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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This report summarizes the findings from an 18-month assessment of the needs of Latino youth ages 10-20 involved with the juvenile justice system and their parents in seven Pennsylvania counties: Adams, Berks, Dauphin, Lancaster, Lehigh, Philadelphia, and York. A relatively high percentage of Latino youth in these counties are in contact with the juvenile justice system. This needs assessment was conducted by the Public Health Management Corporation (PHMC) for the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency’s Disproportionate Minority Contact Subcommittee (DMC). PHMC was assisted by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) in identifying model programs and best practices in juvenile justice. The goal of this needs assessment is to identify the specific needs of Latino youth in the Pennsylvania juvenile justice system in the seven counties, including:

- Educational, employment, and housing needs;
- Need for ESL classes;
- Need for Spanish language translators and interpreters;
- Need for bilingual/bicultural staff in social service organizations, juvenile justice agencies and schools;
- Availability of orientation and other materials in Spanish;
- Existence of culturally competent alternatives to detention; and
- Special needs of immigrants, undocumented individuals, and youth who are, or who are alleged to be, gang members.

This information will be used by the DMC to develop and implement strategies to address existing needs.

Methods

The information on the needs of Latino youth in the juvenile justice system was collected using quantitative and qualitative methodologies, including informational interviews with Juvenile Probation Office and social service agency staff in each county; an internet-based survey of the Juvenile Probation Offices; 18 focus groups of Latino youth ages 10-20 involved with the juvenile justice system in each county and parents; and a review of best practices and model programs addressing disproportionate minority contact in other jurisdictions. Focus group participants were recruited from community based organizations, juvenile probation offices, and schools and were paid $30 (youths) and $50 (parents) each. Parents who participated were not necessarily related to the youths who participated. The Latino youths and
parents who participated in the focus groups self-identified as being of Cuban American, Dominican American, Mexican American, and Puerto Rican origin.

**Major Findings**

All seven counties in this study need:
- more **bilingual Juvenile Probation Officers and trained Spanish-speaking interpreters** at every point of contact with the juvenile justice system, from police to the courts;
- more **bilingual and bicultural mental health therapists and substance abuse treatment counselors** for Latino youths and families involved with the juvenile justice system;
- **high quality translations** of more JPO documents into Spanish;
- **objective instruments which assess risk and screen** for mental health and substance abuse problems and which are consistent across the counties;
- high quality **cultural diversity and competency training** at every point in the juvenile justice system, from police to the court system;
- better **access to bilingual and bicultural parenting programs** for Latino families involved in the juvenile justice system;
- better access to **extended learning opportunities before and after school** for older Latino youth involved in the juvenile justice system; and
- more **early intervention and prevention programs** that reduce violent conflict resolution and truancy for Latino youth in the juvenile justice system and their families.

Based upon these findings, the following changes in programs and policies are recommended for all seven counties in this study.

**Recommendations for the DMC Subcommittee**

**Bilingual Services**
- Recruit more bilingual/bicultural Juvenile Probation Officers in all seven counties;
- Translate more official documents and brochures used in the JPOs in all seven counties into Spanish at a reading level consistent with literacy levels for youths involved with the juvenile justice system and their families and which reflect regional variations in the Spanish language;
- Continue to support the use of objective instruments, such as the MAYS1-2, DAI, and YLS that assess risk and mental health and substance abuse issues consistently across all seven counties;
- Recruit more bilingual/bicultural mental health and substance abuse treatment therapists in all seven counties;
• Insure that service providers who contract with JPOs provide programs available in Spanish in all seven counties;
• Create in each county a Spanish language video similar to the one being developed in Berks County which explains JPO procedures and the juvenile court system and can be played in JPO waiting rooms; and
• Hire more court interpreters in each county.

Training
• Provide JPO staff, court staff, and police in all seven counties with high quality, regular cultural competency and diversity training which is specific to different minority cultures, including Latino culture; and
• Continue to educate police in all seven counties on available diversionary programs, with programs such as the Philadelphia Minority Youth/Law Enforcement Curriculum, and to educate minority youth through programs like the Harrisburg Middle School DMC Curriculum.

Prevention
• Improve face-to-face communication between parents of Latino youth at risk for being involved in the juvenile justice system and school personnel to discuss truancy problems in all seven counties;
• Develop bilingual outreach programs in all seven counties for parents of Latino youth at risk for involvement in the juvenile justice system to provide information on bilingual parenting resources;
• Support bilingual programs in all seven counties for parents of Latino youth at risk for involvement in the juvenile justice system that address delinquency prevention and intervention techniques for parents;
• Partner with local educational agencies in all seven counties to develop programs which teach non-violent dispute resolution for Latino youths at risk for involvement in the juvenile justice system and their parents;
• Re-examine the effectiveness of “twilight schools” in all seven counties and develop alternatives, if necessary; and
• Examine the process of re-entry into the appropriate school for the juvenile in all seven counties and eliminate factors that contribute to gaps in school attendance.

Outreach
• Partner with Latino service organizations in communities in all seven counties and/or Latino leaders in an effort to reduce Latino disproportionate minority contact; and
• Coordinate efforts to reduce disproportionate minority contact with the schools, community organizations, social service providers, the police, the courts, and efforts funded by the MacArthur Foundation.

Based upon the findings of this study and recommendations of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, the following next steps are recommended,
using the existing structure of the DMC Subcommittee to address the following issues in the seven counties.

**Next Steps**

- Develop a cultural competency plan in each of the seven counties and appoint a cultural competency coordinator to insure that all the recommendations are implemented;
- Use the findings from the needs assessment to guide effective strategies for working with Latino youth involved in the juvenile justice system and their families in all seven counties;
- Examine the effectiveness of referrals to related systems (education, foster care, mental health services, etc.) and develop objective assessment tools which are consistent across all counties if they do not exist;
- Examine the policies, processes, and decision making points along the entire continuum in all seven counties to see if there are disparities specific to Latino youth that impact their progression through the system (e.g., cultural barriers for parents, lack of legal representation, missed diversion opportunities, etc.);
- Address the lack of bilingual representation in juvenile justice programs in all seven counties. Increase the diversity of staff (hiring, training, community awareness) in the juvenile justice system in all seven counties by developing a strategy for recruiting, hiring, and training more Latino or bicultural Spanish-speaking advocates or staff;
- Integrate culturally appropriate strategies, including integrating family approaches, addressing cultural identity issues, and having a solid understanding of immigrant experiences;
- Increase community awareness among juvenile justice personnel to improve their understanding of community resources, dynamics, and politics;
- Increase the number of community programs that assist Latino youth in the juvenile justice system and upon release; and
- Increase collaboration with local stakeholders and develop partnerships between CBOs and the juvenile justice system.
INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the findings from an 18-month assessment of the needs of Latino youth ages 10-20 involved with the juvenile justice system and their families in seven Pennsylvania counties: Adams, Berks, Dauphin, Lancaster, Lehigh, Philadelphia, and York. A relatively high percentage of Latino youth in these counties are represented in the juvenile justice system. The disproportionate minority contact requirement of the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 2002 encourages states to improve juvenile delinquency prevention efforts and to reduce the disproportionate number of juvenile members of minority groups in the system.

This needs assessment was conducted by the Public Health Management Corporation (PHMC) and the National council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) for the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency’s Disproportionate Minority Contact Subcommittee (DMC). The goal of this assessment is to identify the specific needs of Latino youth in the Pennsylvania juvenile justice system in the seven counties, including:

- Educational, employment, and housing needs;
- Need for ESL classes;
- Need for Spanish language translators and interpreters;
- Need for bilingual/bicultural staff in social service organizations, juvenile justice agencies and schools;
- Availability of orientation and other materials in Spanish;
- Existence of culturally competent alternatives to detention; and
- Special needs of immigrants, undocumented individuals, and youth who are, or who are alleged to be, gang members.

Latinos are the fastest-growing racial/ethnic group in the United States and are already the largest racial/ethnic youth population in the country. According to the U.S. Census Bureau the number of Latino juveniles in the United States will increase by almost 60% by 2020. Not surprisingly, there are a growing number of Latino youth in the juvenile justice system and this trend is unlikely to change without intervention.

A close examination of the national data shows that Latino youth are increasingly the subject of unequal treatment within the U.S. criminal justice system (Hartney and Silvan, 2007). They are over represented at every stage along the juvenile justice continuum from arrest to incarceration. Nationally, Latino youth serve more time, an average of 305 days compared to an average of 193 days for white youth (Villaruel, 2002). Addressing the problem is complex, as there are underlying factors that contribute to disproportionate minority contact. In the juvenile justice system, offender and criminal labeling, racial/ethnic bias and attribution, insufficient diversion options, barriers to
parental advocacy due to language barriers, educational barriers and poor system/community integration contribute to their overrepresentation.

These system-level factors are further compounded by socioeconomic conditions, family factors, and educational system issues. Poor socioeconomic conditions include low-income jobs, lack of opportunity for upward mobility, few job opportunities, urban density/high crime rates, few community support services, and inadequate health and welfare resources. Family factors shown to contribute to minority overrepresentation include economic stress, limited supervision, and a high percentage of single parent homes (although Latino families usually have two parent households). Inadequate educational systems issues are evidenced by a lack of early childhood education and prevention programs, the high number of early dropouts, a lack of culturally responsive education and poor education quality overall. In addition, a lack of cultural role models is problematic considering the influence peers and positive adults have during adolescence (Devine, Coolbaugh, & Jenkins, 1998).

The methods used to collect information for the assessment are described below, followed by a section summarizing Findings for the seven county areas as a whole and for each county individually. The Findings are followed by a description of model programs and best practices that reduce disproportionate contacts with Latino youth, and a concluding section.

**METHODS**

Information on the need of Latino youth ages 10-20 in the juvenile justice system in each county and their families was collected using four different methods:

- 15 informational interviews with Juvenile Probation Office staff and social service agency staff,
- an internet-based survey of the Juvenile Probation Offices;
- seven focus groups of parents and eleven focus groups of Latino youth involved with the juvenile justice system; and
- a review of best practices and model programs addressing disproportionate minority contact in other jurisdictions.

**Informational Interviews**

Information interviews were guided using different written questions for probation office and social services agency staff (Please see Appendix A for copies of the Interview Guides). Question topic areas for the informational interviews included:

- Availability of bilingual services in the probation office;
- Availability of bilingual social, medical, and mental health services;
- Juvenile probation office prevention and intervention services;
- Causes of disproportionate minority contact for Latino youth; and
• Suggestions for prevention and intervention services.

The interviews lasted from one to one and one-half hours and were conducted in person and by telephone by PHMC staff. In several cases more than one staff person from each probation office or social service agency was interviewed (Please see Appendix B for a list of key informants.)

**Juvenile Probation Office Survey**

In addition to the informational interviews, each juvenile probation office also participated in an internet-based survey that collected additional information on the availability of bilingual services in the probation office and on local juvenile justice system programs for Latino youth.

**Focus Groups**

Eleven focus groups of Latino youth involved in the juvenile justice system and seven groups of parents of Latino youth were conducted in the seven counties, as show in Table 1, in Appendix C.

• **Methodology**

The focus groups were led by trained facilitators in either Spanish or English, as preferred by the participants. Three bilingual, bicultural facilitators (Cuban American, Mexican American, and Puerto Rican) were used for all of the parent groups and for the majority of youth groups. The focus groups lasted from 60 to 90 minutes and were guided by separate sets of written questions for parents and youth (Please see Appendix A for copies of the Focus Group Guides). The topic areas included:

• Need for bilingual/bicultural services in the juvenile justice and social services systems;
• Need for programs and services that might prevent juvenile delinquency; and
• Causes of disproportionate minority contact for Latino youth.

A total of 138 Latino individuals, 55 parents and 83 youth ages 10-20, participated in the focus groups.¹ (See Table 1 in Appendix C). Focus group participants self-identified as Cuban American, Dominican American, Mexican American, and Puerto Rican and were recruited from community based organizations, juvenile probation offices, and public schools. Focus group discussions were audio taped, and the names of focus group participants and information they gave were kept confidential. Youth who participated were paid $30 and parents were paid $50 in compensation for their time and travel expenses. The socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of youth and parent focus group participants were collected in a short survey and are shown in Tables 2 and 3 in Appendix C.

---

¹ The parents and youth who participated were not necessarily related to each other.
Parent Demographic Characteristics

The parents who participated in the focus groups were predominantly female, Puerto Rican, English speaking, and in their 30s and 40s.

**Gender.** Parent focus group participants were predominantly female (83.3%).

**Ethnicity.** Nine out of ten parent focus group participants (88.9%) were Puerto Rican. Four parents were Mexican American (7.4%) and two were Dominican American (3.7%).

**Age.** More than three-quarters of parents were aged 30-49 (79.6%).

**Employment Status.** Forty-seven percent were employed, 49.1% were unemployed, and 3.6% were students.

Youth Demographic Characteristics

The youth who participated in the focus groups were a more demographically diverse group than the parents, and were more likely to speak English.

**Gender.** More than three out of four youth (79.5%) were male, reflecting the gender distribution of youth in the juvenile justice system population.

**Ethnicity.** The youth participants were more ethnically diverse than the parents: two out of three youth self-identified as Puerto Rican (67.5%) compared to 88.9% of the parents. In addition, 14.5% of youth self-identified as mixed Latino, 9.6% as Dominican American, 7.2% as Mexican American, and 1.2% as Cuban American.

**Age.** Youth ranged in age from 10 to 20 years, and the mean age was 15.9 years.

**Language.** Youth were more likely to speak English than the parents who participated in the focus groups. Only 4.9% of youth spoke only Spanish or Spanish better than English compared to 31.5% of parents, and a majority of youth (53.1%) spoke English better than Spanish. Nearly one out of four spoke both languages equally well (24.7%) and 17.3% spoke only English.

Best Practices and Model Programs

The National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) completed a review of the literature on best practices in reducing disproportionate minority contact and identified two programs that can be used as models in reducing disproportionate minority contact in Pennsylvania. The full text of the NCCD report is included in Appendix D.

The next section, Findings, summarizes the results of the informational interviews, internet-based survey, and focus groups for the seven counties as a whole, followed by a section on findings for each individual county, and Conclusions and Recommendations.
FINDINGS

Background

Overall, Latino youth are disproportionately represented in the juvenile justice system in Pennsylvania compared to their representation in the general population of the Commonwealth (9.7% \(^2\) versus 6.0% \(^3\)).

Among the seven counties chosen to participate in this project, Lehigh County has the highest percentage of Latino youth in the juvenile justice system (37.0%). \(^4\) (See Figure 1, below, and Table 4 in Appendix C). Although Adams County does not have a high percentage of Latino youth in its juvenile justice system, it was chosen for this assessment because, in contrast to the other six counties, its Latino population is more rural and, until recently, was predominantly migratory.

Figure 1.  Percentage of Latino Youth in Juvenile Justice System Compared to the General Youth Population, by County

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, the City of Philadelphia has the largest number of Latinos of all ages in its population (128,300) among the seven counties in the study. Lehigh County has the highest percentage of Latinos of all ages in its population, (19.0%), followed by Berks (17.0%), Philadelphia (13.0%), Lancaster (9.0%), Dauphin (5.0%), Adams (6.0%), and York (5.0%)


\(^4\) PCCD Request for Proposals, 2007.
Berks County has the largest number of Latinos born in Puerto Rico after Philadelphia (10,158 and 41,267, respectively), and the highest percentage of Spanish-speaking households where all of the members over age 14 have at least some difficulty speaking English (24.2%). In comparison to Berks County, Philadelphia has 41,267 Puerto Rican born individuals, and 10,054 linguistically isolated households where Spanish is spoken.

The first section – Findings – looks at the causes of disproportionate Latino representation in the juvenile justice system from the perspective of Juvenile Probation Offices and Latino youth and parents.

**Causes of Latino Overrepresentation**

Key informants who participated in this project identified the culture of “street values” as being the primary reason for overrepresentation of Latino youth in the juvenile Justice system in their counties, rather than disparities in treatment at different points in the juvenile justice system.

**York County** was the only JPO that identified police practices as one cause of disproportionate Latino contact. They felt that the police are more likely to arrest Latino youth than refer them to diversion programs.

In contrast to key informants, Latino youth and parents who participated in the focus groups felt that the main cause of disproportionate minority contact is police discrimination. They felt that police are more likely to arrest Latinos because of prejudice.

“Yes. My boyfriend and I were stopped. They asked me, ‘Whose car is this?’ I responded by letting them know that I was the owner. They say, ‘You guys look suspicious!’ They tell me. Okay. I look suspicious. Then they ask, ‘Do you have drugs in the car?’ No. We do not have drugs.’ ‘You look too young to have a new car. This car is for drugs.’ That’s what they tell me. And they stopped us for 30 minutes. They asked us if we had pills and they searched the car. We had to get out of the car. They asked for the registration and my license and I had to wait out of the car for 30 minutes. They were checking the car all over to see what was in it. They told me that I was too young to have a new car.”

*(Philadelphia parent)*

“How can you say understand the culture, when they basically look at us, Hispanics, as low lifes who do the most crime? And a lot of people don’t have respect for Hispanics, especially in the system.

---

5 U.S. Census (2000). It is important to note that Latinos are often undercounted by the U.S. Census.
Causes of Juvenile Delinquency

The adoption of “street values,” which often accompanies low socioeconomic status and low educational attainment, may lead to involvement in the juvenile justice system by youth of any race or ethnic group. The adoption of “street values” is a survival skill that often has unintended negative consequences for youth of all ethnic and racial backgrounds and their families.

Street values may require that youth retaliate with violence if they feel they are being disrespected. Latino youth participating in focus groups described fighting with other students and/or their teachers or principals who they felt disrespected them. In Pennsylvania, assault on a teacher or principal is aggravated assault and carries a heavier penalty than simple assault. Many focus group parents and youth recounted violent acts at school against youth and adults who the parents felt were “disrespectful” of their child. They felt that the schools should be able to prevent the disrespectful behavior instead of calling the police.

“I, when I was a little girl, was taught in Puerto Rico, if you get hit you have to hit back. Because if you would not hit back you would get a big spanking by your mother. Or, your father would whip you. That’s the way I raised my nieces. You understand. Here the law is not like that. Here, by law, if you get hit you are supposed to stay like this, go to the principal, give complaint or go to the justice. Then you are called ‘rat.’” (Dauphin County parent)

“I told my son not to let anyone hit him. When you have any problems hit them back.” (Philadelphia parent).

Parents may also have limited knowledge of U.S. and local laws that mandate that school districts immediately notify the police when certain offenses, such as carrying a weapon, are committed. The parents expect the schools to discipline the youth without calling the police. As one parent observed:

“Schools have to learn how to deal with the students [because] they call the police and they tell them just take them already and sometimes students get arrested and they press charges for insignificant things and they are cuffed and taken to jail like [a] criminal....” (Philadelphia parent)

Low socioeconomic status and educational attainment also put youth at risk for involvement in the juvenile justice system. Youth may not graduate from high school due to the need to assist in supporting their families. As a result, they
may be unable to find jobs which pay well enough to compete with illegal street jobs.

In addition, assimilation into U.S. culture often causes tensions in immigrant families that may lead to delinquent behavior. According to social service agency and JPO staff, children often learn English faster than their parents, and, as a result, take on more authority in the household than the parents. They may no longer respect their parents or their parenting style, and disobey. Youth who are more fluent in English and have a greater knowledge of U.S. systems than their parents may use that knowledge to gain advantage. For example, youth may tell their parents that Children and Youth Services will remove them from the home if the child reports that their parents used physical force with them.

“Where I live, there I have heard the little children say, “I will call 911 and tell them what you do to me.” I believe there should be a system that is well educated. That they can differentiate between family.” (Berks County parent)

Untreated mental illness is also a common cause of juvenile delinquency. The National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice found that in 2006 over 70% of youth in three different juvenile justice settings met criteria for at least one mental health disorder. For Latino youth, the problem is compounded by language barriers to receiving diagnosis and treatment. Latino families with limited English proficiency may be unaware of mental health services or unable to find a bilingual therapist. Furthermore, undocumented Latinos often avoid any publicly funded services due to fears of being deported. These Latino families lack access to the full range of prevention and intervention services that are offered.

The causes of disproportionate minority contact listed above may be further aggravated by language and educational barriers between JPO and Court staff and parents and youth, and a lack of understanding of juvenile justice system procedures. The next section summarizes findings on the availability of bilingual and bicultural services in the seven JPOs that were included in this study.

**Bilingual Juvenile Justice System Services**

Bilingual and bicultural services in police departments, juvenile probation offices, the courts, and social service agencies are an important tool in communicating and establishing trust with Latino parents and youth.

---

Juvenile probation offices in the seven counties studied vary greatly in their capacity to provide bilingual and bicultural services, with Berks County offering the most bilingual services, and Adams County the least (Table 1). The greater capacity to offer bilingual services in Berks County probably reflects the size of the Latino population (36,096) and the presence of additional funding from the MacArthur Foundation’s Models for Change Initiative. In comparison to Berks County, Adams County has 3,210 Latinos of all ages; currently there are only 22 Latino youth in the caseload of the Adams County JPO. Of the other counties in the study, York, Dauphin, and Lancaster Counties offer the least amount of services after Adams County.

Table 1: Bilingual Juvenile Probation Office Services by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Adams</th>
<th>Berks</th>
<th>Dauphin</th>
<th>Lancaster</th>
<th>Lehigh</th>
<th>Philadelphia</th>
<th>York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Probation Officer</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Receptionist</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recorded voice mail in Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video in Spanish Explaining Probation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Letter in Spanish</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules of Probation in Spanish</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation plans in Spanish</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Bilingual and Bicultural Probation Officers**

All JPO and social service agency staff with whom we spoke agreed that bilingual and/or bicultural JPOs are important in the successful completion of probation and in reducing disproportionate minority contact. Among the seven counties in the study, Philadelphia had the most bilingual Juvenile Probation Officers (6) and Adams and York Counties have the least – one non-Latino, bilingual officer in Adams County and one Latino officer in York County. Berks County has five bilingual officers, the second highest number, followed by Lancaster (4) and Lehigh Counties (2).

However, Latino parents and JPO and social service agency staff stressed that bilingual services must reflect regional variations in culture and language.

“There are people from other countries that use words that we don’t know. Because right now my television at my house they say words that I say, ‘If this is Spanish I don’t understand it.’ I have to put it in English to know. Because not all the languages are the same. Just because we speak the same language does not mean we speak the same.” (Philadelphia parent)
Other focus group participants felt that, in some counties, although there is adequate Latino staff, the Latino juvenile justice staff may have spent most of their adult life in the U.S. and differ in class, culture, and education from Latinos who were raised in Caribbean and Latin American countries. As a result, they have problems understanding families’ culture and language and may not be able to communicate with families as effectively as possible. In addition, some parents who participated in the focus groups felt that Latino juvenile justice system personnel were prejudiced.

“And when I went he (her son) was cuffed in a chair, he was maybe 13, like he was a delinquent. So, he said, ‘Mami the police asked me if I was smoking.’ Because his eyes were red - my son appears depressed, see, he takes medicine, he has allergies. And the police had the nerve to ask him - ‘You look like you high.’ I said to the police, ‘If you think that my son is high I want you to give him the test’. Now they give him the test and if he’s negative, you’ll see. The thing is, the police was Hispanic - like he was discriminating against his own kind. Yeah. The Hispanic police discriminate against their own. That’s what they did to my son.” (Berks County parent)

Parents also felt that Latino employees of the schools and juvenile justice system often refused to interpret, falsely claiming that they did not speak Spanish.

“There are some people here (Family Court) that speak Spanish, but when you go to them they say they don’t, and in the schools, too. Because I know - in the southwest there’s a school, I speak to - her name is Carmen - and she speaks Spanish. And I say, ‘Hablaren español?’ And she says, ‘No I don’t speak Spanish.’ When I go to the front I say ‘You say you don’t speak Spanish?’ Imagine if I was a parent that didn’t speak English.” (Berks County parent)

“There are times people that are Hispanics and know both languages, they tell you in your face they don’t speak Spanish. Knowing and having the means to help they tell you in your face they don’t know. The Puerto Ricans, they are the first ones. The Puerto Rican female officers. They tell you they don’t know Spanish.” (Philadelphia parent)

Due to communication problems and lack of information, parents and youth who participated in focus groups were unsure of their rights during various phases of the juvenile justice process. For example, many parents were unsure of the amount of time that their child could be detained before a parent or guardian was notified. Parents recalled immense worry, especially if they
were unaware of their child’s detention for several hours because the detention originated during school hours.

“There was a group in X High School. My son was going to that school, he had good grades, he was in the 11th grade. There was a terrible fight. A group of students hit a student. The students were Hispanics and the student that was being hit was American. They caught a group of students that were waiting for the elevator and they were arrested. They didn’t have anything to do with the fight. They were mistreated and taken to the police station. The police department did not contact the parents. They didn’t call me. I didn’t know where he was. I was going crazy. Where was he? My husband was looking for this boy everywhere. He always behaves. He never went anywhere. I was like a nut looking everywhere, too. Then I was called at 8 pm to go and pick him up that it was an error. That the students were arrested at 4 pm and it hit 8 pm. They realized then that it was an error and they let him go.” (Philadelphia parent)

“They got my daughter and the rest of the students and they put the handcuffs on all of them. She was five hours in the police wagon. Without me knowing she was there. Her and other students handcuffed. She never had charges before. They had her five hours in there in the big police wagon (and) it doesn’t have any windows. She would tell the police, since she’s asthmatic, that she had asthma because of the heat, they didn’t listen to her. Everything happened and they never called me and informed me about anything. At 7 p.m. is when I came, she arrived at home, I was looking for her, not even her sister knew of what had happened. No one told us anything.” (Philadelphia parent)

In most counties, families with youth on probation who need an interpreter at the JPO must request one from the JPO. Families may not be aware that an interpreter is available, or that using a JPO interpreter instead of a friend or relative is advisable. All counties in the study have bilingual probation officers (Table 1). Adams County has one bilingual probation officer who is not bicultural. Philadelphia has the most bilingual probation officers, with six, followed by Berks (5), Lancaster (4), Lehigh (2), and York (1) Counties. JPO staff in all seven counties felt that more bilingual juvenile probation officers were needed. However, recruitment is very difficult because, unlike the police, a college degree is required. There is a shortage of bilingual Latinos with college degrees, and they can obtain other types of jobs with higher salaries. The York County bilingual JPO is paid an extra $500 stipend, which the JPO finds has aided recruitment. York County also recruits bilingual college seniors at job fairs, but recommended conducting outreach to freshmen and
sophomores to encourage bilingual Latino students to choose a major in the criminal justice field.

Families with parents with limited English proficiency are assigned to Latino JPOs in all of the seven study counties except York. In York County, they attempt to assign all Latino families to the Latino JPO. The Latino JPOs report that being assigned Latino families with limited English proficiency does not increase their caseload, but that their workload is increased because they need of these families are so much greater than more assimilated families. In most counties, the children usually speak English, but the parents often do not. Because the parents have limited English proficiency and they often have very little knowledge of “the system,” they often use the JPO as an interpreter and facilitator for their contacts with the English-speaking world. Latino parents who participated in the focus groups felt that the lack of Spanish-speaking staff was due to discrimination.

“Why (are there not enough interpreters)? Because we’re Latinos. I have some English, everything is in English - all the letters from the school, what I can’t answer in English, I look for someone to help me. Some people, unfortunately, discriminate. Unfortunately, yes there’s discrimination.” (Berks County parent)

“If you try to talk, like my mom, she had to talk to the police in various occasions, they (the police) laughed when she mispronounced a word.” (Berks County youth)

In response to this need, the Berks County JPO is planning to use MacArthur Foundation support to purchase the Rosetta Stone Spanish language program and will require all staff to learn conversational Spanish.

All social service agency staff and JPO staff agreed that more bilingual/bicultural officers were needed to meet the increasing demands placed on their office by growing Latino populations, especially new immigrants from Puerto Rico or outside the U.S. with limited English proficiency and limited experience with U.S. government systems. Immigration rates may slow due to the current recession, but there will still be a need for more Latino staff.

- **Other Bilingual Services**

Providing ancillary and educational services in English and Spanish is an important tool in helping Latino families understand the juvenile probation system, and therefore complete probation successfully. This, in turn, reduces disproportionate minority contact.

Only three counties (Berks, Lancaster, and Lehigh) have a bilingual receptionist, and two counties (Berks and Lehigh) have a recorded voicemail
menu in Spanish, although all of the counties in the study have substantial Latino populations (Table 1). In addition, only three counties (Berks, Philadelphia, and York) send initial letters to families in Spanish as needed. Four counties (Adams, Berks, Lehigh, and Philadelphia) have the capacity to translate a youth’s probation plan into Spanish as needed. Latino probation officers report that they often translate JPO documents into Spanish themselves on an as needed basis. Parents participating in focus groups felt frustrated that so much vital information on the juvenile justice process was not understandable to them.

“No lawyers, not his parole officer, or persons at the school spoke Spanish when my son was going through all of this and when things come in the mail everything arrives in English.” (Philadelphia parent)

“We need to find people to help us. For the same reason related to what is happening. Everything is in English. I know Spanish. If you talk to me slowly in English I understand you. Now, if you talk to me fast in English I will not understand. We have to look for help.” (Lehigh County parent)

Because some Spanish-speaking parents involved with the juvenile justice system had limited literacy in Spanish, a Spanish language video explaining JPO procedures might be helpful, but this is not yet available in any of the counties, although several have pamphlets in Spanish. Berks County is producing a video on the rules of probation in Spanish with funding from the MacArthur Foundation.

With the exception of Adams County, key informants and focus group participants felt that there is a lack of sufficient interpreters in the juvenile courts in every county. Many families must wait several hours for their case to be heard in court because there are insufficient interpreters to fill the need. Court staff may be hostile to families who need an interpreter. Two parents who participated in the focus groups recalled being told by a judge that “They [are] in the United States and need to learn English” when they requested an interpreter.

Court interpreters are often allocated to adult as well as juvenile courts, leading to long delays. For example, in Berks County, the juvenile courts must share the three court interpreters with the adult court system, which leads to delays. Additionally, in most counties, families must request a court interpreter 24 hours before their hearing. As a result, families do not have an interpreter in court and to have the JPO explain to them what happened afterwards. Families may also have their case heard using the juvenile, a relative, or friend as interpreter. In Berks County, a parent said that at court appointments, she often brings
siblings of the system-involved youth to act as translators because “There is a sign that reads bring your own interpreters or wait twenty-four hours for one.”

This can have serious consequences for the outcome of the juvenile’s case because untrained interpreters may not be able to translate the English legal terms correctly into Spanish. Focus group participants were able to recall situations where they witnessed poor interpretation of court proceedings.

“At times, I have seen parents take family members as interpreters and that person is not telling you exactly what the judge is saying…The judge could be saying, ‘We are going to sentence you,’ and the interpreter says, ‘He may sentence you.’” (Berks County parent)

Children who interpret may knowingly misrepresent what is said to their parents to avoid parental disapproval or because translation is too difficult.

“I translated the information to my Mom in Spanish but sometimes I don’t really care about the information that we get from JPO [juvenile probation] and I just tell her that the papers are not important in a nice way.” (Dauphin County youth)

“When my Mom came and they [police] released me, police staff was all talking in English and they kept looking at me to translate but then they didn’t…so I wouldn’t switch up my story. So instead they used one of the guys that clean up ‘cause he was Spanish and he just told my Mom to sign so she can take me home. But my Mom still really didn’t understand.” (Philadelphia youth)

“The youth study center, there’s times that, I have witnessed this, they tell the youth to be the interpreter. The youth don’t even know what they’re telling their parents. I have seen them repeating the same thing. And it doesn’t have anything to do with the program and what they’re saying. They are saying I am misbehaving or whatever, but they’re not going to tell their parents...” (Philadelphia parent)

Social service providers (advocates, counselors, case managers) recall that some judges expect them to serve as court interpreters although this may be a conflict of interest.

“I work as a case manager and am not at court to serve as a translator but judges are the first ones who want you to interpret. How can I interpret if I am going to be reporting on the youth’s

---

7 That is, you must notify the court that you need an interpreter 24 hours in advance of your hearing.
progress? We are there to support the family not interpret.” (Philadelphia case worker)

Interpreters were particularly needed in Philadelphia Family Court (1801 Vine Street).

“I would prefer that an interpreter would explain to the parent and then we would just follow up with the parent. There’s no interpreter in 1801. I don’t care what they say. We have witnessed it. You would have to wait all day and maybe 20 to 40 kids are seen before they do get an interpreter. It would be 3 o’clock or 4 pm.” (Philadelphia parent)

Many communication problems and conflicts between Latino youth, their parents, and the juvenile justice system could be avoided by improving cultural competency and diversity awareness of juvenile justice system personnel at all points of contact with Latino youth and their families.

**Cultural Diversity and Competency Training**

Many parents and youth felt that police and the juvenile justice system did not treat them with respect because they were Latino. Youth in Philadelphia and Berks Counties, in particular, felt that the police were disrespectful and in some instances shoved and threatened them unnecessarily. Many youth and parents spent time during discussion to recount unpleasant contacts with police, probation officers, and teachers. They felt that race and ethnicity was a primary factor in the detention of their children.

“I was also told (by a school principal), ‘When it was an American school many years ago--I graduated from this school--20 years ago this school was perfect. Now that there’s Hispanics and Blacks now the school doesn’t work well.’” (Philadelphia parent)

“I think the system needs to start with the police. I think they need more training. Because they don’t communicate with people and they are always classifying people based on race, or by culture. So, they need training like in psychology. Because they don’t know.” (Philadelphia parent)

Cultural diversity and competency trainings can provide non-Latino police and JPO and court staff with the knowledge required to decrease disproportionate minority contact. Five of the seven JPOs that participated in the study hold cultural competency and diversity trainings, but only one county (York) provides it on a regular schedule (annually), and only Adams, Berks, and York Counties address Latino culture specifically (Table 2). Providing staff with cultural competency and diversity training is important in reducing misunderstandings
between JPOs and families that may lead to poor probation outcomes. For example, in many Latino cultures, looking someone in the eye is disrespectful, but in Anglo culture it is a sign that someone is telling the truth. JPO staff observed that their office would benefit from trainings on a more regular schedule, and trainings that were uniformly of good quality, but that trainings must be supported by senior administration.

Two efforts are currently underway to provide police and youth with training on minority youth and law enforcement issues. In Dauphin County, the DMC Subcommittee and the Harrisburg School District’s Downey Elementary School have piloted a curriculum to reduce DMC at the arrest stage. The program participants included the statewide DMC Subcommittee, the Dauphin County Juvenile Probation Department, the PA Human Relations Commission, the ACLU, the Harrisburg School District Resource Officers, and the Harrisburg City and Susquehanna Township Police Departments. In Philadelphia, the DMC Subcommittee and the MacArthur Foundation’s Models for Change Initiative have piloted a curriculum for law enforcement on discretion in arresting youth.

Table 2: Juvenile Probation Office’s Community Involvement and Diversity Trainings by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Adams</th>
<th>Berks</th>
<th>Dauphin</th>
<th>Lancaster</th>
<th>Lehigh</th>
<th>Philadelphia</th>
<th>York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the office worked with Latino community members to assess services</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the office have formal ties with other community agencies to serve Latino youth?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAININGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the office have cultural competency training?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is mandatory?</td>
<td>No specific schedule</td>
<td>No specific schedule</td>
<td>No specific schedule</td>
<td>No specific schedule</td>
<td>No specific schedule</td>
<td>No specific schedule</td>
<td>No specific schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often is it held?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it address Latino communities?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is mandatory?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often is it held?</td>
<td>No specific schedule</td>
<td>No specific schedule</td>
<td>No specific schedule</td>
<td>No specific schedule</td>
<td>No specific schedule</td>
<td>No specific schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it address Latino communities?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many U.S. jurisdictions lack objective risk assessment and mental health and substance abuse screening instruments, including some of the seven counties in this study. Using a structured decision making model evaluates the youth’s background and estimates likelihood for recidivism from an objective, standardized, and empirically tested approach. This can help improve decision making by classifying youth according to level of risk and reassessing them at different stages in the process. Accurate risk and needs assessments can help inform treatment, placement, and court disposition. It can also be used to step-down youth into a lower-security program if warranted. Alternatives to secure detention for cases that do not pose a public safety risk or are for technical violations can help to reduce disparities in the system as well as provide cost-effective approaches, whereby savings can be allocated to prevention services, program needs or staff training.

As shown in Table 3, all counties perform some type of risk assessment and screening for either mental illness or substance abuse, although the same instruments are not used consistently across all counties. In April 2009, nine juvenile probation offices, including Berks, Lehigh, and Philadelphia Counties, began using the Youth Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (YLS/CMI) risk assessment instrument with support from the MacArthur Foundation. The YLS is a research-based risk assessment instrument which will be used to determine appropriate levels of supervision, establish measurable goals, and allocate resources. Berks County has also instituted use of the Detention Assessment Instrument (DAI) with funding from the MacArthur Foundation.

Currently, 24 juvenile probation departments in Pennsylvania are piloting the MAYSI-2 screening instrument to identify potential instances of mental and emotional disturbance. This project, funded by the MacArthur Foundation, includes Adams and Lancaster Counties. The MAYSI-2 is already being used to screen for mental illness in Berks and Philadelphia Counties. All seven counties in the study, except Lehigh County, test for substance abuse, either by using an assessment tool, such as SASSI, or testing urine. None of the counties use assessments that specifically identify youth by ethnicity or race, since that might lead to bias in prosecution.
### Table 3: Juvenile Probation Office Use of Screening Instruments by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adams</th>
<th>Berks</th>
<th>Dauphin</th>
<th>Lancaster</th>
<th>Lehigh</th>
<th>Philadelphia</th>
<th>York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSESSMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What juvenile risk assessment does the office use?</td>
<td>Risk Assessment Worksheet</td>
<td>DAI and YLS</td>
<td>YLS</td>
<td>In-house</td>
<td>NCA</td>
<td>YLS</td>
<td>PSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the office screen for mental illness?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What MH instruments do you use?</td>
<td>MAYSI-2</td>
<td>MAYSI-2</td>
<td>Psych. evals</td>
<td>MAYSI-2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>MAYSI-2</td>
<td>Psych. evals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the probation office screen for substance abuse?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What SA instruments do you use?</td>
<td>Drug screens, self-report</td>
<td>Dept. generated</td>
<td>Drug screens, self reporting</td>
<td>SASSI</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Drug screens, prior history</td>
<td>SASSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there sufficient bilingual therapists?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alternative Programs

Six of the seven counties in the study did not have alternatives to detention or after care programs that are specifically geared to Latino youth (Table 4). Philadelphia has an aftercare program geared to Latino youth and ARC’s Residential Program at Susquehanna Trail in York serves Latino youth from several counties. Alternatives to detention, residential programs, and after care programs that take into account the special needs of Latino youth and Latino culture may be more successful in reducing high rates of recidivism among this population.
### Table 4: Other Juvenile Justice Services by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMS</th>
<th>Adams</th>
<th>Berks</th>
<th>Dauphin</th>
<th>Lancaster</th>
<th>Lehigh</th>
<th>Philadelphia</th>
<th>York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated sanctions system</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home supervision</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic monitoring</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening report center</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening curfew violation center</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot camp</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth build program</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth violence reduction program</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-gang program</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Aid Panel</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino members on the Youth Aid Panel</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter for Youth Aid Panel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aftercare program</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aftercare program specific to Latino youth</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other programs:
- Informal adj. Consent decree, JUMP program, int. PRO
- Cornell Abraxas NRD/NR T. Deten Alt. Prgm/ TAP, Diakon Weekend Alt Program, Salvation Army Bridging the Gap Program
- Community Justice Panels
- YAP, Prevention services, AVRP
- Weekend Alternative Program

However, many of the counties have programs that, while not specifically geared to Latino youth, present alternatives to detention or reduce the number of youth in detention. For example, all counties in the study employ electronic monitoring and provide aftercare for youth completing probation. Philadelphia has the widest range of alternative programs and employs graduated sanctions. Two counties lack graduated sanctions: Berks and Dauphin Counties. All counties except Lancaster have home supervision. Four counties: Berks, Lehigh, Philadelphia, and York, have Youth Aid Panels, although only Berks and Lehigh Counties have Latino panel members. Berks and York Counties lack “boot camp,” and three counties, Adams, Dauphin, and Lehigh, lack evening reporting centers. Only three counties have a Youth Build Program: Lancaster, Philadelphia, and York, but five counties, Berks, Lancaster, Lehigh, Philadelphia and York, have anti-gang programs funded by a federal initiative.
Behavioral Health and Educational Services

All seven counties in the study provide a wide range of social, educational, and behavioral services to youth in the juvenile justice system. These services may help youth avoid recidivism by addressing underlying individual and family problems. Behavioral health services include family and individual counseling, residential treatment, anger management, and mental health and substance abuse treatment. Educational services for parents and youth include English as a Second Language (ESL) classes, GED programs, and alternative schools. However, both social service providers and juvenile probation office staff feel that there is a need for more services to be available in Spanish as well as in English.

- Behavioral Health Services

Social service providers and juvenile probation office staff all identified a critical need for more bilingual and bicultural mental health and substance abuse treatment providers. Proficiency in Spanish is essential because many Latino parents do not speak sufficient English to participate in treatment, and parental involvement is key in family counseling. Latino parents with limited English proficiency may also feel more comfortable with a Latino counselor. Although Latino youth are more likely to speak English, they may not speak English well enough to effectively communicate with the therapist.

Parents also have unsuccessfully tried to find help for their children, but were not able to find early intervention programs that would advise them how to deter youth from truancy and other precursors to delinquency. Parents were unaware of prevention and intervention programs and services, especially bilingual programs, to fill this need. Parents attributed this to a lack of communication among social service providers, school personnel, and community members and to a lack of materials in Spanish.

“Not a lot of information is in Spanish pertaining to helping kids or programs that maybe available for them [including] group sessions in Spanish…they need programs to train Hispanics on what the system is about, and what steps they need to take.” (Lehigh County parent)

“Before he was committed or went to the detention center, before he cut another child’s face, I knew my son was using and selling drugs, coming home late, and had problems. He was only 14 years old and no one would help until he got into greater problems.” (Berks County parent)
“I went as far as calling Children & Youth [Services] to have him placed but nobody wanted to get involved. It’s sad that we didn’t get help until he was charged with two felonies. What more is it going to take for the system to help you get help for your kids... they are quick to put our kids in jail but not when they are getting destructive.” (Dauphin County parent)

All juvenile probation offices in the seven counties in this study offer help to parents through parenting programs and family counseling. For example, Philadelphia’s JPO has a Parent Project, Dauphin County provides a Parent Support Group Program and Family Therapy, and Lehigh County offers the Alpha Program, which provides parenting classes. However, these programs are generally not bilingual.

Some parents found the help and information on parenting that they needed.

“Well, I’m happy with the probation. The probation officers my girl had they were very good. They went to my house. They gave me information that I needed for them. Since I wasn’t from here either. They gave me information for help. For the girls and for me. When you are raising children that are not yours at times it’s difficult. You understand. But thank God that they helped me.” (Dauphin County parent)

- Educational Services

Educational services for Latino youth include ESL classes and alternative schools for youth returning from placement. There are an adequate number of ESL classes for adults and youth in all counties. However, ESL for youth is taught in many elementary and middle schools, but less often in high schools. Latino youth of high school age who enter this country may therefore have more difficulty learning English if their high school does not offer these classes. Many schools do not provide special education classes in Spanish, which results in Latino special education students with limited English proficiency falling even further behind.

Many parents who participated in the focus groups in this study experienced frustration in finding help in addressing truancy problems at an early stage. Parents reported that they did not receive notice of their child’s truancy until the truancy had been going on for a long time.

“They don’t call the parents when they are absent, when they are receiving bad grades, or when they are cutting classes [instead] they wait until the problem is in the worst state and then we [the parents] are the bad ones.” (Philadelphia parent)
However, key informants reported that, although the Pennsylvania Department of Education requires immediate written notification of truancy to parents, truant youths may intercept truancy letters or deliberately fail to translate the letters correctly into Spanish for parents with limited English proficiency.

In addition, returning to a student’s original school after detention seemed to be problematic in many counties and the quality of education at alternative disciplinary schools is often poor. According to juvenile probation office staff and service providers, some counties require attendance at the twilight schools for a set period of time to allow the student to re-adjust. Most JPO staff and service providers felt that the “twilight schools,” which meet in the late afternoon or early evening and serve youth who have completed residential placement but are not yet ready to go back to their original school, have several problems. First, instruction is typically not bilingual, and, in some programs, students do not have teachers but sit in front of computer monitors with English language programs. Many youth have difficulty following an English-based computer program and drop out. Second, the programs leave students with no structured activity during day time hours, leading to more opportunities to re-offend. Third, instruction is usually only three hours per day, causing students to get even further behind in their class work. Finally, many students lack transportation to the twilight schools, which are often in a different neighborhood from their original school.

These problems are compounded by the difficulties many students face in re-entering their original school.

“Right now my son wants to study but they won’t accept him in the school. He was discharged from school. I tried to enroll him again. I enrolled him. The first day he went to the school the principal sent him back home because he was afraid my son was going to sell drugs in school. I told him my son never in his life has done such a thing. In my house you have never seen such a thing. My son keeps insisting that he does want to study. He had asked for a specific school because when he was there he was doing mechanic and construction and that’s what he likes. He continues to like those things. However, he was sent to another school. His parole [officer] and counselor were trying to see what they can do for him so that he can get his GED.” (Lehigh County parent)

In some cases, schools are legitimately concerned with maintaining the safety of their students. Some families may be confused by the process. The process may be too lengthy to allow students admission as soon as they have completed their placement. In Lehigh County they have begun the readmission process two months before placement ends to address this problem, and report a smoother transition back to school.
In January 2009, the Pennsylvania Department of Education issued new guidance to ensure that children and youth in the state promptly enroll in school. The Basic Education Circular provides specific guidance on re-enrollment of children returning from delinquency placement. It prohibits school districts from placing returning students in alternative education programs for disruptive youth merely because the youth has been adjudicated delinquent. School districts cannot refuse to enroll a youth based on a student’s disciplinary record unless a youth is currently expelled for a weapons offense. Youth and families with limited English proficiency must be provided with translation and interpretation services if necessary for the re-enrollment process.

**Factors in Successful Completion of Probation**

Successful completion of probation for Latino youth helps reduce recidivism, and thereby reduces disproportionate minority contact for Latino youth. Many factors are involved with the successful completion of probation, including assignment to appropriate, effective probation programs; positive relationships between the family and the juvenile probation officer; motivation; support from the family; and access to programs which address the underlying causes of juvenile delinquency.

JPOs in each county identified different factors in successfully completing probation; and the most common factor cited was regular school attendance. Other factors were family buy-in, links to the proper provider, involvement in positive social activities, and employment.

Several parents praised the JPO and felt that their child had benefited from probation, thereby avoiding re-arrest.

“My son…he went and he robbed copper from a place, tools, I don't know what exactly, something like that…And they got put on to the probation system, which, in my case, I think it was good for my son. I mean, he got into trouble after that, but nothing major. Like I said, his grades went completely up. I think it's more or less the environment that the kids are in…And like with probation, they got my son into a lot of programs like the college, Muhlenberg College, he goes every Thursday, which he loves. Actually, he wants to graduate which before he wanted to drop out. Now he's willing to graduate, and he wants to get a four year scholarship to college. He's very active in work, he's very very smart but he acted stupid because he was hanging out with his friends.” (Lehigh County parent)
“Still, the grandson that is 18 years old, I like when the probation officer goes to the house at night and says, “Luis. What’s going on? Where are you? I saw you yesterday in front of the house. What were you doing there?”… I thank the justice of Harrisburg.” (Dauphin County parent)

Parents also felt that probation should include positive rewards for youth who were following the rules.

“I consider that the system is only focusing on what the children are doing wrong and what are the consequences. However, they are not rewarding the children when they stay in the system and do what they have to do. You understand. Like my son. He’s on house arrest. But what benefits is he getting from the house arrest? How will they reward him for his attitude and for complying with what he needs to do?” (Lehigh County parent)

Both youth and parents felt that employment was very important in avoiding recidivism. They wanted more assistance in seeking opportunities for youth employment. In some counties, creating more employment opportunities for youth was recommended by parents instead of increasing access to organized sports or other social activities. One parent viewed youth employment as serving a dual purpose, especially as it relates to at-risk Latino youth, “…having a job will help him learn the value of hard work and keep him from getting in trouble on the streets.” (Lancaster County parent). However, it was also noted that even teens with misdemeanor charges incur barriers to finding employment. As one youth observed, “Teens who have small charges have an even harder time finding jobs so we are back to where they started, shoplifting and selling weed.” (York County youth).

Latino youth and parents who participated in the focus groups felt that free after school programs aimed specifically at youth ages 12-18 were needed to insure successful completion of probation, with activities that they enjoy. Focus group participants commented that there are programs available in many communities, but many are either too expensive for large low-income families, have a waiting list, are hard to access by public transportation, or require additional expenses for equipment the families cannot afford. Youth were particularly interested in art programs that provide supplies and sports programs that furnish equipment.

“They should have, like, art programs for low-income people. Like my son loves art, he loves it but I don’t seem to find anywhere to get him to do that. Because I’m a low-income person and I cannot afford for him to go to a school. That’s just not affordable for me. I got another one who likes art and he’s about to drop out of school too. If they had more programs and try to prevent kids now before
they go into something else, they can prevent them to end up in jail or in a juvenile place.” (Lancaster County parent)

In addition to placing a great emphasis on the need for more year-round youth employment opportunities in their county, youth and parents suggested the following: structured programs to keep youth involved in activities after school (i.e. tutoring), truancy prevention programs, technology training programs and organized and inexpensive community sports programs. As one youth noticed, “Some activities, such as basketball, calm me down and put me somewhere else because I am having fun and don’t have to worry about my problems.” (Lancaster County youth)

In general, parents and youth felt that structured community programs should aim to teach and emphasize Latino culture and should be open year-round, not only during the school year. Additionally, programs should be available to older teens and young adults within the community and should be safe and inviting.

“The Boys and Girls Club out here, we might as well leave them in the streets because they are running up and down the stairs and cursing and carrying on...the staff is just standing around and there is no control.” (Dauphin County parent)

Some youth also felt that having an adult to act as a mentor, such as an advocate, would help them avoid activities and friends that got them into trouble. Youth seemed to appreciate having a youth advocate in addition to a probation officer. Many youth mentioned that they appreciated time spent with their youth advocate and enjoyed such outings. It is important for youth to receive individualized attention. In distinguishing the perceived differences in roles of a probation officer versus a youth advocate, one youth said,

“The probation officer can get you locked up but an advocate talks to you about making the right decisions and takes you places.” (Philadelphia youth)

Several youth also said that having a youth advocate and/or probation officer prevented them from being on the streets. Both youth and parents suggested that it would be helpful for formerly adjudicated youth who have successfully gone through the juvenile justice system to serve as mentors. One youth said,

“Someone who has been put on probation before knows our struggles...we can relate to each other. I think information coming from someone your own age makes more sense instead of someone older.” (Lancaster County youth).

In addition, the special needs of undocumented immigrant Latino families and Latino youth who are gang members may need to be addressed in order to
insure the successful completion of probation. Latino families who are undocumented are often generally unaware of what services and benefits they may receive, and lack an understanding of the juvenile justice system. They may avoid speaking up at the probation office and in court due to fears of being deported. These families may be afraid to accept services such as counseling for the same reasons. Latino youth who are gang members are at higher risk for recidivism due the attractions of gang membership and associated criminal behavior for them. Berks, Lehigh, Lancaster, Philadelphia, and York Counties both participate in the Multi Agency Gang Eradication Task Force (MAGNET), which provides specialized services for Latino gang members, including a bilingual therapist.

**JPO Contacts with Latino Communities**

In four of the seven counties (Adams, Berks, Lehigh, and Philadelphia), the JPO has had formal ties with agencies that serve the Latino community. Close communication between the JPO and local Latino organizations may help to develop prevention and intervention strategies that work for Latino youth, thereby decreasing disproportionate contacts with Latino youth. Contact with the Latino community is more difficult in counties such as York and Dauphin, where the agencies that traditionally served the Latino community were closed recently.
FINDINGS BY COUNTY

The seven counties selected for this study vary in the characteristics of the Latino population and the services that are offered to Latino youth in the juvenile justice system. The following section highlights the unique needs of each county for services for Latino youth based on the informational interviews and parent and youth focus groups.

Adams County

Adams County is the one county included in the study that does not have a relatively high percentage of Latino youths in its juvenile justice system. The Latino population is primarily Mexican American and includes migrant workers and many undocumented individuals. Currently, there are only 22 Latino youth on probation in Adams County. Despite this, interviews with JPO staff, a service provider, and parents and youth revealed some successes and some gaps in services, including:

- The JPO needs more bilingual juvenile probation officers who are bicultural as well as bilingual;
- The availability of Spanish language materials in the JPO and School District is good, but translation quality is sometimes poor;
- The county needs more bilingual/bicultural mental health and substance abuse counselors;
- Bilingual GED programs are only for migrant workers, many Latinos are no longer migrants;
- Undocumented Latino adults cannot participate in ESL classes, although documented adults have easy access; and
- There is close cooperation between and after school program for Latino youth and the School District, which aids in prevention efforts.

Berks County

Berks County is home to the second largest Latino population among the seven counties in the study. It has the highest percentage of linguistically isolated families and the second highest rate of disproportionate Latino contact with the juvenile justice system among the seven counties.

Berks County participates in the MacArthur Foundation’s Models for Change Initiative. Its committee on disproportionate contact with Latino youth meets monthly, includes representation from a wide variety of stakeholders, and has initiated many new projects. The Berks County JPO has five bilingual/bicultural Juvenile Probation Officers, a bilingual receptionist, and voicemail in Spanish...
and English. JPO documents, including the initial contact letter, rules of probation, and probation plans are available in Spanish through a grant from the MacArthur Foundation.

According to key informants and parents and youth, there is a need for:

- More bilingual/bicultural juvenile probation officers and providers of mental health and substance abuse services;
- More outreach to Latino immigrants to provide information on available social, educational, and health services;
- More police training in diversionary programs to lessen high arrest rates of Latino youth;
- An alternative to the “twilight school;”
- More cultural competency and diversity training for staff in juvenile justice system agencies;
- More preventive services for families before conditions are critical.

**Dauphin County**

Dauphin County has almost 11,000 Latino individuals, according to the 2000 U.S. Census, and it has a relatively low rate of disproportionate Latino representation in the juvenile justice system. Dauphin and Lancaster County JPOs offer the least amount of bilingual and/or bicultural services of the seven counties after Adams County. Dauphin County has only one bilingual/bicultural Juvenile Probation Officer, but the rules of probation are translated into Spanish.

Dauphin County JPO staff identified the following needs:

- More bilingual/bicultural staff at the JPO and also at provider agencies;
- More interpreters in the court system;
- More written materials in Spanish for the JPO office; and
- More ESL classes for youth and adults in the community.

**Lancaster County**

Lancaster County has more than 26,000 Latino residents, 21.0% of whom are living in linguistically isolated households. This is the third highest rate of linguistic isolation among the seven counties in the study. Lancaster County JPO has a bilingual receptionist and four bilingual/bicultural Juvenile Probation Officers. JPO staff and social service providers identified the following issues specific to Lancaster County:

- More bilingual/bicultural JPO staff and service provider staff;
• More court interpreters who speak Spanish;
• Parenting classes led by a Spanish-speaking team; and
• More outreach to Latino parents which gets them involved.

**Lehigh County**

Lehigh County has the highest percentage of Latinos in the population (10.2%), and the second highest rate of linguistically isolated households (21.8%) of the seven counties in the study. It also has the highest rate of disproportionate minority contact among the seven counties. Lehigh County JPO has only two bilingual/bicultural Juvenile Probation Officers. However, it has a bilingual receptionist and voicemail in English and Spanish. Bilingual JPO staff can translate JPO documents into Spanish as needed.

According to key informants, in Lehigh County there is a need for:

• More bilingual/bicultural Juvenile Probation Officers;
• More bilingual/bicultural mental health and substance abuse providers, especially therapists;
• More truancy prevention programs for Latino youth in elementary schools; and
• More Latino participation in Youth Aid Panels.

**Philadelphia County**

The City of Philadelphia has the largest Latino population by far among the seven counties, the largest range of bilingual and/or bicultural services for Latino youth in the juvenile justice system, and the largest number of bilingual Juvenile Probation Officers (6). Philadelphia is also a site for the MacArthur Foundation’s Models for Change Initiative. JPO documents are translated into Spanish, including the initial letter sent to parents and the rules of probation. The Philadelphia JPO screens for mental illness and substance abuse problems, and uses several instruments to assess juveniles for risk.

Key informants and parents identified several issues specific to Philadelphia:

• A serious shortage of court interpreters, causing long waiting times for families in court who elect to use an interpreter;
• Lack of sufficient residential placements for Spanish speaking youth;
• Lack of sufficient residential placements for girls, a small but significant portion of their caseload;
• Not every disciplinary and twilight school offers ESL classes;
Many juveniles lack treatment for mental health and substance abuse problems; and
Due to funding constraints, the JPO must exhaust all resources before placing a juvenile in a residential program.

York County

York County has more than 11,000 Latinos, according to the 2000 U.S. Census. This represents 3.0% of the general population, the smallest percentage of Latinos in the general population among the seven counties in the study. The York County JPO screens all juveniles for risk factors, and conducts mental health and substance abuse assessments on all juveniles. The JPO has only one Latino Juvenile Probation Officer. The initial JPO letter sent home to parents is available in Spanish. However, the rules of probation and probation plans have not been translated into Spanish, and there is no Spanish voicemail.

Key informants in York County identified several issues related to Latino youth in contact with the JPO:

- Provider services, such as the impact of crime class, are not available in Spanish;
- Lack of bilingual staff among providers causes communication problems with parents; as a result, youth do not keep appointments and violate probation; and
- A program that helps parents get acclimated to U.S. culture and understand parenting issues would be very helpful.
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The seven counties that were the subject of this study present different levels of contact with Latino youth in the juvenile justice system, different Latino populations, and different resources to address this issue. However, there are areas of need and gaps in services common to all counties. Addressing these needs with a coordinated approach through a central organization, such as the PCCD’s DMC Subcommittee, can create greater benefits than if each JPO acted alone.

Recommendations for the DMC Subcommittee

Bilingual Services

- Recruit more bilingual/bicultural Juvenile Probation Officers in all seven counties;
- Translate more official documents and brochures used in the JPOs in all seven counties into Spanish at a reading level consistent with literacy levels for youths involved with the juvenile justice system and their families and which reflect regional variations in the Spanish language;
- Continue to support the use of objective instruments, such as the MAYS1-2, DAI, and YLS that assess risk and mental health and substance abuse issues consistently across all seven counties;
- Recruit more bilingual/bicultural mental health and substance abuse treatment therapists in all seven counties;
- Insure that service providers who contract with JPOs provide programs available in Spanish in all seven counties;
- Create in each county a Spanish language video similar to the one being developed in Berks County which explains JPO procedures and the juvenile court system and can be played in JPO waiting rooms; and
- Hire more court interpreters in each county.

Training

- Provide JPO staff, court staff, and police in all seven counties with high quality, regular cultural competency and diversity training which is specific to different minority cultures, including Latino culture; and
- Continue to educate police in all seven counties on available diversionary programs, with programs such as the Philadelphia Minority Youth/Law Enforcement Curriculum, and to educate minority youth through programs like the Harrisburg Middle School DMC Curriculum.

Prevention

- Improve face-to-face communication between parents of Latino youth at risk for being involved in the juvenile justice system and school personnel to discuss truancy problems in all seven counties;
• Develop bilingual outreach programs in all seven counties for parents of Latino youth at risk for involvement in the juvenile justice system to provide information on bilingual parenting resources;
• Support bilingual programs in all seven counties for parents of Latino youth at risk for involvement in the juvenile justice system that address delinquency prevention and intervention techniques for parents;
• Partner with local educational agencies in all seven counties to develop programs which teach non-violent dispute resolution for Latino youths at risk for involvement in the juvenile justice system and their parents;
• Re-examine the effectiveness of “twilight schools” in all seven counties and develop alternatives, if necessary; and
• Examine the process of re-entry into the appropriate school for the juvenile in all seven counties and eliminate factors that contribute to gaps in school attendance.

Outreach
• Partner with Latino service organizations in communities in all seven counties and/or Latino leaders in an effort to reduce Latino disproportionate minority contact; and
• Coordinate efforts to reduce disproportionate minority contact with the schools, community organizations, social service providers, the police, the courts, and efforts funded by the MacArthur Foundation.

Two communities, Santa Cruz, California and Multnomah County, Oregon, have instituted similar changes in their Juvenile Probation programs and community, as described below. (See Appendix D for the full text of the NCCD’s Report on Best Practices in Reducing Disproportionate Minority Contact).

Model Programs

Two model programs in the United States have pioneered efforts to reduce disproportionate minority contact with Latino youth by providing staff and police officers training in cultural competency, hiring a more ethnically diverse staff; making the JPO more “user friendly” to Latino families; improving communication with Latino families; developing a more neutral risk assessment; and creating more alternatives to detention. These measures can be useful in planning further DMC reduction efforts in the seven counties in the study and are described in more detail below.

• Santa Cruz, California

In Santa Cruz, California, the probation agency developed a cultural competency plan and appointed a cultural competency coordinator to ensure that all program processes support the reduction of DMC. Additionally,
Public health management corporation guidelines were established regarding the types of skills and abilities needed by staff. Ongoing training was provided in cultural sensitivity, cultural competence and the dynamics involved in disproportionate representation and disparate treatment of Latino youth.

In an effort to reduce barriers to family involvement in the juvenile justice system, Santa Cruz County Probation took the following steps (Giraldo, 2008):

- Contracted with a professional who can translate forms and court jargon in a way clients can understand, taking into account the people who will be reading the form and their literacy level;
- Distributed brochures and posted juvenile hall policies and procedures and visiting hours in Spanish;
- Developed a video that plays continuously in the juvenile court waiting area that describes the probation and court process in Spanish; and
- Altered the start time of parent workshop to later in the evening to be considerate of seasonal migrant farm worker schedules, provided a hot meal and childcare for small children, and adjusted the evidence-based curriculum (i.e. role play exercises) to be more culturally attuned with the daily experiences of Latino families and to increase family buy-in.

In Santa Cruz, CA, the probation department continuously communicates with their partners, including law enforcement agencies about alternatives to detention or the importance of having these options for all youth. The successes of DMC work in the Santa Cruz Probation Department can be attributed to the development and agreement on a set of sanctions (levels of community based program options) to increase alternatives to detention. More than one level of supervision was provided.

- Multnomah County, Oregon

In Multnomah County, Oregon, several changes were made to training and staffing patterns along the juvenile justice continuum. For example, the probation department diversified itself to reflect the demographics of the county. Racial and cultural sensitivity training was provided. Four part-time trial assistants were hired to support attorneys with pretrial placement and decision planning. In an effort to divert youth from initial contact with the system, community police officers were also trained.

Community alternatives to detention were also created including shelter care, foster homes, home detention, and a day reporting center. Multnomah County developed and validated a risk assessment instrument to guide decisions regarding admissions to detention. The result was a more powerful tool to identify risk to re-offend or failure to appear. “The county stopped relying on criteria such as “good family structure” and “gang affiliation,” which may be
biased against youth of color, and expanded the “school attendance” factor to include “productive activity.”

Based upon the findings of this study and recommendations of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, the following next steps are recommended, using the existing structure of the DMC Subcommittee to address the following issues in the seven counties.

**Next Steps**

- Develop a cultural competency plan in each of the seven counties and appoint a cultural competency coordinator to insure that all the recommendations are implemented;
- Use the findings from the needs assessment to guide effective strategies for working with Latino youth involved in the juvenile justice system and their families in all seven counties;
- Examine the effectiveness of referrals to related systems (education, foster care, mental health services, etc.) and develop objective assessment tools which are consistent across all counties if they do not exist;
- Examine the policies, processes, and decision making points along the entire continuum in all seven counties to see if there are disparities specific to Latino youth that impact their progression through the system (e.g., cultural barriers for parents, lack of legal representation, missed diversion opportunities, etc.);
- Address the lack of bilingual representation in juvenile justice programs in all seven counties. Increase the diversity of staff (hiring, training, community awareness) in the juvenile justice system in all seven counties by developing a strategy for recruiting, hiring, and training more Latino or bicultural Spanish-speaking advocates or staff;
- Integrate culturally appropriate strategies, including integrating family approaches, addressing cultural identity issues, and having a solid understanding of immigrant experiences;
- Increase community awareness among juvenile justice personnel to improve their understanding of community resources, dynamics, and politics;
- Increase the number of community programs that assist Latino youth in the juvenile justice system and upon release; and
- Increase collaboration with local stakeholders and develop partnerships between CBOs and the juvenile justice system.
Appendix A: Focus Group and Informational Interview Guides
You have been asked to participate in this group because you have been in contact with the Pennsylvania system for detention and/or probation for youths. The Disproportionate Minority Impact Sub-committee of the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency is conducting this group to get information on the needs of Latino Youth who have been in detention and/or probation. We are also looking for information on services which would help Latino Youths stay out of the juvenile justice system, and any problems Latino Youths might have in getting services.

We will be talking about your experiences with detention and/or probation, and I have a set of questions to ask. There are no right or wrong answers, and we value everyone's opinion. The information from these discussion groups will be combined with other information in a report which we will send to the Disproportionate Minority Contact Sub-committee. The group tonight will be tape recorded because we do not want to miss anything you say. I want you to know that everything you say here is confidential. Your first or last name will never be used in any report that comes out of this group. In addition, we do not know your last name, and we will only use first names in the group and on the tape to protect you.

My job is to ask the questions tonight. Since we have a lot of things to talk about, I may have to ask you to finish talking about a question to make sure we finish on time. Also, I ask that only one person talk at a time so that everyone has a chance to talk. Please turn off your cell phones or put them on "vibrate." Please use the rest rooms or get something to eat at any time.

Before we start, does anyone have any questions?

Questions

1) First, let us introduce everyone. Please tell us your first name, and tell us a little bit about yourself and your family.

Probe for: age, grade in school, community they live in, family size, where from originally, ethnicity, fluency in English, any social services they and their family currently receive; have they ever been diagnosed with a learning disability (such as ADHD, dyslexia), mental health problem (depression, bi-polar disorder, etc.), substance abuse problem, or chronic physical health problem? If so, what?

2) How did you first come in contact with the juvenile justice system?

Probe for: what type of offense committed; where offense occurred; how old were they at the time; were they sentenced as an adult; what was the disposition of their case; were they detained or committed or placed, and if so, where; what social services, if any, have they received; were they re-offenders, and, if so, what was the offense and the disposition of their case; what is their current status?
3) Were there times when you were arrested, detained, committed, in placement, or on probation when you needed someone to speak to you to give you information in Spanish, or information in Spanish in writing, but you could not get the information in Spanish? For you? For your parents? If you did need information in Spanish, what kind of information did you need? When did this happen?

4) Have you met any police department intake workers or workers with the juvenile courts, detention, placement, or commitment centers, or probation offices who could speak both Spanish and English? If so, when? Were they Latino? If they were not Latino, did they understand your culture? Did staff who did not speak Spanish and English understand your culture? Respect it? Would staff who spoke both Spanish and English or were Latino have been helpful to you? To your parents? How could they have helped?

5) How well do you think the police intake staff, workers from the juvenile courts, detention centers, placement, commitment facilities, or probation offices who speak both Spanish and English speak Spanish? How much do you think they know about your culture and understand cultural differences between Anglo and Latino culture? Between different Latino cultures? How well do you think they respect your culture? How much information did they give you and your family in Spanish? Were there any differences in how much information in Spanish the workers at the detention centers, probation offices, and court gave you and your family? If so, what?

6) What services do youths in the juvenile court system and on probation and their families need to help them understand the system for youths? Probe for: how the juvenile justice system operates and what procedures are used; potential risk factors for youth; what prevention/youth programs are available; parenting skills for immigrant households. What are the potential barriers to communicating this information to Latino youths and their families? Probe for: language/cultural issues.

7) What services did you and your family receive because you were arrested, detained, committed, placed, or on probation? (Probe for: anger management, ESL classes, GED classes, gang intervention, youth employment, help with immigration issues, youth center, after-school program, etc.) Can you get these services in Spanish or English? How helpful would you say these services were they in keeping you from returning to the courts or detention or probation?

8) Did you or your family have any problems receiving these services? If so, what were they? Probe for: language/cultural issues, transportation, services not located in the community, service not open during accessible hours, issues with immigration status, racial bias/inequalities.

9) Were there any services you or your family needed but did not get? If so, what were they? What was the reason you did not get them?

10) Were there any services you and your parents did NOT get that would have helped keep you from further contact with the courts or detention or probation? What were they? (Probe for: anger management, ESL classes, GED classes, gang intervention, youth employment, help with immigration issues, youth center, after-school program, etc.) Why didn't you or your parents receive these services?
11) What types of services should be offered to Latino youths and their families in your community to prevent Latino youth from becoming involved with the courts, detention, or probation? Probe for: bilingual/bicultural prevention programs, youth employment programs, GED programs, ESL programs, parenting skills for immigrant families.

12) What would be some problems to getting these services? How should these problems be solved? Would you or your family use these services? Why or why not?
You have been asked to participate in this group because your son or daughter has been in contact with the Pennsylvania system of detention and/or probation for youths. The Disproportionate Minority Contact Sub-committee of the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency is conducting this group to get information on the needs of Latino Youth who have been in detention and/or on probation and their families. We are also looking for information on services which would help Latino Youths and their families stay out of the juvenile justice system, and any problems Latino Youths and their families might have in getting services.

We will be talking about your experiences with your son or daughter's detention and/or probation, and I have a set of questions to ask. There are no right or wrong answers, and we value everyone's opinion. The information from these discussion groups will be combined with other information in a report we are writing which we will send to the Disproportionate Minority Contact Sub-committee. The group tonight will be tape recorded because we do not want to miss anything you say. I want you to know that everything you say here is confidential. Your first or last name will never be used in any report that comes out of this group. In addition, we do not know your last name, and we will only use first names in the group and on the tape to protect you.

My job is to ask the questions tonight. Since we have a lot of things to talk about, I may have to ask you to finish talking about a question to make sure we finish on time. Also, I ask that only one person talk at a time so that everyone has a chance to talk. Please turn off your cell phones or put them on "vibrate." Please use the rest rooms or get something to eat at any time.

Before we start, does anyone have any questions?

Questions

1) First, let us introduce everyone. Please tell us your first name, and tell us a little bit about yourself and your family.

Probe for: age of children, grade in school, community they live in, family size, where from originally, ethnicity, fluency in English of parents and children, any social services their family currently receives; has their son or daughter ever been diagnosed with a learning disability (such as ADHD, dyslexia), mental health problem (depression, bi-polar disorder, etc.), substance abuse problem, or chronic physical health problem? If so, what?

2) How did your family first come in contact with the juvenile justice system?

Probe for: what type of offense committed; where offense occurred; how old was child at the time; was child transferred to adult court; what was the disposition of the case; was the child detained or committed or placed, and if so, where; what social services, if any, has the child or the family received; was the child a re-offenders, and, if so, what was the offense and the disposition of the case; what is the child's current status?
3) Were there times when your son or daughter was arrested, detained, committed, in placement, or on probation when you needed someone to speak to you to give you information in Spanish, or information in Spanish in writing, but you could not get the information in Spanish? For your child? If you did need information in Spanish, what kind of information did you need? When did this happen?

4) Have you met any police department intake workers or workers with the juvenile courts, detention, placement, or commitment centers, or probation offices who could speak both Spanish and English? If so, when? Were they Latino? If they were not Latino, did they understand your culture? Did staff who did not speak Spanish and English understand your culture? Respect it? Would staff who spoke both Spanish and English or were Latino have been helpful to you? To your parents? How could they have helped?

5) How well do you think the police intake staff, workers from the juvenile courts, detention centers, placement, commitment facilities, or probation offices who speak both Spanish and English speak Spanish? How much do you think they know about your culture and understand cultural differences between Anglo and Latino culture? Between different Latino cultures? How well do you think they respect your culture? How much information did they give you and your child in Spanish? Were there any differences in how much information in Spanish the workers at the detention centers, probation offices, and court gave you and your child? If so, what? Perhaps probe for how their experience would have been different if there was an increased understanding of cultural issues.

6) What services do youths in the juvenile court system and on probation and their families need to help them understand the system for youths? Probe for: how the juvenile justice system operates and what procedures are used; potential risk factors for youth; what prevention/youth programs are available; parenting skills for immigrant households. What are the potential barriers to communicating this information to Latino youths and their families? Probe for: language/cultural issues.

7) What services did you and your child receive because your child was arrested, detained, committed, placed, or on probation? (Probe for: anger management, ESL classes, GED classes, gang intervention, youth employment, help with immigration issues, youth center, after-school program, etc.) Can you get these services in Spanish or English? How helpful would you say these services were in keeping your child from returning to the courts or detention or probation?

8) Did you or your child have any problems receiving these services? If so, what were they? Probe for: language/cultural issues, transportation, services not located in the community, service not open during accessible hours, issues with immigration status, racial bias/inequalities.

9) Were there any services you or your child needed but did not get? If so, what were they? What was the reason you did not get them? Hopefully this will be cross referenced with what is publicized as being available in the community.

10) Were there any services you and your child did NOT get that would have helped keep your child from further contact with the courts or detention or probation? What were they? (Probe for: anger management, ESL classes, GED classes, gang intervention, youth employment, help
with immigration issues, youth center, after-school program, etc.) Why didn't you or your child receive these services?

11) What types of services should be offered to Latino youths and their families in your community to prevent Latino youth from becoming involved with the courts, detention, or probation? Probe for: bilingual/bicultural prevention programs, youth employment programs, GED programs, ESL programs, parenting skills for immigrant families.

12) What would be some problems to getting these services? How should these problems be solved? Would you or your child use these services? Why or why not?
Appendix B: Key Informant List
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**Juvenile Probation Offices**
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County of Adams  
Juvenile Probation

Jeff Gregro  
Assistant Chief Probation Officer  
Berks County  
Juvenile Probation Office

Ann Marie Welch Christian  
Probation Officer  
Dauphin County  
Juvenile Probation Office

Sherry Lupton  
Diana Rodriguez  
Lancaster County  
Office of Juvenile Probation

Paul J. Werrell  
Chief Juvenile Probation Officer  
Manuel Gomez  
Juvenile Probation Officer  
Lehigh County  
Juvenile Probation Department

Omar Allegria  
Amy Warner  
Alex Maranon  
Probation Officers  
City of Philadelphia  
Juvenile Probation Department

Bryce C. Wickard  
Chief Probation Officer  
Christina M. Ortega  
Probation Officer  
York County  
Juvenile Probation Department

**Social Service Agencies**

Mirna Wildasin  
Project Director, Second Generation
Center Director, Gettysburg Generacion Diez
Hempfield Behavioral Health
Gettysburg, PA

Brenda Franco-Teissonnierie
Parent/Partner Program Coordinator
Community Prevention Partnership
Reading, PA

Angel Figueroa
Vice President for Resource Development
I-LEAD
Reading, PA

Jacqueline Rucker
Executive Director
La Casa de Amistad
Harrisburg, PA

Christina Lickman
Director, Youth Build Program
Spanish American Civic Association
Lancaster, PA

Sybille Damas
Vice President for Neighborhood Development
Lisa Varon
Project Manager
PA Latino Juvenile Justice Network
Congreso de Latinos Unidos
Philadelphia, PA

Rashad Elby
Director
The Residential Program at Susquehanna Trail
Alternative Rehabilitation Communities, Inc.
York, PA
Appendix C: Tables
Table 1. Focus Group Participant Sources, Number, and Size by County¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Adams</th>
<th>Berks</th>
<th>Dauphin</th>
<th>Lancaster¹</th>
<th>Lehigh</th>
<th>Phila</th>
<th>York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JPO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPO</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congreso</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# parent groups | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1
# youth groups  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1
# parents       | 5 | 11| 12| 8 | 8 | 6 | 4
# youths        | 4 | 25| 3 | 7 | 14| 23| 7


Table 2. Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics of Parent Focus Group Participants (W/OUT YORK)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary language spoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Spanish</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish better than English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both equally</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English better than Spanish</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The parent and youth focus groups in Lancaster County were repeated due to a low participation (n=3 in each).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary language spoken w/children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Spanish</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish more than English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both equally</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English more than Spanish</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=54

Table 3. Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics of Youth Focus Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Latino</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish better than English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both equally</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English better than Spanish</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only English</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language spoken with parents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Spanish</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish more than English</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both equally</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English more than Spanish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only English</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=83
Table 4. Representation of Latino Youth in Juvenile Justice System and General Youth Population by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Percentage of Latino Youth</th>
<th>Juvenile Justice System</th>
<th>General Youth Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berks</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dauphin</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*Issues Facing Latino Youth and Families*

Latinos are the fastest-growing racial/ethnic group in the United States and already the largest racial/ethnic youth population in the country. According to the US Census Bureau the number of Latino juveniles in the United States will increase by almost 60% by 2020. Not surprisingly, there are a growing number of Latino youth in the juvenile justice system, and this fact is not likely to reverse itself without intervention. States with an emerging Latino population across the country have a unique opportunity to be proactive in addressing gaps in their ability to serve Latinos on various levels, including, prevention, intervention, re-entry programs, treatment programs, and workforce development. There are evidence-based systemic changes that can address the issues facing Latino youth in the justice system and help to reduce disparities and disproportionate minority contact (DMC).

*Disproportionate Minority Contact*

A close examination of the national data shows that Latino youth are increasingly the subject of unequal treatment within the US criminal justice system (Hartney and Silva, 2007). They are overrepresented at every stage along the juvenile justice continuum from arrest to incarceration. Addressing the problem is complex, as there are underlying factors that contribute to DMC. In the juvenile justice system, offender and criminal labeling, racial ethnic bias and attribution, insufficient diversion options, barriers to parental advocacy and poor system/community integration contribute to their overrepresentation.
These system-level factors are further compounded by socioeconomic conditions, family factors, and educational system issues. Poor socioeconomic conditions include low income jobs, low mobility, few job opportunities, urban density/high crime rates, few community support services, and inadequate health and welfare resources. Family factors shown to contribute to minority overrepresentation include economic stress, limited supervision, and high percentage of single parent homes (although Latino families usually have two parent households). Inadequate educational system issues are evidenced by a lack of early childhood education and prevention programs, the high number of early dropouts, a lack of cultural-responsive education and poor education quality overall. In addition, a lack of cultural role models is problematic considering the influence peers and positive adults have during adolescence (Devine, Coolbaugh, & Jenkins, 1998).

The Annie E. Casey Foundation’s Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) recommends ten strategies justice and law enforcement departments should consider when addressing disproportionate minority contact (DMC), including confinement of Latinos/as:

1. Formulate a vision and related policy goals for reducing DMC.
2. Create structures (e.g. task forces) charged with sustaining a focus on DMC.
3. Collect data and conduct research to document where disparities occur.
4. Build coalitions and alliances with communities and people of color.
5. Diversify the composition of the system’s work force.
6. Diversify the service delivery system by contracting with organizations located in communities of color and managed by people of color.
7. Provide cultural and racial sensitivity training for staff at all levels of every
agency of the system.

8. Minimize opportunities for discriminatory decisions by creating objective instruments and guidelines free of racial bias.

9. Improve defense representation to increase advocacy for youth of color.

10. Change the policies and practices of other systems (e.g. mental health, child welfare) to prevent “dumping” into secure detention youth who would be better served by those systems (Hoyt, Schiraldi, Smith and Ziedenberg, 2002).

National Successes/Best Practices

While JDAI makes several recommendations, often, the “how to” of effectively implementing model recommendations is not translated in practice. Among other challenges, resources and leadership support are needed to implement and sustain change. Therefore, it is important to recount how these recommendations have been implemented and to view examples of best practices. The JDAI recommendations have been categorized to include four areas: (1) increasing cultural competent systems and networks; (2) increasing the availability of appropriate services and structures; (3) reform system policies and (4) using data and research to inform juvenile justice processes.

This report provides an overview of policy, system changes and enhancements that can reduce the overrepresentation of Latino youth in the juvenile justice system and better respond to their needs. It provides strategies to lessen the negative impact and illustrates examples of successful practices from across the country in the key areas identified. This report concludes with recommendations for the next steps that should be taken to continue the work of reducing DMC and the overrepresentation of Latino youth in the justice system.
1. Increase Cultural Competent Systems and Networks

The inadequate level of representation of culturally trained juvenile justice staff to meet needs of youth being served is a paramount issue affecting many cities and states. In addition to recruitment and hiring practices, implementation of cultural diversity and cultural awareness training for all staff, including administrators is imperative. Integrating culturally appropriate strategies means that programs should consider integrating family approaches, hiring bilingual/bicultural program staff, addressing cultural identity issues, and language, and having a solid understanding of immigrant experiences.

Culturally competent staff and system responses can lead to better outcomes for Latino youth. This includes a review of intake practices, release to custody practices, and general awareness of cultural differences (i.e., youth not making eye contact with authority figure) as a sign of respect instead of the latter. Staff must be familiar with immigration patterns and the impact on families. Some Latino youth live in the US with someone other than a parent (older sibling, aunts/uncles, and other extended family members). It is not uncommon for some Latino children to be sent to live in the US with extended family because parents feel there are better opportunities for work and education than in their home country or their parents may have been deported. If intake workers do not believe these “other” people are their caregivers, they may not release them to their custody, causing unnecessary and unfair stays in secure detention. Parents of youth who are undocumented may fear getting into trouble themselves if they have to report to a correctional institution because of their status (Villaruel et al, 2002). This can contribute to parents not coming to pick up their children from custody.
Model Strategies:

- In Santa Cruz, California, the probation agency developed a cultural competency plan and appointed a cultural competency coordinator to ensure that all program processes support the reduction of DMC. Additionally, guidelines were established regarding the types of skills and abilities needed by staff. Ongoing training was provided in cultural sensitivity, cultural competence and the dynamics involved in disproportionate representation and disparate treatment of Latino youth.

- In Multnomah County, Oregon, several changes were made to training and staffing patterns along the juvenile justice continuum. For example, the probation department diversified itself to reflect the demographics of the county. Racial and cultural sensitivity training was provided. Four part-time trial assistants were hired to support attorneys with pretrial placement and decision planning. In an effort to divert youth from initial contact with the system, community police officers were also trained.

- In an effort to reduce barriers to family involvement in the juvenile justice system, Santa Cruz County Probation took the following steps (Giraldo, 2008):

  1. Contracted with a professional who can translate forms and court jargon in a way clients can understand, taking into account the people who will be reading the form and their literacy level

  2. Distributed brochures and posted juvenile hall policies and procedures and visiting hours in Spanish.

  3. Developed a video that plays continuously in the juvenile court waiting area that describes the probation and court process in Spanish.
For purposes of program delivery, Santa Cruz, CA altered the start time of parent workshop to later in the evening to be considerate of seasonal migrant farmworker schedules. They provided a hot meal and child care for small children. They tweaked the evidence-based curriculum (i.e. role play exercises) to be more culturally attuned with the daily experiences of Latino families and to increase family buy-in.

2. Increase Availability of Appropriate Services and Structures

There is a lack of community-based alternatives for youth, and an even greater lack of alternatives specifically targeting the needs of Latino youth in particular. Funding to increase protective factors which include cultural and gender identity, jobs, education, meaningful opportunities in community such as advocacy, civic participation, and mentoring are necessary. In addition, service delivery that provides an appropriate mix of prevention, intervention, and aftercare services to address identified risk factors for Latino youth is critical.

Nationally, NCCD analysis of the Adolescent Health Survey found that 28% of Hispanics, and 25% of African American high school students reported they were victims of violent crime, compared with 11% of Asians and 16% of Whites (Wordes & Nunez, 2002). Latina girls have higher rates of dropping out of school and pregnancy as well as higher suicide rates, these indicators are critical in the prevention of juvenile delinquency. For Latino youth, the process of acculturation can have negative effects on mental health status (NCLR, 2005). Appropriate programming must include mental health services to deal with issues of victimization, suicide ideation, substance abuse treatment, teen pregnancy prevention, and support programs for children of incarcerated parents. It also includes programming and services
which may help to create a safety net. Education and support for parents at risk of abuse/ neglect of children, increased legal representation for youth inside to reduce transfers to adult court, and language translation for parents with children involved in juvenile justice court system are all services that could help reduce Latino delinquency.

Often, challenges exist regarding cooperation and coordination among the education system, social service providers, and the juvenile justice system (probation, detention, residential). For families, there are often barriers and challenges to accessing services. These include inadequate sources of treatment and insufficient Latino personnel. The most commonly reported barriers were lack of knowledge of where to seek treatment, distance to treatment, transportation issues, and lack of Spanish speaking providers who are culturally and linguistically trained (NCLR, 2005). Documents are often not available in Spanish, lack of lack certified translators or unavailability of translators when needed. This is further complicated by the stigma surrounding receiving mental health services in Latino families and their reluctance to utilize outside services.

Model Strategies

- In Santa Cruz, CA, the probation department continuously communicates with their partners, including law enforcement agencies about alternatives to detention and the importance of having these options for all youth.
- In Multnomah County, Oregon community alternatives to detention were created including shelter care, foster homes, home detention, and day reporting center.
3. Reforming system policies that negatively impact Latinos

In order to reduce racial disparities, biases in assessment instruments and in policies and practices must be addressed. System change requires coordination among a variety of youth-serving organizations, including child welfare, education, health, and juvenile justice agencies, that may not be accustomed to coordinating and collaborating with each other (OJJDP). From law enforcement policies and practices (e.g., targeting low income neighborhoods), to staff biases in processing (Hoyt et al, 2002). Perceptions that minority youth lack the community and family resources to support alternatives to detention and that the only way for them to receive treatment is from the system. Also the inability to see larger social forces affecting their delinquent behaviors may contribute to their status. Nationally, Latino youth serve more time, an average of 305 days, compared to White youth average of 193 days (Villaruel et al, 2002).

Further, many jurisdictions lack objective risk assessment instruments. Often there are criteria that may create racial bias, and these should be addressed. Using a structured decision making (SDM) model evaluates the youth’s background and estimates likelihood for recidivism from an objective, standardized, and empirically tested approach (NCCD-CRC). This can help improve decision making by classifying youth according to level of risk and reassessing them at different stages in the process. Accurate risk and needs can help inform treatment, placement, and court disposition. It can also be used to step-down youth into a lower-security program if warranted. Alternatives to secure detention for cases that do not pose a public safety risk or are for technical violations can help to reduce disparities in the system as well as provide cost-effective approaches, whereby savings can be allocated to prevention services, program needs or staff training.
Targeting policies and practices that may contribute to DMC is also important. JDAI recommends creating new policies and practices for probation violations, warrants and “awaiting placement” cases (Hoyt et al, 2002). In a DMC workshop with Alameda County, California, NCCD engaged probation staff about the reasons that youth do not show up for their court hearings and about the reasons why they don’t comply with court orders. Probation staff were asked to identify ways the department could reduce probation violations, increase appearance in court, increase compliance and the resources that would be needed as part of the local DMC planning process. This type of work can be a catalyst for change in how staff think about, respond to and deliver services to improve outcomes for youth in their care.

Model Strategies

- The successes of DMC work in Santa Cruz Probation Dept. can be attributable to the development and agreement on a set of sanctions (levels of community based program options) to increase alternatives to detention. More than one level of supervision was provided. Multnomah County developed and validated a risk assessment instrument to guide decisions regarding admissions to detention. The result was a more powerful tool to identify risk to re-offend or failure to appear. “The county stopped relying on criteria such as “good family structure” and “gang affiliation,” which may be biased against youth of color, and expanded the “school attendance” factor to include “productive activity.”

The following are examples of strategies used to increase likelihood youth will appear in court, thus reducing warrants.

- Provide date of hearing in writing
- Call to remind youth and parent
• Provide transportation or public transportation passes

• Cook County, Illinois: court mails notices of next court hearings and phones youth and families as reminders, service providers alerted to court hearings and remind youth. Failure to appear (FTA) reduced from 39% to 13% of court hearings.

• El Paso County, CO: Use grassroots advocates to remind and/or transport youth to hearing

• Santa Clara County, CA and Bellingham, WA: Reset hearing date and warrant placed on hold for one to two weeks while PO and public defender contact youth

• Clayton County, Georgia: established a Locator unit which is notified electronically when a youth fails to appear in court. The unit contacts the parent at home or at work, or the youth’s school if the parent has not been reached or message cannot be left. The probation officer may also be called. When the probation officer intervenes, a form describing the failure to appear in court and the penalties related to this as well as the information that the FTA will be forgiven if the parent calls the court the next business day is given to the parent. The Presiding judge indicates that 99% of the youth are found the same day, stating they either did not receive a summons or forgot about the hearing. FTAs reduced by 88%.

4. Using Data and Research to Inform the Juvenile Justice Processes

Although it is improving, there continues to be a lack of information/data to appropriately respond to the issues facing Latino youth. Collecting, maintaining, and reviewing data on race/ethnicity across all decision points in the system is important to informing the process.
Further, proper data collection allows for valid comparisons and supports funding for community based programming and evaluation.

**Model Strategies**

- Santa Cruz County, CA probation department created a map of key decision points affecting decisions to arrest, book, detain, release and place juveniles. They use data to demonstrate that most youth who are sanctioned to alternatives to detention do not re-offend and make it to most court hearings.

- Multnomah County, Oregon collects and maintains data on the detention system, over-representation, and disparate treatment.

This report seeks to build on recommended practices and identify the next steps that should be taken to continue DMC work. Based on what we have learned by identifying the needs of Latino youth and families in contact with the system in Pennsylvania, more specific guidelines can be outlined.

**Next Steps**

1. Utilize the findings from needs assessment to guide effective strategies for working with Latino youth and their families.

2. Examine interconnectedness of related systems (education, foster care, mental health services, etc). Develop appropriate assessment tools if they do not exist.
3. Address the policies, processes, and decision making points along the entire continuum to see if there are disparities specific to Latino youth that impact their progression through the system (E.g., cultural barriers with parents, legal representation, diversion opportunities, etc.)

4. Address the representation of staff in juvenile justice programs. Increase the diversity of staff (hiring, training, community awareness) in the juvenile justice system by developing a strategy for recruiting, hiring and training more advocates/staff who are Latino, or who speak Spanish and are culturally competent.

5. Increase community awareness among juvenile justice personnel to improve their understanding of community resources, dynamics and politics. Increase community programs to better assist Latino youth in the system and upon release. Increase collaboration with local stakeholders and develop partnerships between CBO’s and the juvenile justice system can help improve outcomes for youth.

6. Assess systemic data collection issues and barriers. Systematic uniform data collection procedures should be established for all counties. Without accurate data, racial and ethnic profiles, the system will fail to accurately reflect and represent the Latino population. This inaccuracy poses limitations/barriers to examine the uniqueness of the Latino juvenile population, to address the disparities and to develop appropriate services and programs for this population.
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