

Multnomah County

Juvenile Crime Prevention
Plan

2025 - 2027

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Guidelines for Developing Local High Risk Juvenile Crime Prevention Plans

The Oregon Youth Development Division (YDD) provides Juvenile Crime Prevention (JCP) funds to counties and tribes for programs focused on youth at risk for juvenile crime and establishes assessment criteria for the local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans. The criteria include, but are not limited to, measuring changes in juvenile crime and recidivism ([ORS 417.850](#)).

The purpose of this document is to provide guidelines for developing local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans for 2023-2025 biennium ([ORS 417.855](#)).

Each board of county commissioners shall designate an agency or organization to serve as the lead planning organization to facilitate the creation of a partnership among state and local public and private entities in each county. The partnership shall include, but is not limited to, education representatives, public health representatives, local alcohol and drug planning committees, representatives of the court system, local mental health planning committees, city or municipal representatives and local public safety coordinating councils. The partnership shall develop a local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plan ([ORS 417.855](#)).

Local public safety coordinating council shall develop and recommend to the county board of commissioners a plan designed to prevent criminal involvement by youth. The plan must provide for coordination of community-wide services involving treatment, education, employment and intervention strategies aimed at crime prevention ([ORS 423.565](#)).

JCP plans will be reviewed for approval by the Youth Development Council (YDC) members and staff. The lead agency is required to submit a JCP Plan in accordance with the “Required Plan Elements” described in this document.

Additionally, [ORS 417.850](#) requires the YDC to review and coordinate county youth diversion plans and basic services grants with the local high-risk juvenile crime prevention plans.

Oregon Administrative rules relating to the [Juvenile Crime Prevention](#) have been adopted by the YDC and have been filed by the Secretary of State in Chapter 423, Division 120.

Required Plan Elements

1. Planning Process

The Multnomah County Juvenile Services Division envisions a community where every young person thrives through strong connections and effective support, helping them steer away from the criminal justice system and towards successful futures.

Our mission is to empower youth by connecting them to their communities and enhancing public safety through effective interventions. We aim to reduce recidivism and prevent further involvement in the juvenile and adult justice systems.

Our programs and services are designed to provide youth and families with resources, skills, and support by leveraging partnerships with community organizations and other stakeholders. The juvenile justice system prioritizes restorative practices that are healing-centered, trauma-informed, and tailored to the needs of individuals.

Since the submission of the 2023-2025 JCP plan, we have engaged in thoughtful planning and discussions, including a thorough evaluation and data analysis of the services funded by the JCP. We have conducted numerous stakeholder meetings to understand community needs, which revealed a strong demand for enhancing prevention and intervention services to keep youth engaged in their communities.

BIPOC youth continue to be overrepresented in the Multnomah County Juvenile Justice System. 2024 data indicates that BIPOC youth are 5x more likely to be referred to JSD as White youth. What is important to note is that BIPOC youth are 8x more likely to be referred for criminal referrals. 86% of youth benefiting from the services from JCP Funding identify as Black, Indigenous, and/or People of Color. 405 youth were served on probation in FY 2024. 86% of those youth did not receive a new adjudication within one-year post disposition.

1. Population to be served

The population served by this funding are youth ages 10-17 in Multnomah County. Although Multnomah County is geographically small in comparison to the other 35 counties in Oregon, it is the most racially and ethnically diverse county in the state. These funds serve youth demonstrating at-risk behaviors that have come to the attention of Juvenile Services Division by way of diversion, schools, courts, and/or law enforcement. Last fiscal year, 362 youth were served by JCP-prevention funded programs. Of those youth, 47 percent were African-American youth, 30 percent were Hispanic, 15 percent were Caucasian, and 8 percent were other. 89 percent were males.

2. Services/programs to be funded

- Multnomah County uses JCP funds, along with Gang Transition Services (GTS) funds, to support services for pre-adjudicated and adjudicated youth who are impacted by the juvenile justice system.
- These funds provide critical community-based, family-focused, culturally-responsive services to at-risk youth in our community. These services include the Community Monitoring Program (CMP), Community Healing Initiative (CHI), and short-term shelter placements.
- Since the implementation of Senate Bill 1008 on January 2, 2020 - which ended the automatic transfer of youth to adult criminal court - the juvenile system has assumed responsibility for processing and providing services to young people adjudicated on very serious person-to-person felonies. Between January 1, 2024 and December 31, 2024 there were 56 youth referred to Multnomah County Juvenile Services Division that previously would have been automatically transferred to the adult system.
 - Of those 56 youth, 17 had their cases dismissed. The remaining 39 youth had petitions filed in the juvenile court, with none of those youth ending up waived to the adult system. With the juvenile system now responsible for supervision of youth adjudicated for serious felony cases, the services funded by JCP are needed more than ever. JCP funding assists Multnomah County in continuing to provide proven resources that positively impact youth outcomes.
- **COMMUNITY HEALING INITIATIVE (CHI):** CHI is a family- and community-centered collaboration designed to stop youth gang and gun violence in Multnomah County by addressing its root causes. This collaborative paradigm between Multnomah County and culturally-specific community-based providers reflects joint system responsibility that entails shared financial resources and investments, shared system outcomes and shared risk. CHI provides culturally specific services to African American, Latinx youth, African immigrant and refugee youth and families. CHI applies supervision/suppression, intervention, and prevention strategies to youth and families

who have recent involvement with high-risk activities and behaviors relevant to violence/gun violence. Each family receives a comprehensive assessment and individualized family service plan. Services are tailored to meet a family's individual needs and integrated in a manner that reduces and prevents gang violence. A network of public safety and social service agencies, and community-based organizations known as the CHI Team, build service capacity, promote integrated case management, increase connection to ethnic communities in the metropolitan area, and augment community safety. The CHI Team focuses on sustainability through fostering family and community ownership and empowerment. Services are evidence-based, culturally-specific, and family-oriented. The family service plans address criminogenic needs that most closely link with recidivism and youth violence. CHI also includes a mentoring program which pairs CHI youth with a professional adult mentor with similar life experiences, who represents a culturally relevant and positive role model in the young person's life. The goals of CHI are to prevent medium and high-risk youth of color from committing new crimes and penetrating further into the justice system. Culturally competent, strength-based programs that are delivered in homes and the community are shown to be most effective with marginalized youth.

- **SHELTER CARE:** Shelter care is one of the alternatives to detention that the Juvenile Services Division (JSD) utilizes. Shelter care services offer at-risk youth who would otherwise be placed in costly detention beds an opportunity to remain safely in the community under a high level of structure and supervision by professional shelter care providers. JSD contracts with Boys and Girls Aid and Maple Star Oregon to provide short-term shelter and treatment foster care to pre- and post-adjudicated youth. Services are focused on providing a safe, secure and supportive environment that assists with behavioral stabilization, strengthening individual and family relationships, using evidence-based practices (EBP) and strength-based approaches in dealing with the criminogenic needs of the youth, and facilitating the youth's reintegration back to the family and/or community. The majority of justice-involved youth placed in these shelter programs are Latinx and African American. By serving youth of color in culturally appropriate placements (short-term shelter care or treatment foster care), research has shown the disproportionate confinement of youth of color drops significantly and keeps youth connected to their communities without compromising public safety.
- **COMMUNITY MONITORING PROGRAM (CMP) APPENDIX B:** Community monitoring is another alternative to detention utilized by the Juvenile Services Division (JSD). The Community Monitoring Program (CMP) permits some at-risk youth who would otherwise be housed in detention to remain in the community under the supervision of Volunteers of America's (VOA) Youth Monitors. CMP serves as a central component of Multnomah County's juvenile detention reform work. The program gives

at-risk youth greater opportunity to demonstrate accountability and responsibility than if they would have been in detention. Additionally, youth can remain involved in the community, their schools, and access community-based services. The Juvenile Court establishes the conditions under which each youth will remain in the community. Under continuous supervision through the use of electronic monitoring, home visits and phone calls, the youth can continue with school and/or work and maintain community ties, support systems, or alternative care. VOA's Youth Monitors are specially trained to detect violations of conditions of release or threats to public safety. Youth Monitors conduct random field visits, evaluate any changes to the youth's living situation within the community and file reports with the Juvenile Court. To ensure community safety, any activity that places the public at risk may result in removal from the program and placement in detention under the authority of the Juvenile Services Division or the Juvenile Court.

3. JCP Risk Assessment Tool

The Juvenile Court Counselors, CHI Coordinators, and the Community Intervention Specialists conduct the assessments and reassessments. They participate in quarterly training that includes trauma informed care, assertive engagement, motivational interviewing, community resources, etc. They have also been trained in the OREGON JCP ASSESSMENT (2006.1)- Community Version. The JCP Assessment, in addition to a Family Assessment Tool, are used to create a Service/Success Plan with the youth and family based on strengths, needs, and risk level. The Juvenile Court Counselors are responsible for entering the assessment data into the YDD Data Manager and JJIS.

4. Evidence-Based Practice

See Appendix B and Appendix F

5. Cultural appropriateness

See Appendix C & D

6. Relationship of JCP Prevention Services to the JCP Basic and Diversion funds

Multnomah County utilizes funding from the Oregon Department of Education Youth Development Division to operate an additional program that maximizes GTS funding targeting all first-time youth offenders with a qualifying low-level offense. Eligible youth are referred to Community Healing Initiative - Early Intervention (CHI-EI), a

program operated by community-based, culturally-specific nonprofit organizations that provide support, services and referrals. Prior to July 2015, these first-time, low-level offenders received warning letters from the Multnomah County Juvenile Services Division (JSD). The early intervention and diversion program engages youth and their families with culturally-responsive care coordination and case management, school connection and reconnection assistance, pro-social activities and referrals to needed services (counseling, health, emergency assistance, etc.). This initiative was designed by a multi-disciplinary, cross-sector team to help reduce disparities in the number of referrals for youth of color to the Juvenile Services Division, and reduce the likelihood that these youth return and/or penetrate more deeply into the juvenile justice system.

7. Budget

See Appendix E

APPENDIX A – Sample planning partners list

Education representatives	Multnomah Education School District, Bich Do & Christine Otto
Public health representatives	Multnomah County Health Department
Alcohol and drug services	REAP, Corrections Health
Representatives of the court system	Chief Family Law Judge Patrick Henry ; Lead Juvenile Judge Amy Holmes Hehn
Mental health representatives	Multnomah County Behavioral Health Department
City or municipal representatives	OVP, City of Portland, City of Gresham

Local public safety coordinating councils	Multnomah County
Community based organizations	POIC + RAHS, Latino Network, Youth Advocate Program
Youth and families	Multnomah County Family Voice Council
Culturally specific organizations	REAP, SOS, Latino Network, Pathfinders, POIC
Workforce boards and services	Worksystems

Appendix B – Evidence-Based Practices and JCP Services

JCP Funded Services Calendar Year 2024:

Multnomah JCP Service Provider/Program	Total
CHI Probation - African American	13
CHI Probation - Latino	29
Community Monitoring Program (CMP)	149
Individual Therapy / SO	5
Individual Therapy/SOT	20
Shelter Care - MapleStar	9
MapleStar Oregon Inc.	9
Shelter Care BGAID	12
(blank)	
Grand Total	237

The Community Healing Initiative (CHI):

Helps to ensure that youth of color are receiving the support and services to meet their needs. At the community level, CHI is essential to increasing equity, and building capacity and safety in communities of color. Culturally-specific nonprofits Portland Opportunities Industrialization Center (POIC) and Latino Network providing services have adapted the services to specifically respond to the populations they serve. POIC's intervention approach is based on the Theory of Triadic Influence (TTI) (Flay, Snyder, & Petraitis, 2009) and informed by African-centered values, beliefs, and practices. Latino Network's intervention approach is based on the specific history of Latinos in Oregon, Latino cultural values, as well as the historical social oppressions and local social barriers they have had to face.

Community Monitoring (VOA)

Volunteers of America Oregon (VOAOR) partners with Multnomah County to implement the Community Monitoring Program (CMP). The staff is comprised of me as the Program Director, Program Lead, and five Youth Monitors. This is letter is to give you some basic information about the program.

The population that we serve is youth 12 to 19 years old who reside in Multnomah County up to 25 youth. These youth who are placed on CMP are pre-adjudication and post-adjudication. The Juvenile Court Counselor (JCC) must have a Home Safety Check completed prior to acceptance to the program or within a 24-hour period of the referral. The CMP staff will work families to ensure program compliance and respect their culture and values.

When a youth is referred to CMP, we require a Referral from the JCC, court orders, and any safety plans that apply. Youth and families will be given an orientation to CMP when released that will review the program rules and expectations. These intakes occur between the hours of 9:00AM to 4:00 PM. If an intake needs to occur outside of this time frame, it must be arranged in advance between the family, JCC, and CMP staff. You will find the rules to the program attached that the youth and families receive.

There are two types of monitoring, community and electronic. Youth on Community and Electronic Monitoring all start on level one and can move through the four levels of the program based on program compliance. Every Tuesday the Community Monitoring staff meets to discuss the performance of each youth on the program. At this meeting, it is decided if a youth should be leveled up or down depending on their

compliance with the program. In some cases when a youth is noncompliant, the youth will be summonsed by CMP staff to be reviewed at a Preliminary Hearing to decide if the youth will continue on the program or be held in detention.

SHELTER CARE:

Multnomah County serves as a model site, and has long been regarded as a national leader in the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI). Shelter care is one of the alternatives to detention that the Juvenile Services Division (JSD) utilizes. Shelter care services offer at-risk youth who would otherwise be placed in costly detention beds an opportunity to remain safely in the community under a high level of structure and supervision by professional shelter care providers. JSD contracts with Boys and Girls Aid and Maple Star Oregon to provide short-term shelter and treatment foster care to pre- and post-adjudicated youth. Services are focused on providing a safe, secure and supportive environment that assists with behavioral stabilization, strengthening individual and family relationships, using evidence-based practices (EBP) and strength-based approaches in dealing with the criminogenic needs of the youth, and facilitating the youth's reintegration back to the family and/or community. The majority of justice-involved youth placed in these shelter programs are Latinx and African American. By serving youth of color in culturally appropriate placements (short-term shelter care or treatment foster care), research has shown the disproportionate confinement of youth of color drops significantly and keeps youth connected to their communities without compromising public safety.

Appendix C – Cultural Appropriateness

The Community Healing Initiative (CHI) helps to ensure that youth of color are receiving the support and services to meet their needs. At the community level, CHI is essential to increasing equity, and building capacity and safety in communities of color. Culturally-specific nonprofits Portland Opportunities Industrialization Center (POIC) and Latino Network providing services have adapted the services to specifically respond to the populations they serve. POIC's intervention approach is based on the Theory of Triadic Influence (TTI) (Flay, Snyder, & Petraitis (2009) and informed by African-centered values, beliefs, and practices. Latino Network's intervention approach is based on the specific history of Latinos in Oregon, Latino cultural values, as well as the historical social oppressions and local social barriers they have had to face.

Overarching Themes in Literature:

- Youth should be treated as key player in their treatment plan - not just recipients
- Goal setting - youth should be involved in goal setting process and other important decisions about their involvement in the program - gives youth a voice and autonomy
- Providers should have a strong understanding of the youth's background - family, school, community, and cultural norms/traditions
- The physical setting is important - youth should feel like they are in a safe environment (both physically and emotionally) and one that is easily accessible to them
- Allow youth to freely express themselves in a safe space - understand that each youth is unique and will react/adapt to the program differently (aka one size does not fit all)
- Where appropriate, engage with youth's families and communities
- Use a strength's-based approach to treatment
- Rely on assessments/surveys to gauge youth's level of engagement and provide youth with feedback on their progress
- Culturally sensitive treatment approaches are shown to be more effective with youth
 - Providers should have training in cultural competence
 - Providers should take time to assess youth's experience with racism, their socio-economic context, the role of family and spirituality in treatment, and other cultural norms specific to the youth
 - For details on culturally sensitive treatment approaches with youth, see research under Racially/Ethnically Inclusive Strategies for Youth Engagement: Best Practices

Connecting Themes to Multnomah County Programs (e.g., CHI):

- Emphasis is placed on importance of supporting youth within the context of their families and communities
- Use of a strengths-based approach to treatment (Positive Youth Development framework - used within CHI)
 - This framework also encourages programs to involve and engage youth as equal partners
- Youth involvement in identifying needs/goals
- Incorporation of culturally-specific services

Developmentally Appropriate Programming for Youth: Literature Review

The Youth Development Handbook: Coming of Age in American Communities
Hamilton & Hamilton, Eds. (2004)

- Development is continuous - therefore when working on developmental goals with youth, it's important to identify domains for growth. Progress (not attainment) is key
- Youth Development principles: (1) emphasis on positive approach and universality (or goal of all youth thriving), (2) importance of healthy relationships and challenging activities that endure and change over time, (3) engaging young people as participants, not just recipients
- The best designed program is by itself neither the sole nor even strongest influence on attitudes and behavior - youth are also influenced by relationships
- Within any given program, a youth's experience is unique and what impacts their decisions may be the result of different programmatic influences (e.g., content learned vs. mentorship experience)
- One activity is not necessarily developmentally appropriate and enhancing for all youth
- Youth have different interests and needs and therefore respond differently to the same opportunities
- When a program engages participants in serious decisions, those programs usually benefit and can be more responsive, more attractive, and more effective

Important Program Features

- Youth centeredness - effective youth organizations put youth at the center and adults who work with them know about their interests and what they bring to the organization
 - They know about their lives at home, school, in the community and build on strengths
- Cycles of planning, practice, and performance - successful programs provide ongoing feedback to youth about how they are progressing as well as recognition of growth and accomplishment
- Caring community - critical for youth is a setting where they feel physically and emotionally safe, respected, and accepted

Exploring Developmentally Appropriate Practice (DAP)

Micemoyer (2016)

Pennsylvania State University

- Knowledge of Effective Practices (these are from the perspective of early learning with younger youth)
 - Creating a caring community of learners - build positive and responsive relationships between youth, staff, and families
 - Teaching to enhance development and learning - provide balance of teacher-directed and child-initiated activities that meet individual needs and goals
 - Planning curriculum to achieve important goals - develop written curriculum that supports individualized learning
 - Assessing development and learning - list assessment to curriculum and use assessment to measure youth's progress
 - Establishing reciprocal relationships with families - work in partnership with families to learn about child, develop two-way communication, and establish supportive relationships

Youth Engagement: Lessons Learned

Mix, Clary, Bradley (2021)

Youth at-risk of Homelessness

- Engagement should be early and creative
 - Practitioners made it a point to tell youth that they are the lead team member
 - Typically wait 2-3 months into program before asking youth to develop goals - allows time to build trust and rapport and makes the discussion feel more authentic and less transactional
- Building rapport sets stage for sustained engagement

- Create an inclusive and mutually respectful partnership with shared power
- Use mindfulness techniques to be aware of implicit biases related to youth
- Avoid labeling youth and their language
- Give youth space to “tell it like it is”
- Accept “nontraditional” appearances in both staff and youth (tattoos, facial piercings, etc.)
- Use incentives to maintain participation and build rapport
- Incorporate trauma-informed practices
- Goal setting is an opportunity to encourage youth voice and choice
 - Help guide youth to create their own goals rather than set goals for them
 - It’s important to allow youth to “fail forward” and make developmentally appropriate mistakes which promote learning and prepare youth for future
- Use multiple methods to know if, when, and to what extent youth are engaged
 - Do not rely on gut feelings - alternative option is to rely on assessments and surveys to determine youth’s level of engagement
 - Other signs of engagement include youth independently reaching out to provider for help or intentionally staying connected; also, when youth are actively demonstrating skills learned
- Consideration for practitioners to support youth engagement in services
 - Important to know that youth engagement looks different at various ages and developmental levels
 - Should view youth engagement as a process and not an outcome

Racially/Ethnically Inclusive Strategies for Youth Engagement: Literature Review

Culturally sensitive substance use treatment for racial/ethnic minority youth: A meta-analytic review
Steinka-Fry, Tanner-Smith, Dakof, & Henderson (2017)

- Cultural sensitivity within mental health treatment has been a bit more established compared to substance use treatment
 - Existing frameworks that target core cultural or contextual factors such as cultural explanatory models of the problem, treatment expectations, or other ethnospecific mediators of treatment outcomes (e.g., inclusion of family or spirituality)
- Importance of culturally sensitive treatment
 - Linked to increased treatment utilization, reductions in dropout, and production of better outcomes for clients of color who are typically underserved
 - Lack of cultural consonance linked to client mistrust and discomfort, lack of understanding of or resistance to treatment activity, miscommunication, or failed client-treatment expectations
- Literature Review on Impacts of Culturally Sensitive Treatment for Specific Populations
 - For Latino/a populations, treatment framework(s) recommend inclusion of:
 - Culturally appropriate and syntonic native language and culturally meaningful metaphors
 - Cultural match between client and provider
 - Treatment content based on cultural knowledge, values, customs, and traditions
 - Culturally congruent treatment goals and methods
 - Consideration of clients’ broader socio-economic context
 - For African-American populations, treatment framework(s) recommend inclusion of:
 - Stressors of racial discrimination
 - Racial identity development
 - Values of spirituality
 - Storytelling
 - Familial interdependence

- Gender-role obligations
- For Native American populations, treatment framework(s) recommend addressing:
 - Alienation
 - Perceived discrimination
 - Provider insensitivity
 - Feelings of historical loss
 - Resistance to disclose personal feelings
 - Indigenous problem solving
- Other common components of treatment in the literature include:
 - Cooperation with important members of target community
 - Accessible location of services
 - Provision of cultural sensitivity training for providers
- Results specific to substance use treatment
 - Authors found that use of culturally sensitive treatments were associated with significantly greater reductions in substance use relative to comparison conditions

Racial Trauma in the Lives of Black Children and Adolescents: Challenges and Clinical implications
Jernigan & Henderson Daniel (2011)

- Overview:
 - Racial stress can emerge when systems are oblivious or unwilling to acknowledge presence of racism and its implication on development of Black children and adolescents who are forced to find ways to cope
 - Membership in a racial and ethnic group can influence perception, impact, and recovery when one has experienced trauma
 - Authors call for providers to better understand and be able to clinically assess for issues of racial trauma in Black youths and intervene from a developmentally appropriate strengths-based perspective
- A Strengths-Based Approach to Assessing and Treating Racial Trauma in Children
 - One proposed model requires counselor competence in socio political histories of race and racism as well as knowledge of racial identity assessment
 - Treatment must also occur in a safe and validating environment
 - There should be a comprehensive assessment of trauma history (e.g., nature of incident, actions taken, client's thoughts and feelings, etc.)
 - Racial trauma should include secondary trauma in which client was a witness to racism

Evidence-Based Family Intervention and Juvenile Delinquency: A Critical Literature Review of Hispanic Ethnic Factors and Cultural Trajectories
Cueto (2020)

- Gender roles, discrimination, and immigration are salient factors that need attention in treatment with Latino men
- Attention should be given to use of Spanish language and ecological context of client
 - In some cases ecological context includes family's relocation into a new country with its own laws, regulations, and traditions
 - This can lead to feelings of isolation, challenges with community resources, and stress related to norms within the home vs. the community
- Additional treatment considerations include family organization (composition and values of nuclear family), family life cycle (values of collectivism and respect for authority in the family), and religion/spirituality

- General Considerations Included in Culturally Sensitive Interventions for Latinos
 - Treatment should pay attention to values held strongly by Latinos such as fidelity to family and gender role behavior
 - Some providers may ask the individual to aspire for adaptation of program's social norms which may be norms/values that are discouraged in Latino culture
 - Providers should receive training in cultural competence, obtain history on immigration, and provide consultation on values and proper use of language
 - Spanish language contains many nuances and subtleties - it is not enough to just translate an intervention into Spanish (some concepts may not apply or be appropriate)
 - Use of metaphors in treatment can help client to feel at an equal level of understanding and can strengthen the therapeutic relationship

Appendix D - Best practices for LGBTQ+ youth

The Juvenile Services Division, POIC and Latino Network center our work on inclusively working with youth of all gender identities, gender expressions, and sexual orientations. The Care Coordinators meet youth where they are at, use their chosen pronouns, help them identify their strengths, build confidence in their identities and navigate challenges they may face such as bullying, fear, lack of trust, negative reactions from family and friends and society in general.

Among LGBTQ+ youth, gender-diverse youth often face the greatest discrimination due to the visibility of their gender expression. When youth express their gender identities Care Coordinators respond in affirming and supportive ways, and help them identify supportive people in their social networks. Due to the trauma and discrimination faced by gender-diverse youth, Care Coordinators work with youth to identify any emotional challenges and whether there is a need for mental health support. Youth are also connected to LGBTQ+ organizations, resources and events.

LGBTQIA Youth in Detention-Probation

Overarching Themes in the Literature

- Let youth guide how they identify.
- Rigid conceptions of gender and sexuality undermine the system's effectiveness.
- Juvenile Justice Agencies should train staff on SOGIE information.
- About 20% of the youth in detention identify as LGBTQIA, and studies estimate as high as 85% and as low as 40% identify as a youth of color.
- According to a nationally representative sample: Girls of color are more likely to identify as LGBTQIA than White girls, whereas White boys are more likely to identify as LGBTQIA than boys of color.
- LGBTQIA youth have high rates of victimization (i.e., physical, emotional, and sexual) from various institutions - family, school, home, and community.
- LGBTQIA youth are especially vulnerable to extended detention stays and/or community supervision.
- Families for LGBTQIA youth may not be their biological family: family may come in different forms for these youth.

- LGBTQIA youth may have unique health needs (e.g., exposure to STIs, Hep C, lesbian youth are more likely to have been pregnant, transgender youth may need access to Hormone Replacement Therapy or be forced to adhere to the “freeze-frame” or freeze the treatment).
- LGBTQIA are at a higher risk for mental health needs and suicide than heterosexual youth.
- Culturally specific programs are needed for reentry and transition.
- Employment is harder to obtain and maintain for LGBTQIA youth, and especially for transgender youth.

- **Annie E Casey Foundation. (2015). *A Guide to Detention Reform: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Youth in the Juvenile Justice System*.
Defines SOGIE: Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, and Gender Expression
(SOGIE) BEST PRACTICES:**

- *Prohibit Discrimination in JJ:* Juvenile justice agencies should adopt written policies prohibiting discrimination against any youth on the basis of SOGIE, and guaranteeing equal treatment and access to services.
- *Model Respect:* Juvenile justice agencies and detention facility administration should require personnel, contractors and volunteers to interact respectfully with all youth, irrespective of SOGIE.
- *Collecting and Protecting SOGIE Information.* Juvenile justice agencies should develop protocols for collecting SOGIE information from all youth served by the agency and for protecting the information from inappropriate dissemination.
- *Training Staff:* Juvenile justice agencies and detention facility administrators should require all employees, contractors and volunteers to receive initial and ongoing training on agency policies related to serving LGBT youth.
- *Engaging Families.* Probation agencies should actively engage the parents and families of LGBT youth.
- *Contracting with Competent Providers.* Juvenile justice agencies should require all contractors to provide LGBT-competent services.
- *Does our policy align with best practices when housing LGBTQ youth?*
 - Personnel cannot make sound decisions based on assumptions: to reach an informed decision, the intake officer must possess reliable, accurate information, which should be obtained from the youth.

Experiences:

- Stigma and rejection from the community and home.
- LGBTQ youth experience rejection or ostracization in their homes, schools, and communities.
- Elevated risk for negative health and mental health outcomes, school drop out, homelessness and social isolation.
- In fact, 90 percent of LGBT youth in juvenile detention have been suspended or expelled from school at least once.
- These risk factors – school exclusion, family rejection, homelessness and failed safety-net programs – contribute to the disproportionate number of LGBT youth who come in contact with the juvenile justice system.

Rates:

- In a self-administered survey completed by 1,400 detained youth, approximately 20 percent of youth self-identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, questioning (LGBQ), gender nonconforming (GNC) or transgender (T). Of these youth, 85 percent identified as youth of color.
 - *We should expect that nearly 20 percent of youth detained identify as LBGQ, GNC, or T. And a significant portion are youth of color.*
 - They were also more likely to be detained for truancy, warrants, probation violations, running away and prostitution – low-level and victimless offenses related to economic and social marginalization.
 - LGBT youth are especially subject to extended detention or community supervision.
- p. 12.

Emerging Best Practices for the Management and Treatment of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Questioning, and Intersex Youth in Juvenile Justice Settings

Family Rejection and Homelessness

- Most LBTQIA+ youth experience family rejection and homelessness. Often cited as “acting out” and/or “being unruly.”
- **LBTQIA+ YOUNG ADULTS WHO EXPERIENCE HIGH LEVELS OF FAMILY REJECTION** (compared to those who reported low to no family rejection)
 - 8.4 times more likely to have attempted suicide
 - 5.9 times more likely to report high levels of depression
 - 3.4 times more likely to use illegal drugs
 - 3.4 times more likely to report engaging in unprotected sex.

School Harassment

- 2015 National School Climate Survey
 - 70.8% of LGBT students surveyed reported being verbally harassed in the past year based on their sexual orientation and 54.5% reported being verbally harassed based on their gender expression;
 - 27.0% of students reported being physically harassed in the past year based on their sexual orientation and 20.3% reported being physically harassed based on their gender expression;
 - 13.0% of students reported being physically assaulted in the past year based on their sexual orientation and 9.4% reported being physically assaulted based on their gender expression; and
 - 48.6% of LGBT students experienced electronic harassment, also known as cyberbullying, in the past year.
- LGBT youth are punished more harshly than heterosexual peers and report higher rates of expulsion.
- **NOT IN THIS REPORT, BUT UPDATED NUMBERS FROM THE MOST RECENT SCHOOL CLIMATE (2021):**
 - 81.8% of LGBTQ+ students in our survey reported feeling unsafe in school because of at least one of their actual or perceived personal characteristics.
 - Nearly all LGBTQ+ students (97.0%) heard “gay” used in a negative way (e.g., “that’s so gay”) at school; 68.0% heard these remarks frequently or often, and 93.7% reported that they felt distressed because of this language.

- 76.1% experienced in-person verbal harassment (e.g., called names or threatened) specifically based on sexual orientation, gender expression, and gender at some point in the past year — 60.7% of LGBTQ+ students were verbally harassed based on their sexual orientation, 57.4% based on gender expression, and 51.3% based on gender.
- 31.2% were physically harassed (e.g., pushed or shoved) in the past year based on their sexual orientation, gender expression, or gender — 22.4% of LGBTQ+ students were physically harassed at school based on their sexual orientation, 20.6% based on gender expression, and 20.5% based on gender.
- 61.5% of LGBTQ+ students who were harassed or assaulted in school did not report the incident to school staff, most commonly (69.6% of students experiencing harassment or assault) because they did not think school staff would do anything about the harassment even if they did report it.

LGBTQIA and Race

- Youth of color are more likely to be detained, and youth who are LGBTQI are more likely to be detained, the intersection creates a cumulative disadvantage.
- This means that 17% of the surveyed youth who were detained were LGBTQI youth of color.

KEY FOUNDATIONAL ISSUES:

- Professionalism: It is the responsibility of all administrators and staff to protect and care for LGBTQI youth equitably with other youth in their care.
- Respect:
 - 1. Showing respect is the best and most effective way to elicit information necessary to establish safety for LGBTQI youth.
 - 2. Staff fulfillment of their professional obligation to treat facility populations with respect creates a safer overall confinement environment.
- Creating a Safe, Respectful, and Non-Discriminatory Environment:
 - Nondiscrimination: Administrators leading the effort to establish an LGBTQI policy must ensure it includes a comprehensive non-discrimination policy that prohibits any form of discrimination against youth based on actual or perceived sexual orientation and gender identity or expression.
 - Respectful Communication: Agency leaders should develop specific guidance for staff regarding their interactions with LGBTQI residents that specifies the use of respectful language and avoidance of demeaning language, including common slurs. Respectful communication means always using the chosen name and pronouns consistent with the gender identity of transgender, gender non-conforming, and intersex youth in custody when communicating with or about them.⁷⁵
 - Privacy: Creating a safe, respectful environment means that staff should not disclose a youth's sexual orientation or gender identity to anyone without the youth's consent ("outing a youth") unless it is an emergency.
 - An example: If youth disclose that they are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, questioning, queer, or gender non-conforming, it is important to talk with them about it in an open and understanding manner. An employee should never just "move on" as that may send a negative message; For example, an employee can talk about what it means for this youth.
 - Training in Agency Policy for All Staff, Contractors, and Volunteers: Ensuring all persons who may have contact with LGTBQIA youth.

- Grievance Procedures: A well-designed and safe grievance process can also help in staff management since grievances can be a key indicator of how effective the agency's LGBTQI policies and practices are, whether staff training and accountability measures are sufficient, etc.
- Institutional Change:
 - Bring staff directly into the information gathering and (ultimately) the policy development and implementation phases of the agency's project.
 - Conduct outreach to local, state, or national LGBTQI organizations.
 - Assess an agency's knowledge, attitudes, comfort, and experiences with LGBTQI youth.
 - Assess intake.
 - Ensure appropriate housing and placements.

Wilson, B. D., Jordan, S. P., Meyer, I. H., Flores, A. R., Stemple, L., & Herman, J. L. (2017). Disproportionality and disparities among sexual minority youth in custody. *Journal of youth and adolescence, 46*, 1547-1561.

Abstract:

Research indicates that sexual minority youth are disproportionately criminalized in the U.S. and subjected to abusive treatment while in correctional facilities. However, the scope and extent of disparities based on sexual orientation remains largely overlooked in the juvenile justice literature. This study, based on a nationally representative federal agency survey conducted in 2012 ($N = 8785$; 9.9% girls), reveals that 39.4% of girls and 3.2% of boys in juvenile correctional facilities identified as lesbian, gay, or bisexual. These youth, particularly gay and bisexual boys, report higher rates of sexual victimization compared to their heterosexual peers. Sexual minority youth, defined as both lesbian, gay, and bisexual identified youth as well as youth who identified as straight and reported some same-sex attraction, were also 2–3 times more likely than heterosexual youth to report prior episodes of detention lasting a year or more. Research indicates that sexual minority youth are disproportionately criminalized in the U.S. and subjected to abusive treatment while in correctional facilities. However, the scope and extent of disparities based on sexual orientation remains largely overlooked in the juvenile justice literature. This study, based on a nationally representative federal agency survey conducted in 2012 ($N = 8785$; 9.9% girls), reveals that 39.4% of girls and 3.2% of boys in juvenile correctional facilities identified as lesbian, gay, or bisexual. These youth, particularly gay and bisexual boys, report higher rates of sexual victimization compared to their heterosexual peers. Sexual minority youth, defined as both lesbian, gay, and bisexual identified youth as well as youth who identified as straight and reported some same-sex attraction, were also 2–3 times more likely than heterosexual youth to report prior episodes of detention lasting a year or more. Implications for future research and public policy are discussed.

FINDINGS:

- Findings from a nationally represented sample, 12% were sexual minorities.
- Sexual minority youth were disproportionately sentenced to detention, were likely to have been in custody for over a year, and more likely reporting sexual assault.
- The proportion of girls identified as a sexual minority in detention were nearly 3.3 times that of the general population.

- Latinas were more likely to identify as a sexual minority for girls, and for boys, White boys were more likely to be identified as a sexual minority. *This finding mirrors the adult population estimates.*

APPENDIX E – BUDGET

FY 2025 - 2027 BUDGET CATEGORY	Amount
Personnel & Fringe Benefits: Juvenile Counselor (100%) & Juvenile Counselor (14%)	\$386,862
Travel: N/A	\$0
Equipment: N/A	\$0
Supplies: N/A	\$0
Consultants/Contracts: Culturally specific community organizations to provide Community Healing Intervention Early Intervention (CHI-EI) services.	\$457,304
Other Costs: Client assistance	\$18,368
Grant Administration: Administrative costs (10% of personnel costs)	\$38,686
Total	\$901,220

APPENDIX F –OUTPUT AND OUTCOME MEASURES

All Active Cases in FY2022

Table 1: Demographics of Youth* Receiving JCP Funded Services

Risk Level	Gender	Race/Ethnicity
High - 53%	Male - 91%	Caucasian - 18%
Medium - 28%	Female - 9%	Hispanic - 19%
Low - 13%		African-American - 52%
Unknown - 6%		Other - 11%

* Youth JCP scores can change during the course of supervision. Table 1 represents the youth's score at the time the data was collected, not the youth's initial JCP risk score.

Table 2: JCP Risk Level of Youth* Receiving Funded Services

Program/Service	Unclassified/Unavailable	Low	Medium	High	All
RISE/GTS	4 2%	34 19%	50 28%	88 50%	176 100%
CHI**	12 14%	0 0%	24 28%	50 58%	86 100%
Shelter	4 8%	3 6%	11 22%	33 64%	51 100%
CMP	7 6%	17 15%	33 30%	55 49%	112 100%
All	27 6%	54 13%	118 28%	226 53%	425 100%

*110 CHI clients were served in FY22. 86 youth had JJIS numbers and therefore, only those 86 youth are included in the data tables.

Table 3: Gender Distribution of Youth* Receiving Funded Services

Program/Service	Male		Female		Non-Binary		All Participants	
RISE/GTS	176	100%	0	0%	0	0%	176	100%
CHI	75	87%	11	13%	0	0%	86	100%
Shelter	42	82%	9	18%	0	0%	51	100%
CMP	95	85%	17	15%	0	0%	112	100%
All	388	91%	37	9%	0	0%	425	100%

*110 CHI clients were served in FY22. 86 youth had JJIS numbers and therefore, only those 86 youth are included in the data tables.

Table 4: Race/Ethnicity Distribution of Youth* Receiving Funded Services

Program/Service	African-American		Hispanic		Caucasian		Other/Unknown		All Participants	
RISE/GTS	69	39%	30	17%	54	31%	23	13%	176	100%
CHI	59	69%	24	28%	1	1%	2	2%	86	100%
Shelter	22	43%	9	18%	8	16%	12	24%	51	100%
CMP	69	62%	18	16%	15	13%	10	9%	112	100%
All	219	52%	81	19%	78	18%	47	11%	425	100%

*110 CHI clients were served in FY22. 86 youth had JJIS numbers and therefore, only those 86 youth are included in the data tables.

Table 5: Program Completion

Program/Service	Closed Successfully*		Closed Unsuccessfully		Active		All Participants	
RISE/GTS	62	35%	4	2%	110	63%	176	100%
Shelter	30	59%	18	35%	3	6%	51	100%
CMP	53	47%	39	35%	20	18%	112	100%
All	145	52%	61	22%	133	47%	339	100%

**Successful completion events differ by program: RISE/GTS includes completion of community supervision without escalation to an OYA commitment or a charge filed in adult criminal court; Shelter successful completions are exits to live at home or to live in an appropriate community placement, while runaways or escalations to OYA are unsuccessful; Community Monitoring Program includes successful completion of service without an abscond or new crime.*

***No completion/exit status data for CHI due to the fact that CHI youth may continue in CHI services past probation completion.*

Table 6: Youth who received a new criminal referral while enrolled in Programs

Program/ Service	No Recidivism		Recidivism*		All Participants	
RISE/GTS	152	86%	24	14%	176	100%
CHI**	69	80%	17	20%	86	100%
Shelter	35	69%	16	31%	51	100%
CMP	93	83%	19	17%	112	100%
All	349	82%	76	18%	425	100%

**Recidivism is defined as a new felony or misdemeanor law violation referral, regardless of whether or not the referral was adjudicated*

***110 CHI clients were served in FY22. 86 youth had JJIS numbers and therefore, only those 86 youth are included in the data tables.*

Table 7: Youth Committed to OYA while receiving funded services

Program/ Service	OYA Youth Correctional Facility Commitment		OYA Residential Commitment		No Commitments		All Participants	
RISE/GTS	9	5%	5	3%	162	92%	176	100%
CHI*	4	5%	4	5%	78	90%	86	100%
Shelter	0	0%	0	0%	51	100%	51	100%
CMP	0	0%	2	2%	110	98%	112	100%
All	13	3%	11	3%	401	94%	425	100%

***110 CHI clients were served in FY22. 86 youth had JJIS numbers and therefore, only those 86 youth are included in the data tables.*

COUNTY CONTACTS

Authorized Contract Signer Contact Information:

(County Administrator of BOCC Chair)

Name: Sarah Mullen (she/her/hers)

Title: Executive Director

Agency: Multnomah County Local Public Safety Coordinating Council

Address: 501 SE Hawthorne Blvd, Suite 624 Portland, Oregon 97214

Phone Number: 503-988-5777 office

Lead Agency:

Lead Agency Director Contact Information:

Name: Kyla Armstrong-Romero, Ph.D.

Title: Juvenile Services Division Director

Address: 1401 NE 68th Ave, Portland, OR 97213

Email: Kyla.armstrong-romero@multco.us

Telephone: 971-291-3614

County/Lead Agency Fiscal Contact Information:

Name: Colby Dixon

Title: Business Services Manager

Agency: Multnomah County Department of Community Justice

Address: 1401 NE 68th Ave, Portland, OR 97213

Phone Number: 503-988-3961

Email: colby.dixon@multco.us

Electronic Grant Management System (EGMS) Contact

(Who will submit financial claims?)

Same as above

Please submit your plan by March 31, 2025, via email to JCP@ode.oregon.gov