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**Juvenile Justice Proposal Implementation**

The search for solutions for the juvenile justice system demands an adverse amount of resources to make the program's goals and objectives a success. The program is procedural and recursive and therefore requires constant review and evaluation. That ensures that the rights of the juveniles are taken into consideration and straighten the law practitioners’ mode of representation. That is through sharpening their skills and knowledge on youth, through constant training and facilitation.

Besides, as the programs aim at achieving improving the initiatives that prevent circumstances that propagate teen offenses, and improving the juvenile justice system, more resources are in demand. One critical support in need funds to finance the whole procedure of research and facilitation of proposed amendments. The proposition for maintenance of detention facilities, and all goals, calls for a considerable amount of capital for start-up and constant review (NRC, 2014).

**Source of finance**

The primary source of funding for the program targets the Office of Justice Programs (OJP), which provides funds using its own designed formula, payment structure, and cooperative consensus. OJP typically releases funds in grants forms to finance such programs in carrying out research, training the appropriate personnel, in this case, the youths, and their representatives. That includes the defenders and the adjudicators. The funds also help in technical issues and activities about the dissemination of information.

Our programs intend to win the discretionary grants released by OJP since they are usually competitive. The office aims at programs that help in the administration of a couple of juvenile justice systems and applications that protect a child's welfare (OJJDP, 2017). Our programs are consolidated based on a child's health, youth justice, and proper jurisdiction system, which forms our win criteria. Further, we target the formula funds, which generally help curb and end delinquency, enhance the state of the youth justice system, and safeguard youth from falling to be victims of violence.

These funding programs typically get officiated by the state agencies and the juvenile justice officials in all states through the local authorities (OJJDP, 2017). For the release of the funds, the OJP requires a clear set of objectives and measures of performance to help achieve the goals and of which we clearly outlined. The office also demands feedback on the return of the funds through a report which we advocate to prevent wastage and embezzlement.

**Evaluation criteria**

When measuring the program's level of success, various measures will get taken to monitor the efforts of reform to the youth and the juvenile justice system. The system outcomes will determine the effectiveness of the proposed changes in the administration of law, policies, and standards. The youth results will determine how the reform criteria influence the youth's level of change in detention and those within the juvenile justice system. Besides, one tool for measuring the performance of the program in the youth justice system is the determination of the impact on the community level where the necessary violence and abuse take place (Childs, 2019).

**Juvenile system result**

The juvenile system result is a criterion that focuses on the program's effect on the youth justice system. That entails the policies and standards used to assess the level of risks and needs within the system, the workability of the decently implemented program, and the variation of decision making in the order. The ultimate example focuses on the number of teens assessed, detained, and the number deployed and admitted to various programs (Childs, 2019).

**Juvenile result**

The juvenile result presents the criterion that will measure the program's performance based on its effects on the teens served at the juvenile justice system. These results will get associated with the aims of the local agencies (Childs, 2019). Further, the results aim at the effectiveness of the youth treatment, the safety of the public, and inferior behavior reduction. To narrow down the measure of performance, the criteria also focus on the complete procedure of youths, reduction of contacts among the teens, and reduction of community-level violence.

**Data collection**

The success of the program is entirely dependent on the two methodologies, that is, direct link with appropriate personnel and mailing. The direct data collection will focus on collecting personal data on every youth in detention or held in the residential facilities. The data will include the youth’s gender, the authority on placement, date of birth, the offense charged, race, admission details, and the security details. The data calls for teens with 21 years and below and are within the correctional facilities. Further, the facilities will get required to provide information on the population status, layout, structure, and the number of youths in the facilities.

The second method will involve the mailing of forms to the youth justice systems or residential for data collection. These forms will also get directed to individual victims in the facilities and both public and private juvenile facilities. Also, the program will require the electronic transmission of data across various states. The plan further offers a different specification to all the respondents as the forms get formatted to fit the respondent capability (NCJJ, 2017).

Upon completion of the exercise on the referenced data, the data should also get sent through the mail. Any facility that fails to respond will get a reminder of resubmission. The collection criteria follow a series of conditions like the respondents should; be below 21 years, have a stable bed in the juvenile justice facility, offender charged with a viable offense in a law court, and placed in facilities due to that offense. The juveniles and the law enforcement practitioners play as the main target in the program as they usually get associated with residential placement and representation (NCJJ, 2017). However, the facilities that manage individuals 21 years and above will not get considered in the data collection process.

**Implementation process**

Once the data collection process gets completed, the data will be analyzed, and communications feedback gets passed through mail to the respective correctional or residential facilities. That is through a movement to vary the mode of youth treatment concerning the individual juvenile justice systems. The response entirely depends on the information collected about youth behavior, and the impact of the justice system imputation (NRC, 2014). The implementation criteria entail the suggestion of facility replacement, whereby the justice system gets replaced with a gradual approach to change where the juveniles get kept and monitored at the community level.

Moreover, the programs support implementing a detailed evidence assessment for the risks and needs of the youth and the residential facilities. Further, it proposes the implementation of evidence associated treatment and representation program through restructuring levels of probation. The program initiates an electronic model for inspecting and monitoring the system and youth results in all facility levels.

The use of data to review and evaluate the collection, decision-making, and implementation programs and policies will drastically improve the state of youth and the justice systems across different countries (NRC, 2014). That includes the introduction of local agencies that offer training to the jurisdiction level to manage the justice systems better and improve youth behavior.
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