

NEW JERSEY JDAI

Example of a “work-in-progress” Core Strategy Framework for a Case Processing Subcommittee, modified to focus on a few select components for demonstration purposes.

Committee/Subcommittee
CASE PROCESSING

A) PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

Briefly describe problem in general terms within the context of JDAI’s core strategies. Does the problem affect admissions, LOS, DMC, other aspects of detention? How? What data helped identify that this problem exists? Is more data needed to clarify the nature/extent of problem? What type of data & how will it be obtained?

Most Relevant Pathways		Summary Of Problem
<p>#5. REDUCING DELAY</p> <p>#9. SPECIAL CASES (FTAWARRANT)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lengthy case processing time for youth admitted to detention, including those who remain in detention and those released conditionally or to an Alternative. Youth admitted to detention for FTA. 	
Affects...(X)	How?	Data Used to Identify Problem
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LOS	For youth who remain in detention until disposition, LOS is directly related to case processing time; increased time to disposition leading to increased LOS.	Case processing time for Detention youth from arrest to disposition was 61 days; in turn, ALOS was 64 days.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Admissions	<p>a) For non-detained youth, lengthy case processing time increases the likelihood of FTA.</p> <p>b) For youth in Alternatives, lengthy case processing leads to longer LOS on the Alternative, which increases the likelihood of a rule violation.</p> <p>c) Both situations lead to increased detention admissions for youth without new delinquency charges.</p>	<p>a) Case processing time for Alternatives youth is 30% longer than for Detention youth (79 vs. 61 days).</p> <p>b) Alternatives ALOS is 63 days; 46% stay longer than 60 days; 18% stay longer than 90 days.</p> <p>c) Of youth released from detention conditionally or to Alternatives, 16% were readmitted for FTA or a rule violation. In 85% of these re-admissions, the FTA or rule violation occurred more than 45 days post-release.</p>

B) Specific Nature of the Problem

What does the experience of other JDAI sites, the Pathways, etc., say about what might be contributing to the problem and what does local experience say about other factors that might be at work? What data did the committee use to assess the presence of each factor in this county? After reviewing the data, what factors were determined to be at work here? What factors were ruled out? Why?

All Possible Contributing Factors (X those that are at work here)	Data & Info Used to Assess Factor
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> F1. Lack of sufficient court notification system contributes to FTAs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary notification is given verbally in court. If a notice is sent via mail, it goes out immediately following the court hearing, so there can be long lapses between the notification and the date the youth is expected in court. • Analysis of 152 cases referred to Intake for detention indicated 9.7% were for FTA only. All were detained. • Logs indicate 62.3% of Bench Warrants issued between May and July of 2005 were for FTAs.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> F2. Wait time on drug lab results for CDS dockets.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee consensus indicated this was a possible factor. • Snapshots supported this, with CDS charges having the longest case processing time from arrest to disposition. Detention youth = 98 days. Alternatives youth = 109 days.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> F3. No regular review process for non-detained youth leads to longer case processing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No case-review process for non-detained youth exists in this county. The expediting function such reviews serve for detained youth is lost for non-detained/Alternatives youth. • Case processing time for non-detained youth is 30% greater than that for detained youth.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> F4. Differential access to attorney resources can lead to longer case processing by attorney-type.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative Snapshot indicates time from arrest to disposition for youth represented by private attorneys was 71 days and by public attorneys 89 days.
<input type="checkbox"/> F5. Requests for adjournments/continuances.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No data yet-contribution of factor is unknown at this time. • Beginning June 2005 both juvenile court Judges began tracking all requests for adjournments, reasons for requests, and whether granted.

C) Solutions to the Problem

What does the experience of other JDAI sites, the Pathways, etc., say about possible solutions to the problem? Were other solutions proposed? Which factor(s) would each solution address? Which solutions did the committee agree to adopt/implement? Which did it rule out? Why? Which agencies does each solution require to take action?

All Possible Solutions (X those adopted)		Factors	Parties Involved
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S1.	Institute court notification system so notification occurs within two weeks of a scheduled court date.	F1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family Court Intake • Court Coordinators
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S2.	Change current practice of issuing detainable Bench Warrants as “default” first response to FTAs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First response to FTA will be to contact youth and family to determine reason. • Second response will be to issue a daytime (non-detainable) warrant for youth’s appearance at court. • Third response will be detainable warrant. 	F1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juvenile Judges • Court Coordinators
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expediting drug lab results so that CDS cases can be adjudicated and disposed more efficiently. • Expediting letter will be sent to the drug lab with the evidence to be tested starting. 	F2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office of the Prosecutor
<input type="checkbox"/> S4.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify the existing detention review team to include youth released to Alternatives. • Anticipated to begin with implementation of Alternatives Continuum. 	F3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-Disciplinary (All Members of Detention Review Team)

D) Tracking Implementation of Solutions

List each adopted solution and note the start date for implementation. How will you track implementation, i.e., how will you assess whether the solution/policy/practice is actually happening? Is there already a process for recording needed information? Or, is a new process needed? Who will share responsibility for recording, maintaining, reporting information? What are the timelines for reporting?

Solutions		Process for Tracking/Documenting Implementation of Solution
S#	Start Date	
S1	1/1/2006 (anticipated)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Intake Services database was developed to record and track detention-request calls. Can track Court Notification information by including all relevant fields in this new database. • Maintained by Family Court Intake in Access.
S2	9/1/2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judges arrest warrant logbook. • Maintained by Court Coordinators in Excel, records all warrants requested, reasons for request, requestor, whether granted/issued, reasons denied (if applicable). • Reported at Subcommittee meetings.
S3	10/12/2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prosecutor's logbook, maintained by Prosecutor's office in Excel. • Records dates information sent to lab, whether expediting letter accompanied that information, and date results received. • Reported at Subcommittee meetings.