Department of Community Corrections & Rehabilitation
Office of Policy, Planning, and Evaluation

Young Adults in the Justice System: Best Practices in the Literature

Table of Contents

December 2018

Margaret Vohs
Senior Planning Analyst
Margaret.Vohs@Hennepin.US

Danette Buskovick, Manager
Dannette.Buskovick@Hennepin.US

Background

In the last few years, the field of community corrections has seen a nation-wide movement toward new approaches with young adults between the ages of 18 and 24. Young adults are overrepresented in the justice system, representing nearly 30% of arrests[1] though they only comprise 10% of the population. The overrepresentation is particularly high for young adults of color (Council on State Governments Justice Center, 2015), those who started offending under age 12, and violent offenders (Loeber, Farrington & Petechuk, 2013). Young offenders typically do not benefit from being transferred to the adult justice system, and such a transfer can actually increase likeliness for re-arrest (Howell et. all, 2013). In fact, research shows that antisocial behaviors and offending decline in the early 20s, suggesting that most young adults will naturally desist from crime without incarceration (Ishida, 2015). Existing strategies that target this population are aiming to reduce the number of arrests and incarcerations, and lower recidivism rates.

Several best practices and strategies emerged after conducting a review of recent literature on this topic. The most documented types of interventions are:

1. Young Adult Court
2. Probation Tailored to Young Adults
3. Community-Based Programming
4. Legal Action
5. Diversion and Early Interventions

Overall, strategies with young adults are generally beneficial when they are community-based, highly collaborative between systems and agencies, developmentally appropriate, designed to reduce collateral consequences of justice involvement, and integrative of families and/or adult mentors.

Brain Development

One of the main reasons that jurisdictions are considering new approaches with young adults is based on evolving brain research that differentiates young adults from both juveniles and adults. Brain research tells us that the prefrontal cortex, responsible for impulse control and reasoning, is still developing well into a person's mid-20s. As a result, individuals between the ages of 18-24 show brain immaturity and impulsiveness that is similar to juveniles, but are more likely than juveniles to engage in risk-taking behavior and substance abuse (Schiraldi, Western & Bradner, 2015). Furthermore, young adults are "more likely to engage in risk seeking behavior, have

[1] Young adults represent 21% of prison admissions, 26% of the probation population, and 28% of the jail population (Justice Policy Institute, 2016).

difficulty moderating their responses in emotionally charged situations, or have not fully developed a future-oriented method of decision making" (Schiraldi, Western, & Bradner, 2015).

Psychosocial capacities, such as responsibility, perspective, and temperance, continue to develop even further into adulthood. Young adults who are less psychosocially mature exhibit more anti-social decision making (Cauffman and Steinberg, 2000). Young adults are also more motivated by reward-seeking behavior and peer pressure than juveniles or adults (Perker, Selen and Chester, 2017). Put simply, young adults do not have the same brain capacity of adults over age 25 to exercise judgement (Howell et. all, 2013).

Impact of Childhood Trauma on the Brain

For young adults, having a history of trauma and/or victimization can amplify these differences in brain development. Experiencing childhood trauma and repeat victimization is known to increase the risk for many health issues later in life, psychosocial issues, as well as interpersonal violence perpetration and delinquency (CDC, 2016; Chang, Chen and Brownson, 2013; Duke, Pettingell, McMorris and Borowsky, 2010). Almost three-quarters (70%) of incarcerated juveniles and half (50%) of incarcerated adults suffer from at least one mental health disorder (Council on State Governments Justice Center, 2015).

Exposure to psychological trauma can cause involuntary, self-protective shifts in the brain and heightened attention to detecting threats. When a young adult is in this survival-oriented state frequently, it becomes difficult to return to homeostasis and can dysregulate their nervous system. These survival-oriented brain changes compromise the reward/motivation system, the distress tolerance system, and the executive system for processing, and can lead to extreme emotional reactions, impulsivity, and disorganized thinking and coping styles (Ford & Blaustein, 2013).

Youth and young adults who have experienced trauma or victimization often cannot trust the concept that "good deeds and behavior are rewarded, that perpetrating harm should and will be punished, and that maintaining order is mutually beneficial", and as a result will apply different standards for making decisions (Ford & Blaustein, 2013).

Facing Adulthood without Protective Factors

Environmental and social factors play another main role in the overrepresentation of young adults in the justice system. The transition years between childhood and adulthood has extended in recent generations. Young adults reach milestones such as marriage and parenting later in life than in the past (Justice Policy Institute, 2016). In assuming independence, young adults who may already be disconnected from family and labor institutions have to find ways of providing for themselves. Justice-involved young adults in particular have a hard time finding secure employment and/or receiving their high school diploma or GED (Chung, Little, and Steinberg,

2005). They are more vulnerable to peer pressure and have greater access to controlled substances.

Justice-involved young adults have a "a higher likelihood of parental incarceration, poverty, foster care, substance abuse, mental health needs and learning disabilities" (Schiraldi, Western and Bradner, 2015). These problems are most apparent in communities of color. Black and Latino young men more often face socioeconomic challenges, depriving them of protective factors that reduce offending (Loeber, Farrington & Petechuk, 2013). In 2013, one in five young adults was out of school and work, a majority of which were Black or Latino (The Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2015).

Best Practices

Young Adult Court

Young adult courts (YAC) began appearing nationwide in the early 2000s. Similar to other specialized courts, such as drug courts or family courts, YACs are designed to offer age-appropriate case management and services and often opportunities for reducing or expunging records upon successful completion of the program. YACs differ in eligibility criteria, with some accepting young adults up to age 25 and others up to age 20, and some accepting all risk levels while others exclude high risk. The District Attorney Led-Programs (DA Programs) are similar to YACs but typically the DA makes the referral and determines which charges will be significant in programming. There are several well documented examples of YACs and DA Programs in jurisdictions across the country (see Appendix) (Hayek, 2016).

The YAC in San Francisco, CA is unique in that it accepts all risk levels and actually prioritizes felony cases. Other than that, the key components to the San Francisco YAC are similar to those across the country and include activities such as case management, therapy, learning independent life skills, substance abuse treatment, assistance with housing, education and employment, etc. (Henderson-Frakes, Leshnick and Diaz, 2017). YACs often train stakeholders in human brain development, and are successful when rooted in community partnerships (Hakey, 2016). With recidivism being higher in regular adult courts, it is hypothesized that YACs would reduce recidivism by sending fewer young adults to the regular adult court (Loeber, Farrington, and Petechuk, 2013).

Probation Tailored to Young Adults

Some jurisdictions across the country are creating and validating their own young adult screening and assessment tools. These assessments are used to match young adults to specialized supervision based on their needs and risk of offending (The Council of State Governments Justice

Center, 2017). Other programs determine eligibility for specialized supervision on a case-by-case basis, some excluding young adults with violent or gang related crimes. Probation Officers with this population often have reduced case sizes and are trained to be aware of young adult "trauma, brain development, moral decision-making, and impulsivity" (Hayek, 2016). Some jurisdictions go so far as to train the courts and other stakeholders on the specific needs of this population.

Specialized probation for young adults is tailored to allow for common life disruptions such as employment and school. These probation programs remove certain conditions of supervision that set young adults up for failure based on the known environmental and social challenges this group faces. In addition, brain development is often considered when determining violation decisions. Young adults are still held accountable and expected to be fully engaged and motivated to participate in the program (The Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2017). Examples of specialized probation programs around the country are listed in the Appendix.

Transitional Age Unit, California

A well-known program is San Francisco's Transitional Age Unit (TAY). Probation Officers are trained to be competent with young adults and utilize assessment tools designed for young adults. The program collaborates with the Mayor's Task Force on Transitional Age Youth. The Mayor reserves thirteen spots out of twenty-five for young adults in the TAY program. The program also collaborates with the Alternative Sentencing Planning in the District Attorney's office, and the Sherriff's Department. In a recent evaluation, 73% of participants completed the program successfully (Schiraldi, Western, & Bradner, 2015).

Community-Based Programming

There are many community-based organizations aimed at working with justice-involved young adults. Several jurisdictions utilize these agencies for their clients as a condition of probation or as a diversion initiative. Participation may or may not be court ordered, but the justice system is not responsible for monitoring and supervision. Community-based programs often offer wraparound services and meet the needs of young adults in their own home community. These services may include counseling, peer or adult mentoring, work-readiness, education, and technical or vocational training (Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2017).

Community-based programs may provide treatment of mental health issues and substance abuse. Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) is often used with young adults to address causes of delinquent behavior (Council of State Governments Justice Center, 2017). Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST) and Functional Family Therapy (FFT) are also effective therapies and are shown to reduce recidivism in young adults. MST participants have also been shown to have lower rates of arrest for violent offenses, and fewer days of confinement in adult corrections facilities (Loeber, Farrington, & Petechuk, 2013).

Experts in young adult brain development recommend programming aimed at increasing self-regulation. Self-regulation can help young adults with histories of trauma who are hypersensitive to threats. Self-regulation is the ability to "(1) consciously focus attention, (2) be aware of the environment and one's own physical and emotional body states; (3) draw on memory in order to learn from the past and adapt effectively in the present; and (4) maintain or regain emotion states that provide a genuine sense of well-being and lead to further self-regulation" (Ford & Balustein, 2013). Recommended interventions within the self-regulation framework include:

- Attachment, Self-Regulation and Competency (ARC) developed by Blaustein and Kinniburgh
- Sanctuary, developed by Bloom and Rivard
- Structured Psychotherapy for Adolescents Responding to Chronic Stress (SPARCS), developmed by DeRosa and Pelcovitz, and Habib et. all
- Trauma Affect Regulation, developed by Ford and Russo; and
- Trauma Systems Therapy (TST), developed by Brown et. all, and Saxe et. all.

Examples of community-based programs around the country are listed in the Appendix.

> **Roca, Massachusetts**
>
> One of the most well-known community-based programs is Massachusetts's Roca program for court-involved 18-24 year old males. Participants are expected to complete two years of intensive programming followed by two years of less-intensive check ins. The program involves street outreach and door knocking, rigorous case management, developmental stage-based programming for education, employment and life skills, and collaboration with stakeholders such as law enforcement, the courts, corrections, etc. A recent evaluation found that Roca reduced recidivism by 65 percent (Schiraldi, Western, & Bradner, 2015).

Legal Action

Legal action has been taken in several states across the country in order to keep young adults out of prison and reduce recidivism rates. Presented below are the four common strategies for legal action. Examples of legal actions happening around the country are listed in the Appendix.

Raising the Age of Juvenile Jurisdiction

States like Vermont, Massachusetts and Connecticut have or have considered raising the age under which a person can be tried under juvenile jurisdiction from age 18 to age 21. This action would lead to fewer young adults incarcerated and exposed to the criminogenic influences inherent in being incarcerated, and increase the number of young adults given opportunities to participate in alternative, skill-building programs. Reducing the number of adult prisoners would also save money for tax payers (Loeber, Farrington, & Petechuk, 2013).

Reducing Terms of Probation or Sentencing ("Young Adult Discount")

Several states have provided legal "discounts" for young adults in probation terms and sentencing decisions. States have taken steps to ensure that young adults involved in the criminal justice system see fewer collateral consequences, are given probation requirements that are achievable, receive lesser sanctions for probation violations, and receive reductions in sentencing.

Expunging Criminal Records

Some states have established opportunities for young adults to have their criminal records made confidential or expunged. Young adults are receiving shorter wait periods to seal or expunge their records in states like South Carolina and New York. Other states, like Michigan, are offering to avoid a conviction entirely if the young adult agrees to complete an alternative sentence of probation or incarceration for no more than three years.

Eligibility of Parole for Crimes Committed Under a Certain Age

A couple of states have also tried to retroactively respond to adults serving time for crimes committed as a youth or young adult. For example, California has allowed adults eligibility for parole if their crimes were committed before age 23 (Justice Policy Institute, 2016).

Diversion and Early Interventions

Diversion is an alternative to arrest, conviction or incarceration in which young adults are held accountable but given social service programming and other opportunities in their community to reduce criminal behavior. These programs are less costly and more effective than traditional processing (Forman and Yee, 2015), and should be considered with less series cases (Schiraldi, Western, & Bradner, 2015). Diversion can occur at the police level if the police decide to release the young adult, potentially with conditions such as a no contact order. Diversion can also occur at the probation level to prevent the young adult from court processing. The probation officer may instead require the individual to go to treatment, pay restitution, etc. Finally, diversion can occur at the prosecutor level through a restorative community mediation panel with recommendations for treatment, community service, etc. (Ishida, 2015).

Other early interventions may include crime prevention programs aimed to reduce risk-taking behavior, gang involvement, drug dealing, or other violent behavior. Interventions may include early nurse home visiting, parent training and family programming (Howell et. all, 2013). These approaches involve collaboration between social service agencies, corrections and law enforcement, governmental departments, and community organizations. Examples of diversion programs around the country are listed in the Appendix.

Outcomes and Recidivism

Seeing as most of the initiatives that target justice-involved young adults are fairly new, there is limited information on recidivism reduction. Still, some programs have conducted initial

evaluations and offer data on recidivism or other measures of successful outcomes. Below are some general findings from several programs listed in the Appendix.

Young adult court outcomes:

- The San Francisco YAC program mostly serves high-risk felony offenders. It has only been around since 2015, but one year recidivism data shows that, of program participants, 55% were arrested, 40% were charged with a crime, and 29% were charged with a felony, and 7% were sentenced to jail. The overall recidivism rate for young adults and adults in San Francisco returning from prison is 76%.[2]
- The Douglas County DA Diversion Program served just 31 clients between 2007 and 2011. Of the 31, 19 were still involved at the time of evaluation and 12 had exited the program. Of the 12, 7 graduated and 5 were terminated. Two of the twelve clients had a felony conviction within one year of participation.[3]

Specialized probation outcomes:

- In South Carolina, the two-year return to prison rate for the Intensive Supervision Service for young adults was 13.5% compared to an overall recidivism rate of 50% for offenders under age 25 in fiscal year 2010-2011 (Hayek, 2016).
- In Multnomah County, Oregon, the Justice Reinvestment Program (MCJRP) works with young adults facing a presumptive prison sentence. In 2013, only 25% of MCJRP participants were sentenced to prison, compared to 55% of would-be MCJRP eligible cases.[4]

Community-based programming outcomes:

- The Philadelphia Youth Violence Reduction Partnership (YVRP) has contributed to a lower homicide rate amongst young adults. Overall, 13.6% of participants in YVRP were convicted for a crime compared to 24.1% of the comparison group.[5]
- YouthBuild (nationwide): Within one year of graduating the program, 11% are convicted of a crime but not incarcerated compared to 14% of those who drop out and 21-33% of young adults nationwide. Fifteen percent of graduates are convicted and serve time compared to 27% of dropouts. Thirteen percent of graduates have parole revoked compared to 29% of dropouts. Combined, there is a 28% recidivism rate for YB graduates and a 44% rate for dropouts.[6]

---

[2] Clark, M. and Henderson-Frakes, J. (2018). Evaluation of the San Francisco Young Adult Court, outcome study addendum. Social Policy Research Associates.
[3] Public Policy Center (2012). Evaluation of Nebraska's problem solving courts.
[4] Oregon Knowledge Bank. Retrieved from: https://okb.oregon.gov/portfolio-item/mcjrp/
[5] McClanahan, W., Kau, T., Manning, A., Campos, P., & Farley, C. (2012). Illuminating solutions: The Youth Violence Reduction Partnership. Public/Private Ventures.
[6] YouthBuild (2016). Life after lock-up: A special report on successful recidivism reduction. YouthBuild U.S.A.

- Youth Villages Life Set (multiple states): While there have been no significant findings on recidivism, participants had better outcomes in earnings, housing stability, economic well-being, mental health and reduced intimate partner violence.[7]
- Of participants in the Right Turn Career-Focused Transition Initiative (multiple states), only 11% recidivated in the first cohort, while 78% attained a high school degree or equivalent, and 74% of young adults age 18 or above were placed in long term training or jobs.[8]
- In 2015, 70% of participants in the Young Adult Justice Scholars program in New York City completed the program and 68% earned a high school diploma or equivalent.[9]
- The amount of reconvictions of a felony crime after participation in the Arches Transformative Mentoring in New York City is 69% lower than non-participants one year out, and 57% lower two years out. Reconviction in the first year after participation was 19.4%, and 23.3% for the non-participant comparison. Reconviction within two years was 29% for Arches participants and 36.1% for the comparison group.[10]
- In 2014, youth not involved in the Safe and Successful Youth Initiative in Massachusetts were 42% more likely to be incarcerated.[11]
- Roca (Massachusetts): There is an 85% retention rate. An impressive 98% of Roca participants had no new incarcerations, 93% had no new arrests, and 88% had no technical violations in 2015. In 2017, 84% of participants had no new arrests after 24 months of enrollment.[12]
- UTEC (Massachusetts): Of the young adults who completed the program two years ago, 94% had not been arrested since. In 2017, 90% of the young adults involved were not arrested during the year and 99% were not convicted. In comparison, 49% of the non-participant group were not re-arraigned within 1 year. As many as 78% who left UTEC were employed two years later.[13]

Diversion outcomes:

- Participants in the LEAD program in Seattle experienced 58% lower odds of arrest after LEAD between 2009 and 2014.[14]

---

[7] Valentine, E. J., Skemer, M., & Courtney, M. E. (2015). Becoming adults: One-year impact findings from the Youth Villages Transitional Living evaluation. MDRC. http://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/Becoming_Adults_FR.pdf
[8] http://iel.org/Right-Turn-about
[9] https://www.cases.org/programs/young-adult-justice-scholars/
[10] Lynch et. all (2018). Arches Transformative Mentoring Program: An implementation and impact evaluation in New York City. Urban Institute.
[11] Bradham, D., Campie, P., & Petrosino, A. (2014). Massachusetts Safe and Successful Youth Initiative: Benefit-to-cost analysis of Springfield and Boston sites. American Institutes for Research.
[12] https://rocainc.org/impact/outcomes/
[13] https://utecinc.org/our-impact/impact/
[14] Collins, S., Lonczak, H., & Clifasefi, S. (2015). LEAD program evaluation: Recidivism report. Harm Reduction Research and Treatment Center.

Young Adults: Constraints, Barriers & Opportunities

Addressing the needs of young adults will require considerable resources and partnerships. A young adult court, for example, will need to overlap effectively with other system level partners. When working in highly collaborative partnerships, confidentiality around data sharing is constantly of concern (Henderson-Frakes, Leshnick & Diaz, 2017). Other barriers include funding for treatment programs, training for staff in brain development and/or trauma, and pushback from those resistant to the idea that young adults need or deserve a rehabilitative approach (Ford & Blaustein, 2013).

The unique circumstances of young adults can also be seen as opportunities. For young adults, their cognitive skills are growing, their sense of responsibility and independence is developing, their social ties and relationships are strengthening, and they are malleable to rehabilitation (Perker and Chester, 2017). Studies have also shown that many of the interventions that are successful with young adults (i.e. MST, FFT, CBT, drug treatment, employment training, etc.) are cost-effective in that the benefits outweigh the costs (Loeber, Farrington, & Petechuk, 2013). There would also be great financial and social benefit to keeping young adults out of prison and reducing their recidivism rates.

References

Barrow Cadbury, (2010). Young adults and criminal justice: International norms and practices. King's College London. International Centre for Prison Studies.

Cauffman, E., and Steinberg, L. (2000). (Im)maturity of judgement in adolescence: Why adolescents may be less culpable than adults. Behavioral Sciences and the Law (pp. 741-760). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Chang, J. J., Chen, J. J., & Brownson, R. C. (2003, April). The role of repeat victimization in adolescent delinquent behaviors and recidivism. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 32*, 272-280. doi:10.1016/S1054-139X(02)00564-5

Chung, H.L., M. Little and Steinberg, L. (2005). The transition to adulthood for adolescents in the juvenile justice system: A developmental perspective. In D. Wayne Osgood, M. Foster and C. Flanagan, *On your own without a net: The transition to adulthood for vulnerable populations* (pp. 68-91). Chilcago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2016, June 14). *About the CDC-Kaiser ACE Study*. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/acestudy/about.html.

The Council of State Governments Justice Center (2015). Reducing recidivism and improving other outcomes for young adults in the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems. Council of State Governments Justice Center.

The Council of State Governments Justice Center (2017, September). Dos and don'ts for reducing recidivism among young adults in the justice system.

Cuevas, C. A., Finkelhor, D., Shattuck, A., Turner, H., & Hamby, S. (2013, October). Children's exposure to violence and the intersection between delinquency and victimization. *OJJDP National Survey of Children's Exposure to Violence*, 1-9.

Duke, N. N., Pettingell, S. L., McMorris, B. J., & Borowsky, I. W. (2010, March). Adolescent violence perpetration: Associations with multiple types of adverse childhood experiences. *Pediatrics, 125*(e778). doi:10.1542/peds.2009-0597

Ford, J. D., & Blaustein, M. E. (2013). Systemic self-regulation: A framework for trauma-informed services in residential juvenile justice programs. *Journal of Family Violence, 28*, 665-677. doi:10.1007/s10896-013-9538-5

Forman, B. and Yee, S. (2015). Viewing justice reinvestment through a developmental lens: New approaches to reducing young adult recidivism in Massachusetts.

Hayek, C. (2016). Environmental scan of developmentally appropriate criminal justices responses to justice-involved young adults. National Institute of Justice.

Henderson-Frakes, J., Leshnick, S., & Diaz, H. (2017, May). An evaluation of San Francisco's young adult court (YAC): Findings on planning and early implementation. *Social Policy Research Associates*.

Howell, J.C. et. al (2013). Bulletin 5: Young offenders and an effective response in the juvenile and adult justice systems: What happens, what should happen, and what we need to know (Study group on the transitions between juvenile delinquency and adult crime). U.S. Department of Justice.

Hurley Swayze, D., & Buskovick, D. Minnesota Department of Public Safety Office of Justice Programs. (2015). *Youth in Minnesota correctional facilities and adverse childhood experiences: Responses to the 2013 Minnesota Student Survey*. St. Paul, MN.

Ishida, K. (2015) Young adults in conflict with the law: Opportunities for diversion. Juvenile Justice Initiative.

Loeber, R., Farrington, D.P., & Petechuk, D. (2013). Bulletin 1: From juvenile delinquency to young adult offending (study group on the transitions between juvenile delinquency and adult crime). U.S. Department of Justice.

Perker, Selen S., and Chester, L. (2017). Emerging adults: A distinct population that calls for an age-appropriate approach by the justice system. Harvard Kennedy School Malcolm Weiner Center for Social Policy.

Schiraldi, V., Western, B., & Bradner, K. (2015, September). Community-based responses to justice-involved young adults. U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs.

Velazquez, T. (2013). Young adult justice: A new frontier worth exploring. The Chronicle of Social Change.

Appendix

The tables presented below include examples in each of the five practice areas described in this report. These lists are not exhaustive.

Table 1. Young Adult Courts

Location of Program	YAC or DA Program	Year Established	Age Range Served	Eligibility
Bonneville County, ID	YAC	2012	18-24 years old	Misdemeanor or Felony; Involved in drug court system
San Francisco, CA	YAC	2015	18-25 years old	Misdemeanor or Felony; Certain misdemeanor cases excluded
Douglas County, NE	YAC	2004	Up to age 25	Felony; Determined by program coordinator

Kalamazoo County, MI	YA Diversion Court	2013	17-20 years old	Misdemeanor; On probation
Lockport City, New York	YAC	Unknown	16-21 years old	Unknown
Manhattan, New York	YAC	2016	18-20 years old	Felony
Brooklyn, NY	DA Program	2016	16-24 years old	Misdemeanor
Rhode Island (Federal Court)	Deferred Sentencing Program	2015	Unknown	Non-violent crimes, low involvement
Dallas County, TX	DA Diversion Program	2016	18-24 years old	Non-violent
Long Beach City, CA	DA Diversion Program	2016	16-24 years old	Minor offenses
San Francisco, CA	DA Program	2012	18-25 years old	Case-by-case

Table 2. Probation Tailored to Young Adults

Location of Program	Name	Year Established	Age Range Served	Eligibility
Des Moines, IA	Youthful Offender Program	1995	16-22 years old	First time Felony; No gang involvement
Washington D.C.	Young Adult Initiative	2013	Up to age 25	Unknown
Columbia, SC	Intensive Supervision Service	2012	Up to age 25	No prior convictions; Non-violent
Boston, MA	CHOICE	2010	18-26 years old	Involvement in court system
San Francisco, CA	Transitional Age Youth	2009	18-25 years old	Unknown
Multnomah County, Oregon	Justice Reinvestment Program	2014	Up to age 25	Facing presumptive prison sentence

Table 3. Community-Based Programs

Location of Program	Name	Year Established	Age Range Served	Eligibility	Summary
Santa Rosa, CA	Restorative Engagement Transforming Harm Into New Knowledge (RETHINK)	2012	18-25 years old	Misdemeanor and some Felony	Restorative justice conferences; weekly groups
St. Paul, MN	Ujamaa Place	2011	18-30 years old	Voluntary	Education/GED; construction trade; subsidized housing
San Francisco, CA	The Reset Foundation	2016	18-24 years old	Sentences > 18 mo. incarceration	Residential; education; relationship building; life skills
Oregon	Hope Partnership	2010	17-24 years old	Reentry	Arts; life skills; vocational training
Brooklyn, NY	Preparing Leaders of Tomorrow (PLOT)	2013	9-21 years old, some 21+	At-risk or involved in CJS	Mentoring; personal and educational goals

Philadelphia, PA	Youth Violence Reduction Partnership (YVRP)	1999	14-24 years old	Drug involved or incarcerated for drug/gun offense	Home visits; drug treatment; recreation; work-readiness; school crisis; counseling
In 46 States	YouthBuild Offender Program	2004	16-24 years old	Incarceration diversion and reentry	Construction/work-readiness skills
TN, MI, NC, MA, OK	YVLifeSet	1999	17-22 years old	Voluntary	Case management; education; employment; housing; accessing services
NV, IL, NY, MI, TX, KE, TN, CA	Right Turn Career-Focused Transition Initiative	2013	18+ years	Involved in CJS or at-risk; focus on those with disabilities	Career development; education; mentoring; independent living
New York City, NY	Young Adult Justice Scholars/Community Program (YAJS/C)	2012	16-24 years old	Involved in CJS	HS diploma/GED classes; career exploration; case management; financial incentives
New York City, NY	Arches Transformative Mentoring Program	2011	16-24 years old	Involved in CJS; on probation	Mentoring; group activities; financial incentives; education; vocational training
New York City, NY	Community Education Pathways to Success (CEPS)	2011	17.5-24 years old	On probation	Literacy; GED pursuit
In many U.S. cities	National League of Cities Institute for Youth, Education, and Families Justice Reform Program	2015	16-24 years old	N/A	Policy advocacy; support for city leaders; Leadership Academies
MA (many cities)	Safe and Successful Youth Initiative (SSYI)	2011	14-24 years old	Incarcerated or on probation or parole	Case management; mental health care; education; training and employment skills
MA (many cities)	Roca	1988	17-24 years old	Involved in CJS or high-risk	Street outreach; workforce readiness; employment program; CBT; certificate programs
Lowell, MA	UTEC	1999	Unknown	Gang/criminally involved; priority on violent crimes, felony, reentry	Street outreach; employment program; case management; education

Table 4. Legal Action

Location	Type	Year Enacted	Key Provisions
California	Eligibility of Parole	2016	Eligibility of parole for adults under age 23 at time of crime who with a lengthy sentence
Vermont	Raising the Age	2016	Raise the age at which people are tried as adults to 21

Florida	Young Adult Discount	1978	Courts can modify or early terminate probation or sentence for young adult age 18-21 who successfully participates in youthful offender program
Michigan	Expunging Records	2015	Young adult age 17-24 can avoid a conviction or criminal record if they plead guilty and agree to probation or prison not to exceed three years
Montana	Young Adult Discount	2015	Adults under 21 arrested for a DUI will face lesser sanctions
New York	Expunging Records	2015	If adjudicated to be a youthful offender, criminal records will be confidential
South Carolina	Expunging Records; Young Adult Discount	2009	If sentenced under Youthful Offender Act, records can be expunged after 15 years provided no subsequent convictions; young adults ages 17-25 years old will be provided alternatives to adult sentencing

Table 5. Diversion and Early Intervention

Location of Program	Name	Year Established	Age Range Served	Eligibility	Diversion From…
New Hampshire	Young Adult Diversion Program	Unknown	16-20 years old	Arrest for alcohol or drug related offense	Criminal record
Seattle, WA	Police Dept. Pre-Arrest Diversion	Unknown	Unknown	Crime related to housing, substance abuse, or mental health issue	Arrest
Kalamazoo County, MI	YA Diversion Court	2013	17-20 years old	Misdemeanor; On probation; First time offender	Conviction and criminal record
Dallas County, TX	Achieve Inspire Motivate (AIM) Diversion Program	2016	18-24 years old	Non-violent; Must complete GED or secure employment	Case dismissed and expunged
Long Beach City, CA	Promising Adults, Tomorrow's Hope (PATH)	2016	16-24 years old	Minor offenses	Criminal Prosecution
In 46 States	YouthBuild Offender Program	2004	16-24 years old	Unknown	Incarceration