

New Directions in Juvenile Sex Offender Management: Designing a Collaborative Approach

Nancy G. Calley

University of Detroit Mercy

[The Comprehensive Juvenile Sex Offender Management Initiative](#)

[Summary](#)

JUVENILE SEX OFFENDING continues to be a serious problem, comprising 20.61 percent of sexual offense arrests and 16.7 percent of all arrests for forcible rape (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2002). Additionally, it is estimated that 30 to 50 percent of all child molestations are perpetrated by adolescent males (Sickmund, Snyder, & Poe-Yamagata, 1997). Despite an increasingly enhanced understanding of factors related to juvenile sex offending, this category of offenses continues to account for a significant portion of juvenile delinquency. In fact, over the past decade, while these percentages have remained largely consistent (Barbaree & Marshall, 2006), there has been considerable growth in the literature in specific aspects of juvenile sex offending, such as assessment (Calley, 2007; Grisso & Underwood, 2004; O'Reilly & Carr, 2006; Prentky, Harris, Frizzell, & Righthand, 2000; Worling & Curwen, 2001) and treatment (Prentky, Harris, Frizzell, & Righthand, 2000; Witt, Bosly, Hiscox, 2002; Worling & Curwen, 2001), and to a lesser degree, research has been dedicated to issues such as modus operandi (Bijleveld, Weerman, Looije, & Hendriks, 2007; Burton, 2003; Veneziano, Veneziano, & LeGrand, 2003), issues related to legislative changes (Petrosino & Petrosino, 1999; Vasquez, Maddan, & Walker, 2008), and specific legal challenges (Hiller, 1998; Trivits & Reppucci, 2002; Turoff, 2001). In addition, community organizations and juvenile justice systems have implemented various efforts to effectively manage sex offenders, often working independently and often not producing adequate results (CSOM, 2002; D'Amora & Burns-Smith, 1999; English, Pullen, & Jones, 1996).

Whereas traditionally much of the research has dealt with specific aspects of juvenile sex offending or the efforts of one independent organization (e.g., juvenile justice facility, community agency), few efforts have viewed juvenile sex offending comprehensively, as an issue with multiple interacting facets. Further, despite more recent calls for collaborative efforts in juvenile sex offender management as a means by which to achieve more efficient and effective systems of management (ATSA, 2001; Berlin, 2000; CSOM, 2002; D'Amora & Burns-Smith, 1999; English, Pullen, & Jones, 1996, 2003; McGrath, Cumming, & Burchard, 2003; NAPN, 1993), there continues to be a paucity of research addressing such efforts.

In order to move these objectives forward in practice, the *Comprehensive Approaches to Sex Offender Management* model was conceived by the Center for Sex Offender Management (CSOM). CSOM is a collaborative effort of the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice

Programs, the National Institute of Corrections, the State Justice Institute, and the American Probation and Parole Association and is administered by the Center for Effective Policy. The model acknowledges the complex nature of sex offending and the subsequent necessity of key system components to address offender accountability, rehabilitation, and community safety throughout all phases of the criminal and juvenile justice system (CSOM, 2008). More specifically, the CSOM model adopts a comprehensive view of sexual offending and promotes collaborative efforts towards system improvement that address each of the major areas that together comprise significant components of the system of sex offender management. These areas include: Investigation, Prosecution, and Disposition, Assessment, Treatment, Reentry, Supervision, and Sex Offender Registration.

The model builds upon previous work in the sex offender management field over the past two decades (CSOM, 2008) and serves as a teaching guide to assist regions in their own unique system improvement efforts. As such, the model provides a framework for regions to use to identify and promote strategic and collaborative responses to improving their systems of juvenile sex offender management. More specifically, CSOM developed the *Comprehensive Assessment Protocol* (CAP, 2004) for regions to use to guide the initial data collection process that forms the initial step of the system improvement process. Briefly, the CAP is organized in accordance with the CSOM model, including each major category comprising the sex offender management system (e.g., assessment, supervision) and provides an extensive set of exploratory questions to guide the investigator in data collection and assessment activities.

Bringing together both concrete guidance and financial support, the Bureau of Justice Programs has provided funding to regions to support system-wide improvement efforts targeting sex offender management (both adult and juvenile populations). The CAP and other materials developed by CSOM were made available to recipients of this funding to guide system improvement efforts aimed at sex offender management.

[back to top](#)

The Comprehensive Juvenile Sex Offender Management Initiative

Driven by the desire to identify and resolve primary system needs and improve the regional juvenile sex offender management system, a large, highly populated region in the Midwest received funding from the Bureau of Justice Programs to engage in a system improvement initiative. As a recipient of this funding, this author was able to use the CAP and other CSOM materials to guide the system improvement process.

Prior to receiving funding support, the author had received the commitment of multiple factions within the regional juvenile justice system to participate in the system improvement initiative. As a result, a team of stakeholders, including treatment providers, case management providers, regional juvenile justice system, the prosecutor's office, jurists, and local and state law enforcement, was formed to serve as the project's Collaborative Team, working directly with the project coordinator. The project consisted of three broad areas: 1) assessment of the existing juvenile sex offender management system, 2) analysis of the existing system with best practice literature, and 3) development and implementation of strategies to address identified gaps. This article will outline each of the three stages of the project that culminated in the development and implementation of a set of strategies designed to significantly improve the region's juvenile sex offender management system.

Assessment of the Existing Juvenile Sex Offender Management System

As the initial step in the process, an extensive assessment of the existing regional system of juvenile sex offender management was warranted. The CAP was used to guide this process. In addition, several tools were developed by the author and members of the Collaborative Team (Team) to aid in data collection. These included: *The Practice, Policy and Resource Inventory*, *the Juvenile Sex Offender Continuum of Care form*, and *Guiding Questions for Internal and External Data Collection forms*.

To complete the data collection process, members of the Team formed sub-committees around each of the major assessment areas (e.g., Re-Entry). Each sub-committee was then charged with leading the data collection process for their respective area and completed this process through individual and/or group interviews with relevant stakeholders (e.g., law enforcement, victim advocacy organization), the development and use of surveys, analysis of statistical data, and review of existing documentation (e.g., policy, law). Efforts were made to engage all relevant stakeholders throughout every aspect of the assessment process, and as a result, findings reflected multiple sources of input. The assessment process was conducted over a six-month period.

A preliminary step in the assessment process was a need to frame the problem of juvenile sex offending in the region to provide basic knowledge about the issue to the members of the Team. To accomplish this, several data sets were analyzed and reviewed by the Team. Some of these data sets included:

- Number of the state's juveniles charged with a sex crime during the previous 4 years;
- Case outcomes of those juveniles charged with sex crimes during the period;
- Number of the region's juveniles arrested for a juvenile sex crime in the preceding year;
- Number of the region's juveniles found guilty of a juvenile sex crime during the previous 5 years;
- Number of the region's juveniles in residential placement as a result of a sex crime charge and;
- The development of a profile (e.g., types of offenses, age, gender, race) of juvenile sex offenders in residential placement.

In addition to gathering these broad data sets, an in-depth analysis was conducted on all of the region's cases involving juveniles arrested for sex offense charges during the previous year. The following aspects of these cases were analyzed: 1) demographic characteristics of victims and offenders, initial charge, 2) legal manner in which the case was resolved (e.g., dismissal, plea), 3) dispositional charge, and 4) case outcome (e.g., probation, residential treatment) (Calley, 2008). Whereas each of the data sets contributed to the development of an accurate illustration of the region's issues related to juvenile sex offending, this last data analysis provided considerable information to the Team regarding the manner in which juvenile sex offense cases proceeded through the Court system, and produced several significant findings.

Some of the most striking findings had to do with the most common types of offenses committed by the region's juveniles and the manner in which the Court dealt with these offenses. Broadly, the majority of the initial charges were comprised of the most serious sexual offenses with Criminal Sexual Conduct I (most serious of the sex offenses in the state typically involving force and penetration; felony charge requiring sex offender registration); Criminal Sexual Conduct II (second most serious sex offense in state) comprised the second most common initial charge among the population. Whereas this data reflected a region challenged with the most serious types of juvenile sexual offenses, the manner in which the court dealt with these cases may have unintentionally resulted in withholding treatment to the population, possibly motivated by attempts to avoid the sex offender registration law. Specifically, 79 percent of the cases initially charged with CSC I were pled down to Gross Indecency charges (misdemeanor not requiring sex offender registration) (Calley, 2008). As the youth progressed through the Court, only 30 percent of the cases initially charged with CSC I entered the region's juvenile justice system and were thereby eligible for regionally-funded juvenile sex offender treatment (also noteworthy, only 36 percent of all youth charged with juvenile sex offenses were referred to the region's juvenile justice system.) Whereas the issues leading to these Court-related outcomes may very well constitute unintended consequences related to sex offender legislation and its application to juvenile offenders, a significant portion of youth in need of

treatment may not have been able to receive such treatment as a result of dispositional decision-making.

Another method of detailed analysis that was employed by the Team to increase understanding of the existing system was the development of a System Map. The System Map identified each of the steps in the process as a youth proceeded through the juvenile justice system as a result of a sex crime charge. The System Map provided a tremendous amount of detail and clarification as to the existing process that impacted juveniles within the system and throughout their interaction with the system. In conjunction with the various data analyses, the System Map provided a solid picture of the region's existing system.

In addition to the various data already discussed, the assessment of each area of the system (e.g., Treatment, Supervision) included a thorough identification of both existing strengths and needs. However, for the sake of space considerations, a limited sample of the major needs is included here (see [Table 1](#)).

As evidenced by the findings, the assessment yielded a tremendous amount of information about the existing juvenile sex offender management system and as such, was a highly educational process for both Team members and participating stakeholders. Additionally, because assessment activities are typically dynamic and interactive in nature, the process provided numerous opportunities for learning, questioning, and reflecting about the various aspects of the system, at times resulting in immediate changes. Finally, and consistent with ethics related to assessment processes, the complete results of the assessment were made available to all participants and all of the region's stakeholders to ensure that everyone would be able to benefit equally from the work.

Analysis of the Existing System with Best Practice Literature

Having completed an extensive assessment of the existing system of juvenile sex offender management and as such, having gained significant information related to the region's needs in this area, a comprehensive examination of the scholarly literature was warranted. Such a literature review was needed to identify and prioritize gaps between the region's system and current research. To this end, a comprehensive literature review was conducted by the author.

A four-step approach was used to accomplish this that included: 1) an electronic search of major scholarship databases (e.g., EBSCO, LexisNexus) to identify all relevant journal articles, books, and other literature dealing with juvenile sex offending and related areas (e.g., juvenile justice, legislation) published during the past 25 years, 2) collection and review of all relevant scholarship, 3) review of all best practice literature from related professional associations, accrediting bodies, and other formalized workgroups and, 4) an analysis of the major findings in the literature with the existing system needs.

In order to organize the vast literature related to juvenile sex offending and to aid in determining specific additional areas of analysis, the author compiled a bibliography spanning the previous 25 years. In addition, a second bibliography of research conducted during the past ten years was also developed in order to provide a more focused view of the most current literature. This extensive review of the literature provided essential information to the Team, providing concrete knowledge on a variety of issues related to juvenile sex offending, and assisting in prioritizing the needs of the region based upon research. As such, the literature review and analysis provided the Team with evidence-based guidance for use in identifying the region's most significant needs. Moreover, the review provided the Team with the foundation for developing strategies to address these needs. The collection of strategies that were then developed by the Team is referred to as the *Implementation Plan*.

Implementation Plan

Using the data gathered in the comprehensive assessment process and the analysis of existing practices in the region with current research, Team members continued to work in

subcommittees to prioritize each of the needs in their related areas. The prioritized needs identified by each sub-committee were then shared with the full Team for final decision-making. This resulted in the identification and consolidation of the most significant needs of the region's system of juvenile sex offender management. For each identified need, the best practice literature was again used to develop specific broad-based strategies to address such needs, resulting in the development of a comprehensive set of improvement strategies to be implemented within the region.

As evidenced in the findings of the assessment process, a major identified theme was the lack of comprehensive knowledge and understanding among stakeholders regarding juvenile sex offenders and the various issues related to the population. In addition, there was a lack of collective knowledge about the existing juvenile sex offender management system. To address this issue, a significant portion of the improvement strategies focused on increasing the region's collective knowledge regarding juvenile sex offending and juvenile sex offender management through education, training, and the implementation of a variety of evidence-based protocols. In short, the set of improvement strategies emphasized three primary domains: the adoption of best practice standards, training, and education among key stakeholders. More specifically, the strategies were categorized into seven major activities: 1) the development of Exploratory Committees to continue to tackle specific issues requiring additional work, 2) resource development to support the work of various factions of professionals (e.g., police, prosecutor, treatment providers, 3) the implementation of formalized information-sharing forums, 4) the development of a comprehensive data collection plan and annual data review forums, 5) best-practice policy development across all necessary areas, 6) the development and delivery of a comprehensive training curriculum, and 7) the development and implementation of a comprehensive website.

Thirty-six specific action-oriented strategies were developed, each reflecting one of these major activities and together designed to improve the region's system of juvenile sex offender management through the adoption of best practices, education, and training. To illustrate this, the strategies are categorized by the major areas examined in the initial assessment process to indicate the relationship between identified needs and the new strategy development (see [Table 2](#)).

As you can see, each of the strategies was designed to directly address the most significant needs of the region's juvenile sex offender management system with a strong emphasis on increasing the collective knowledge of the region and providing essential tools and resources to promote evidence-based practices throughout the system. Moreover, because sustaining an initiative such as this typically presents the most pressing challenge to systems, strategies that were adopted were those that were thought to continuously improve the system rather than to produce temporary change.

For instance, the development and adoption of best practice policies ensured that all existing and new stakeholders received the same level of guidance in their work and quarterly juvenile sex offender treatment forums were intended to promote continuous dialogue and information-sharing among multiple factions working in the system. Likewise, regularly scheduled systematic review of data promoted an ongoing focus on various issues related to the system and immediacy in responding to system needs. The educational/training curriculum was designed to initially be provided face-to-face during a six-month period, and then be converted to online instruction with open access to all stakeholders; this promoted ongoing educational opportunities for existing professionals in the system and new professionals as they join the system. By making the training available to all existing and future stakeholders, the Team hoped to reduce the knowledge gaps between professionals in the region. Finally, the development of a comprehensive website was viewed as an essential sustainability tool; it was intended to serve as a repository for all best practice documents, guidance tools, and other resources, serve as a communication tool within the system, and provide the online educational curriculum. Regularly scheduled updates to the training curriculum and website were also established to ensure the ongoing relevance of the information made available through the site.

To ensure successful implementation of the comprehensive strategies, timeframes for completion were established and specific individuals were identified as responsible for carrying out the various strategies. Further, the Team planned that each of the strategies would be implemented immediately to further reinforce the effectiveness of the improvement process itself, particularly by efficiently demonstrating the purpose of assessment and providing feedback to all stakeholders. An open forum was held soon after the Implementation Plan was finalized to present the findings and to introduce the Plan to all stakeholders. This forum provided an opportunity for various members of the system to again come together in this shared work, while also promoting new momentum to move the Implementation Plan forward.

[back to top](#)

Summary

The Comprehensive Juvenile Sex Offender Management Initiative (the formal title of the region's system improvement project) was originally pursued because a team of professionals in the region were concerned about the existing status of the juvenile sex offender system. These concerns allowed for not only shared responsibility but more importantly, developing a shared vision and engaging in a highly collaborative effort. As a result of the collaborative work of multiple factions within the region's juvenile justice system, a critical analysis of the existing system was completed, resulting in the development of a comprehensive improvement plan.

Although the intent of this article is to highlight the process that the region used to engage in broad-based improvement efforts, it will be important to report later on the outcomes of the implementation of the strategies. With the evaluation of the implementation plan currently underway, the results of the implementation should be available in the near future.

As the issue of sex offending continues to gain significance in the criminal justice system, it will be essential that systems have specific protocols and processes in place by which to address the complex needs of the population. Moreover, whereas sex offenders comprise just one subgroup of the criminal population, other offenders with specialized needs (e.g., co-occurring mental health disorders, developmentally disabled individuals, young adults/older teens) may benefit equally from such comprehensive and collaborative approaches to system improvement that are specifically designed to address their unique needs. It is likely in this manner that the benefits of an initiative such as this have greatest value: that is, the ability of such efforts to be used as a template for multiple types of system improvement.

[back to top](#)

References

The articles and reviews that appear in *Federal Probation* express the points of view of the persons who wrote them and not necessarily the points of view of the agencies and organizations with which these persons are affiliated. Moreover, *Federal Probation's* publication of the articles and reviews is not to be taken as an endorsement of the material by the editors, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, or the Federal Probation and Pretrial Services System. Published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts www.uscourts.gov

[Publishing Information](#)

New Directions in Juvenile Sex Offender Management: Designing a Collaborative Approach

Tables

[Table 1](#)[Table 2](#)

Table 1.

Major Needs of the System: A Sample of Assessment Findings

Investigation, Prosecution, and Disposition

- Consistent and comprehensive assessment for use in prosecutorial and jurist decision-making
- Comprehensive training related to juvenile sex offenders and investigative work with alleged offenders (modus operandi, victim issues, dynamics involved in juvenile sex offenders, physical evidence)
- Comprehensive guidance to prosecutors, jurists, assessment personnel, and other stakeholders in decision-making regarding juvenile sex offender treatment needs Regular and systematic review of juvenile sex offender data by all stakeholders
- Comprehensive understanding of broad-based impact and review of outcomes related to prosecutorial and judicial decision-making

Assessment

- Consistent and comprehensive juvenile sex offender-specific assessment for use across system (including ethical issues, legal issues, instruments) Comprehensive data sharing and communication among the various stakeholders

Treatment

- Case management, community-based, and residential providers' access to comprehensive resources and knowledge regarding available resources
- Increased understanding and knowledge related to treatment needs by all stakeholders
- Ability of juvenile sex offenders and families/caregivers to efficiently access treatment
- Treatment for specialized juvenile sex offender populations (i.e., younger than 13 years, developmentally disabled, older than 18 years, mentally ill)
- Policy/standard mandating adherence to current empirically-based best practices in juvenile sex offender treatment
- Specialized educational and experiential requirements for juvenile sex offender treatment staff
- Adjunctive services to minimally include family therapy, parent education, mental health treatment, educational and vocational services, and substance abuse services, as needed

Re-Entry & Supervision

- Involvement of multiple stakeholders in comprehensive re-entry/release planning, including: victim advocate, educational personnel, others
- Comprehensive release planning that takes into account the various needs related to community re-entry
- Referrals to community-based providers of adjunctive services (i.e., mental health, substance abuse, family therapy, education, employment, vocation) prior to release
- Collaboration among all relevant stakeholders to promote positive re-entry, ensure that rights of juvenile sex offenders are not violated through discriminatory practices, and promote community safety
- Presence and use of community support networks to support re-entry and guidance for the development and utilization of community support networks
- Identification of assets and resources to support the re-entry process

Legislation

- Legislation mandating treatment of juvenile sex offenders

Other

- Comprehensive understanding of available continuum of care for juvenile sex offenders among all stakeholders
- Established guidelines for information-sharing among all relevant stakeholders (e.g., children's protective services, law enforcement, prosecutors, medical facilities, victim advocacy, victim treatment, offender treatment)
- Comprehensive juvenile sex offender training for all stakeholders (e.g., CPS, law enforcement, prosecutor's office, jurists, detention providers, treatment providers, victim advocates, victim treatment providers) to increase collective understanding of juvenile sex offending behaviors, patterns, treatment needs, current research, etc.
- Complete information contained in client files, including extensive background, past assessments and scores, registration documentation, sex offender specific evaluation, previous agency and Court

- Comprehensive data collection and maintenance practices throughout all aspects of the system

[back to top](#)

Table 2.

Comprehensive Strategies to Address Major System Needs

Investigation
1. Develop or use existing protocol (<i>i.e., Child Abuse & Neglect Protocol</i>) to train law enforcement, schools, child welfare providers, residential providers, and Children's Protective Services for use in response to complaints of juvenile sex offenses and communication and collaboration with other stakeholders.
2. Develop multiple methods for distribution of protocol (e.g., training, self-training modules, facilitated discussions, flyers).
3 . Develop a protocol to guide comprehensive law enforcement data collection for delivery through multiple methods (e.g., training, self-training modules, facilitated discussions, flyers).
Prosecution, and Disposition
4. Develop a <i>Comprehensive Pre-Disposition Investigation Protocol (CPDIP)</i> (e.g., modus operandi, victim impact, offense history, sexual history, family functioning) for use by the prosecutor and jurists and a plan for completion of the CPDIP.
5. Develop a plan for instituting the CPDIP that includes live training and a self-instruction module.
6. Develop a <i>Prosecutorial Decision-Making Guide</i> to provide additional (in addition to the CPDIP) information and guidance in juvenile sex offense cases.
7. Develop a <i>Jurist Decision-Making Guide</i> to provide additional information and guidance in juvenile sex offense cases.
8. Explore the possibility of adding a part-time investigator or additional prosecutor to handle assessment and data collection for juvenile sex offense cases.
9. Develop data collection plan for comprehensive data collection (e.g., data elements, entities involved, data extraction plan) across relevant entities (e.g., Court, Juvenile Assessment Center).
10. Conduct annual systematic reviews of juvenile sex offender data for examination and discussion among all stakeholders.
11. Coordinate a bi-annual (twice per year) breakfast meeting for prosecutor's office, jurists, case management organizations, providers, Court probation and Clinic, County officials, and other stakeholders to discuss issues related to juvenile sex offenders (including annual review of data).
Assessment
12. Develop a <i>Comprehensive Assessment Practices with Juvenile Sex Offenders Protocol</i> that minimally includes the significance of comprehensive assessment, use and types of a variety of assessment tools, use and type of assessment to promote community safety, use and types of assessment tools across the

continuum of care to guide treatment planning (i.e., initial assessment, residential assessment, re-entry, and supervision), ethical and legal use of assessment tools, types of juvenile sex offender-specific assessment tools, strengths and limitations of assessment instruments, and use of assessment tools as outcome measures.

13. Develop a plan for instituting the *Comprehensive Assessment Practices with Juvenile Sex Offenders Protocol* that includes live training and a selfinstruction module.

14. Develop informational sheets regarding juvenile sex offender assessment practices and specific tools for quick references.

15. Develop a Task Force to explore the pros and cons of the use of the polygraph for juvenile sex offenders, including legal issues, appropriate use, purpose, etc. and incorporate findings into the *Comprehensive Assessment Practices with Juvenile Sex Offenders Protocol*.

16. Institute a Task Force to develop an *Information-Sharing Protocol to Guide Work with Juvenile Sex Offenders* to address the types of information to be shared, with whom and when, legal and ethical issues related to information-sharing.

Treatment

17. Revise and expand the existing region-wide policy to identify minimal program standards for all sex offender treatment programs (i.e., residential, community-based).

18. Develop a *Sex Offender Treatment (SOT) Committee* as a regular forum for SOT treatment providers to discuss issues pertinent to treatment (e.g., group composition, caregiver support and family involvement in treatment, staff training, substance abuse treatment).

19. Develop a Sub-Committee to make recommendations regarding an expanded continuum of care for the treatment of juvenile sex offenders to address current gaps in the system including various options in community-based treatment and treatment for JSO youth with special needs (i.e., developmental disabilities, 18-20 year olds).

20. Develop a comprehensive *Best Practices Guide for Residential Treatment of Juvenile Sex Offenders* minimally identifying such issues as informed consent, evidence-based practices, resource coordination and other adjunctive service coordination (e.g., mental health, vocational), assessment, family treatment, caregiver capacity for supervision, community safety and monitoring, staff credentialing, intake and termination practices, participation in community-based treatment following residential discharge and transition planning for re-entry.

21. Develop training to educate stakeholders about Best Practices in Residential Treatment.

22. Develop a comprehensive *Best Practices Guide for Community-Based Treatment of Juvenile Sex Offenders* minimally identifying such issues as working collaboratively with other professionals, informed consent, evidence-based practices, resource coordination and other adjunctive service coordination (e.g., education, employment, mental health), assessment, family treatment, caregiver capacity for supervision, community safety and monitoring, staff credentialing, intake and termination practices.

23. Develop training to educate stakeholders about Best Practices in Community-Based Treatment.

Re-Entry & Supervision

24. Develop a *Best Practices Guide for the Supervision of Juvenile Sex Offenders* minimally identifying such issues as treatment plan development, assessment, information sharing, use of a multidisciplinary team in case planning and oversight, community safety, specialized training, caseload size, staff credentialing, utilization of victim impact statements in case planning, assessment of caregiver capacity and community safety.

25. Develop training to educate stakeholders about Best Practices in Supervision of Juvenile Sex Offenders.

26. Develop a *Strategies & Resource Guide for Addressing & Reducing Secondary Trauma and Burn-Out*

among professionals working with juvenile offenders to be made available to all stakeholders.

27. Develop a Guide to the Formation and Use of Community Support Networks in the Supervision of Juvenile Sex Offenders.
28. Institute a Task Force to explore legal issues related to re-entry of juvenile sex offenders, such as school re-entry, information sharing among community members.
29. Develop a *Brief Resource Directory for Supporting Work with Juvenile Sex Offenders* for distribution to all stakeholders.

Sex Offender Registration

30. Form an Exploratory Committee to examine the process and feasibility for pursuing legislative changes to the Michigan Sex Offender Registration law that allow for greater differentiation between juvenile sex offenders and adult sex offenders.

Other

31. Develop a specialized training curriculum for all stakeholders (i.e., juvenile justice workers and administrators, policy makers, Court officials) to increase knowledge of issues related to working with juvenile sex offenders, minimally including the following topics: decision-making, evidencebased practice, clinical assessment, community safety, information-sharing, legal and ethical issues, and supporting professionals working with juvenile sex offenders (*topics are in addition to specific trainings identified previously*).
32. Discuss the formation of an Exploratory Committee with the Department of Human Services for possible exploration of the development of a multidisciplinary team for juvenile sex offender victims.
33. Form an Exploratory Committee to explore funding for victim services and victim treatment options.
34. Develop a comprehensive website to promote continuous access to project resources (e.g., protocols, self-training modules, informational sheets) and other information that is part of the Implementation Plan as well as to continue to keep juvenile sex offender management a key topic in the region and state.
35. Develop a broad-based public awareness campaign to raise awareness about juvenile sex offenses and legal implications, specifically targeting young persons, parents, teachers, and other community members.
36. Develop and deliver briefings to multiple groups of stakeholders regarding the work of the Collaborative Team, summarizing the assessment findings and implementation plan to garner support and promote momentum for the implementation plan.

[back to top](#)

The articles and reviews that appear in *Federal Probation* express the points of view of the persons who wrote them and not necessarily the points of view of the agencies and organizations with which these persons are affiliated. Moreover, *Federal Probation's* publication of the articles and reviews is not to be taken as an endorsement of the material by the editors, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, or the Federal Probation and Pretrial Services System. Published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts www.uscourts.gov.
[Publishing Information](#)

Institute.

Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2007). *Risk, Need, Responsivity Model for Offender Assessment and Rehabilitation*. Canada.

Gottfredson, S. D., & Moriarty, L. J. (2006). *Clinical Versus Actuarial Judgments in Criminal Justice Decisions: Should One Replace the Other?* Federal Probation, 70(2).

Little, J. (n.d.). An Evaluation of the San Diego Risk and Resiliency Check Up: Social Science Data Analysis Center, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado.

Lowenkamp, C. T., & Latessa, E. J. (2004). *Understanding the Risk Principle: How and Why Correctional Interventions Can Harm Low-Risk Offenders*.

Turner, S., & Fain, T. (2006). *Validation of the Risk and Resiliency Assessment Tool for Juveniles in the Los Angeles County Probation System*. Federal Probation, 70(2), 49–57.

Vose, B., Cullen, F. T., & Smith, P. (2008). *The Empirical Status of the Level of Service Inventory*. Federal Probation, 72(3), 22–29.

[back to top](#)

New Directions in Juvenile Sex Offender Management: Designing a Collaborative Approach

Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers (ATSA) (2001). *Practice standards and guidelines for members of the Association for the Treatment of Sexual Abusers*. Beaverton, OR: Author.

Berlin, F. S. (2000). *The etiology and treatment of sexual offending*. In D. H. Fishbein (Ed.), *The science, treatment, and prevention of antisocial behaviors: Application to the criminal justice system* (pp. 21.1-21.15). Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute.

Bijleveld, C.C.J.H., Weerman, F. M., Looije, D. & Hendriks, J. (2007). *Group sex offending by juveniles*. European Journal of Criminology, 4, 5-30.

Burton, D.L. (2003). *Male adolescents: Sexual victimization and subsequent sexual abuse*. Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 20, 277-296.

Calley, N. G. (2008). *Juvenile sex offenders and sex offender legislation: Unintended consequences*. Federal Probation, 37-41.

Calley, N.G. (2007). *Promoting an outcomes-based treatment milieu for juvenile sex offenders: A guided approach to assessment*. Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 29, 121-143.

Center for Sex Offender Management (CSOM) (2002). *An overview of sex offender management*. Silver Spring, MD: Author.

Center for Sex Offender Management (2004). *Comprehensive assessment protocol*. Silver Spring, MD: Author.

Center for Sex Offender Management (CSOM) (2008). *The comprehensive approach to sex offender management*. Silver Spring, MD: Author.

D'Amora, D., & Burns-Smith, G. (1999). *Partnering in response to sexual violence: How offender treatment and victim advocacy can work together in response to sexual violence*. Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 11, 293-304.

English, K., Pullen, S., & Jones, L. (1996). *Managing adult sex offenders: A Containment Approach*. Lexington, KY: American Probation and Parole Association.

Federal Bureau of Investigation (2002). *Uniform crime report*. Washington DC: Author.

Grisso, T. & Underwood, L.A. (2004). *Screening and assessing mental health and substance use disorders among youth in the juvenile justice system: A resource guide for practitioners*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Hiller, S. (1998). *The problem with juvenile sex offender registration: The detrimental effects of public disclosure*. Boston Public Interest Law Journal, 7, 271-293.

McGrath, R. J., Cumming, G. F., & Burchard, B. L. (2003). *Current practices and trends in sexual abuser management: The Safer Society 2002 Nationwide Survey*. Brandon, VT: Safer Society.

National Adolescent Perpetrator Network (NAPN) (1993). *The revised report from the National Task Force on Juvenile Sexual Offending*. Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 44, 1-120.

O'Reilly, G. & Carr, A. (2006). *Assessment and treatment of criminogenic needs*. In The Juvenile Sex Offender (Eds. Barbaree, H.E. and Marshall, W. L.) (2nd edition). New York: The Guilford Press, pp. 189-218.

Petrosino, A. J. & Petrosino, C. (1999). *The public safety potential of Megan's Law in Massachusetts: An assessment from a sample of criminal sexual psychopaths*. Crime and Delinquency, 45, 140-158.

Prentky, R., Harris, B., Frizzell, K., & Righthand, S. (2000). *An actuarial procedure for assessing risk with juvenile sex offenders*. Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 12, 71-92.

Sickmund, M., Snyder, H., & Poe-Yamagata, E. (August 1997) *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1997 Update on Violence*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Trivits, L. C. & Repucci, N. D. (2002). *Application of Megan's Law to juveniles*. American Psychologist, 57, 690-704.

Turoff, A. G. (2001). *Throwing away the key on society's youngest offenders*. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 91, 1127-1152.

Vasquez, B. E., Madden, S., & Walker, J. T. (2008). *The influence of sex offender registration and notification laws in the United States: A time-series analysis*. Crime and Delinquency, 54, 175-192.

Veneziano, Veneziano, & LeGrand. (2003). *The relationship between adolescent sex offender behaviors and victim characteristics with prior victimization*. Violence and Victims, 15, 363-374.

Witt, P.H., Bosly, J.T., Hiscox, S. P.(2002). *Evaluation of juvenile sex offenders*. The Journal of Psychiatry and Law, 30, 569-592.

Worling, J.R., & Curwen, T. (2001). *Estimate of Risk of Adolescent Sexual Offense Recidivism*, Ver. 2.0 Manual. Etobicoke, ON: Thistletown Regional Centre.

[back to top](#)