



## The Peace Alliance

---

### *Factsheet on Evidence Based Prevention and Intervention Programs*

Each year, states spend a total of about \$5.7 billion incarcerating nonviolent youth offenders<sup>1</sup>, but there are many evidence based programs that have been proven to be effective at reducing violence while saving money. Successful programs such as these would be supported by the Youth PROMISE Act.

#### **Ohio:**

- **In 1994, Ohio implemented RECLAIM Ohio**, a performance-based funding partnership between the state and local governments that expanded counties' use of effective, cost-efficient community-based options for lower-risk juvenile offenders. The program has helped **cut recidivism rates and saved the state millions of dollars**, while annual admissions to Department of Youth Services (DYS) facilities **fell more than 80 percent** between fiscal 1992 and 2012, from more than 3,700 to 633.<sup>2</sup>
- **Only 20 percent** of RECLAIM juveniles recidivated — that is, were subsequently adjudicated, convicted, or committed to a state juvenile or adult facility — within 2.5 to 3.5 years, **compared with more than 50 percent** of those released from DYS facilities.<sup>2</sup>
- Housing a youth in a DYS correctional facility costs **\$338 a day – about \$123,370 per year**, while placing a juvenile in a community-based RECLAIM program costs **\$8,539 annually, or only \$23.50 a day**. The average daily facility population in FY 2010 was 1,125 and the average length of stay was 11.9 months.<sup>3 4</sup>
- By funding more effective community-based alternatives for juvenile offenders, **RECLAIM saved Ohio as much as \$45 for each \$1 invested** in offender processing and estimated, long-term victim costs.<sup>2 5</sup>
- **Montgomery County's LIFE (Learning Independence and Family Empowerment)** program is a Home-Based Family Counseling Program designed to address the behavioral health needs of youth ages 12 to 17 and their family members, involved with The Juvenile Court System.<sup>6</sup>
  - The L.I.F.E Program utilizes the Functional Family Therapy Model (FFT). FFT is an **intensive treatment program** targeting youth, 10-18 years old, with behavioral problems. It **engages family members** in therapy sessions with a clinician aimed at impacting the entire environment of the youth. The program improves supportive communication patterns and reinforces positive school-family and community-family relationships, and has been shown to effectively decrease general delinquent behavior and substance abuse, and increase family cohesion. Youth who successfully completed the LIFE Program were **69.3% less likely to recidivate**.<sup>7 8</sup>

#### **Pennsylvania:**

- Counties in Pennsylvania that **implemented an Evidence Based Intervention**, (EBI) in 2005-2010 saw **an overall 28% decrease** in the number of placements. However, counties that **did not adopt an EBI program** experienced a **22% increase in number of restrictive placements** of youth over the same 6 year period.<sup>9</sup>
- For **every dollar** invested in evidence-based prevention programs, there is a **\$5 to \$25 dollar return**, and the cost of a **90-day placement of one youth** in a detention facility is equal to the cost of providing a complete, **proven-effective, parenting program to 100 families**.<sup>10</sup>

- Seven research-based juvenile delinquency intervention programs in the state are estimated to **return \$317 million per year** in: reduced correction costs, welfare and social services burden, drug and mental health treatment, and increased employment and tax revenue.<sup>11</sup>
- These programs currently have **statewide economic benefits**: Functional Family Therapy (\$136 million), Nurse-Family Partnership (\$119,574,400), Multi-systemic Therapy (\$30 million), Life Skills Training Program (\$16,160,000), Strengthening Families (\$13,082,000), Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care (\$1,427,958), and Big Brothers/Sisters (\$378,000).<sup>11</sup>
- **Life Skills Training Program (LST)**: is a community program designed to **prevent substance abuse and violence** and that provides middle school students with self-care tactics including: resisting peer pressure, decision making skills, communication skills and methods to reduce anxiety.
  - There are estimated **20,000** young people served, with an estimated **per dollar return on investment of \$25.72**, and a total potential economic benefit statewide of **\$16,160,000 per year**.<sup>11</sup>
- **Multi-systemic Therapy (MST)** is a **treatment focused** program targeting at-risk youth 12-17 years old exhibiting chronic/serious antisocial behavior. Trained clinicians deliver **comprehensive care** over 3-5 months, including crisis care and intensive skills coaching, to change home, school and community environments. MST programs have been proven to **increase pro-social functioning, decrease truancy, and reduce drug and alcohol abuse**. In 2008, MST produced an estimated **\$30 million in savings**.<sup>12 13</sup>
- Also used in Pennsylvania, **Functional Family Therapy** engages family members and reinforces positive school-family and community-family relationships, and has been shown to effectively decrease general delinquent behavior and substance abuse, and increase family cohesion.<sup>8</sup>
  - FFT has been proven to **decrease the likelihood of sibling involvement with the justice system by 65%** 2.5-3.5 years after the intervention is administered.<sup>8</sup>
  - FFT provides Pennsylvania with a **statewide economic benefit of \$136 million per year**.<sup>11</sup>

#### **Restorative Justice:**

*The term ‘restorative justice practices’ refers to facilitated group practices that emphasize shared understanding and repairing any harm experienced in connection with the actions of one or more individuals. Restorative justice practices may include community conferences, victim-offender dialogues, family group conferences, or restorative circles, and have been increasingly used in juvenile settings and school systems.*

- After the Longmont Community Justice Partnership (in Longmont Colorado) implemented its **Community Restorative Justice Program**, recidivism rates among youth dropped to **less than 10%** in its first three years, **compared to a county-wide rate of over 50%**.<sup>14</sup>
- Restorative Justice programs from the **Community Conferencing Center** in Baltimore, Maryland has resulted in a **60% reduction in recidivism** in young offenders compared to similar juvenile justice cases in the traditional juvenile justice system.<sup>15</sup>
- In Milwaukee County, Wisconsin, a Community Conferencing program showed a **drop in rearrest rates** among offenders with no prior conviction one year out, **from 27.6% to 8.8%**, when measured against a control group. Through the end of the next year, **the control group had reached 37.9%**, with the **Restorative Justice group remaining at 8.8%**.<sup>16</sup>
- A Canadian study of a conferencing program in an Alberta First Nations community found that **for every dollar spent on restorative justice efforts**, the Canadian government would have spent somewhere **between \$2.46 and \$12.15**, and the Provincial government **would have spent \$3.75**. The report also suspects the stated savings to be “**significantly understated**”, since they do not take factors like reduced recidivism into account.<sup>17</sup>

- 
- 1 [http://www.justicepolicy.org/images/upload/09\\_05\\_rep\\_costssofconfinement\\_jj\\_ps.pdf](http://www.justicepolicy.org/images/upload/09_05_rep_costssofconfinement_jj_ps.pdf)
  - 2 <http://www.pewstates.org/research/reports/state-local-partnership-in-ohio-cuts-juvenile-recidivism-costs-85899478801?p=3>
  - 3 <http://www.juvenilecoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/RightsizingJuvenileJusticeinOhio2-16-111.pdf>
  - 4 <http://thecrimereport.s3.amazonaws.com/2/e4/7/1538/buttsjustice.pdf>
  - 5 <http://www.modelsforchange.net/publications/297>
  - 6 <http://www.southcommunity.com/services/youth-care/learning-independence-and-family-empowerment-program/>
  - 7 <http://www.fftinc.com/resources/LIFE%20Program%20FFT%20Article.pdf>
  - 8 <http://www.episcenter.psu.edu/sites/default/files/ebp/FFT%20logic%20model.pdf>
  - 9 <http://www.episcenter.psu.edu/sites/default/files/ebp/Placement%20Data%205-2012.pdf>
  - 10 <http://www.episcenter.psu.edu/sites/default/files/Articles/IFI%20-%20Prevention%20vs%20Incarceration%20Costs.pdf>
  - 11 [http://prevention.psu.edu/pubs/docs/PCCD\\_Report2.pdf](http://prevention.psu.edu/pubs/docs/PCCD_Report2.pdf)
  - 12 <http://www.episcenter.psu.edu/sites/default/files/resources/FY%202011-2012%20EBI%20Outcomes%20Summary%20FINAL.pdf>
  - 13 [http://www.parecovery.org/documents/QUIC\\_Facts\\_040411.pdf](http://www.parecovery.org/documents/QUIC_Facts_040411.pdf)
  - 14 [http://www.lcjp.org/files/LCJP%202007-2009%20Report%20Final\(1\).pdf](http://www.lcjp.org/files/LCJP%202007-2009%20Report%20Final(1).pdf)
  - 15 <http://www.communityconferencing.org/index.php/impact/>
  - 16 <http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lab/reports/04-6full.pdf>
  - 17 <http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pbletns/cst-bnft-hllw-wtr/index-eng.aspx>