1-887031-89-8