



DRAFT

**Monthly Report:  
December**

**FY2021**

## Section 1: Population and Staffing Data

Table 1a: Population by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	37	40	34	19	17	16	16	13	17	28	24	18
<b>Harrisburg</b>	79	71	57	46	38	31	40	43	48	29	30	39
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	30	27	10	3	3	9	12	10	8	11	13	10
<b>St. Charles</b>	50	65	46	41	33	32	34	38	37	42	32	25
<b>Warrenville</b>	20	16	17	11	11	15	21	27	23	20	24	24
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>116</b>


Table 1b: Average Daily Population by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	40.0	37.2	40.3	24.9	15.7	16.2	15.2	13.4	17.2	23.0	25.7	21.3
<b>Harrisburg</b>	83.0	78.8	67.0	48.7	41.2	35.1	35.5	42.4	49.5	39.8	33.0	37.9
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	29.2	27.0	18.4	6.4	4.2	4.9	10.5	9.2	8.8	9.3	10.4	11.5
<b>St. Charles</b>	45.4	56.0	55.0	43.1	39.4	33.6	36.2	35.0	38.4	39.2	36.8	30.8
<b>Warrenville</b>	21.9	18.0	20.2	12.4	11	12.0	17.8	24.8	26.9	20.8	22.1	23.8
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>219.6</b>	<b>218.0</b>	<b>200.8</b>	<b>135.5</b>	<b>111.5</b>	<b>101.7</b>	<b>115.2</b>	<b>124.8</b>	<b>140.7</b>	<b>132.1</b>	<b>128.1</b>	<b>125.3</b>

Table 2: Security Staff Headcount by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	91	92	92	88	89	87	85	84	82	81	82	
<b>Harrisburg</b>	143	141	141	140	142	141	139	137	133	133	132	
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	51	51	50	50	48	48	48	48	47	46	47	
<b>St. Charles</b>	175	167	165	165	161	155	155	152	151	151	138	
<b>Warrenville</b>	71	71	71	69	68	68	67	68	67	67	67	
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>499</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>478</b>	<b>468</b>	

**Chart 1: Facility Populations on Last Day of Month Last Seven Fiscal Years**



## Section 2: Mental Health Data

Table 5: Percent of Youth Psychotropic Medication

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	28%	62.2%	50%	55%	83.3%	76.2%	76.5%	78.9%	90.5%	89.7%	93.1%	96.4%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	50.8%	56.1%	50.6%	43.5%	47.4%	37.7%	70%	63.5%	57.7%	42.4%	43.8%	60.7%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	38.6%	64.9%	65.5%	70%	60%	53.8%	38.5%	33.3%	38.5%	33.3%	35.3%	35.7%
<b>St. Charles</b>	60.1%	41.6%	51.9%	71.1%	60.5%	57.7%	51.1%	52.3%	38.5%	42.6%	35.8%	26.4%
<b>Warrenville</b>	64.2%	71.4%	68%	70.6%	54.5%	70.6%	54.5%	62.9%	51.6%	56%	66.7%	75%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>48.9%</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>54.2%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>53.7%</b>	<b>59.7%</b>	<b>59.7%</b>	<b>52.7%</b>	<b>50.5%</b>	<b>52.3%</b>	<b>56.4%</b>

Table 7: Distribution of Mental Health Levels


	Mental Health Level 0	Mental Health Level 1	Mental Health Level 2	Mental Health Level 3	Mental Health Level 3.5	Mental Health Level 4
<b>January</b>	9.6%	53.5%	28.9%	7.5%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>February</b>	7.1%	53.5%	31.9%	6.6%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>March</b>	6.5%	50.6%	35.3%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>April</b>	7.4%	50.8%	33.6%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>May</b>	4.9%	57.3%	30.1%	7.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>June</b>	5.4%	50%	33.9%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>July</b>	4.6%	51.1%	33.6%	10.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>August</b>	3.8%	53.8%	36.4%	6.1%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>September</b>	3.6%	52.5%	36.7%	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>October</b>	3.8%	54.5%	34.8%	6.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>November</b>	3.1%	46.9%	43.8%	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>December</b>	4.8%	51.2%	39.2%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>52.1%</b>	<b>34.9%</b>	<b>7.5%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.03%</b>

Table 8: Distribution of DSM V Diagnoses

	Youth with No Diagnosis	Youth with One Diagnosis	Youth with Two Diagnoses	Youth with Three Diagnoses	Youth with Four or More Diagnoses
<b>January</b>	8.27%	7.3%	20.95%	30.21%	37.91%
<b>February</b>	6.93%	5.63%	16.45%	29.87%	41.13%
<b>March</b>	5%	3.89%	11.11%	33.89%	46.11%
<b>April</b>	5.47%	3.91%	13.28%	33.59%	43.75%
<b>May</b>	1.92%	1.92%	15.38%	37.5%	43.27%
<b>June</b>	3.60%	1.80%	15.32%	31.53%	47.75%
<b>July</b>	2.94%	1.47%	19.12%	30.15%	46.32%
<b>August</b>	2.86%	2.86%	15%	35%	44.29%
<b>September</b>	2.72%	2.72%	12.93%	38.78%	42.86%
<b>October</b>	3.62%	2.17%	15.22%	30.43%	48.55%
<b>November</b>	3.68%	5.88%	13.24%	27.94%	49.26%
<b>December</b>	2.70%	6.76%	14.19%	33.11%	43.24%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4.14%</b>	<b>3.86%</b>	<b>15.18%</b>	<b>32.67%</b>	<b>44.54%</b>



**Chart 3: Percent of Youth on Psychotropic Medication**



### Section 3: Substance Abuse Treatment Data

Table 9: Number of Treatment Participants

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	14	8	8	6	2	3	4	4	7	9	11	10
<b>Harrisburg</b>	24	24	14	11	6	12	11	17	16	11	8	10
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	35	37	10	10	5	13	13	15	13	18	17	14
<b>St. Charles</b>	9	8	10	10	9	5	4	6	9	7	8	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	10	9	8	6	2	3	5	4	13	9	6	7
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>48</b>

Table 10: Average Length of Stay for Completers

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	101	101	94	-	-	95	120	-	63	-	71	106
<b>Harrisburg</b>	97	56	99	49	110	75	-	-	56	80	-	42
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	147	110	-	76	46	93	-	-	-	98	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	114	-	-	172	-	-	-	38
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	60	60	-	61	60	-	-	-	-	60
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>62</b>

Table 11: Percent of Discharges by Reason

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Successful Completion</b>	52%	40.9%	37.5%	32.1%	50%	57.1%	28.6%	10%	34.8%	31.6%	13.3%	22.2%
<b>Behavioral Discharge</b>	0%	4.5%	18.8%	0%	12.5%	0%	0%	10%	4.3%	5.3%	6.7%	5.6%
<b>Youth Released</b>	40%	40.9%	31.2%	64.3%	37.5%	42.9%	57.1%	70%	60.9%	57.9%	73.3%	66.7%
<b>Other Discharge</b>	8%	13.6%	12.5%	3.6%	0%	0%	14.3%	10%	4.3%	5.3%	6.7%	5.6%

Table 12: Primary Substance Abused

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Marijuana</b>	71.7%	76.7%	74%	77.6%	79.2%	88.9%	97.3%	97.8%	89.7%	85.2%	78%	72.9%
<b>Alcohol</b>	5.4%	7%	4%	6.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.2%	7.4%	8%	8.3%
<b>Other Drugs</b>	20.7%	14%	22%	16.3%	20.8%	11.1%	2.7%	2.2%	5.2%	7.4%	12%	14.6%
<b>No Diagnosis</b>	2.2%	2.3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	4.2%

For the youth whose primary substance abuse is not specified, four reported using amphetamines, 1 opioids, 1 hallucinogens, and one reported other drugs.



## Section 4: Education Data

Table 13: Students Enrolled in School

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	42	42	30	15	14	8	8	5	9	16	13	9
<b>Harrisburg</b>	64	57	51	30	25	25	27	31	40	34	25	31
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	29	20	6	3	3	6	11	6	6	7	7	11
<b>St. Charles</b>	24	32	32	24	13	11	17	13	14	12	9	8
<b>Warrenville</b>	14	11	17	8	7	9	11	16	17	12	13	11
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>70</b>

Table 14: Teachers Employed

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	7	7	7	7	7	8	7	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	17	17	16	16	16	16	15	16	16	16	16	16
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	6	6	6
<b>St. Charles</b>	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	8	7	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>41</b>

Table 15: General Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5.0	3	4.3	1.4	1.5	0.2	0.7	0.3	1.0	1.5	1.2	0.5
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2.8	1.6	3.2	0.7	0.3	1.0	0.9	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3.2	2.2	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.8	1.4	0.6	0	0.4	0.4	1.0
<b>St. Charles</b>	2.8	4.0	4.5	1.6	1.2	1.4	2.4	2.3	1.6	1.8	1.4	0.6
<b>Warrenville</b>	2.5	2.3	3.4	1.8	1.5	1.8	2.7	3.0	4.7	4.0	4.0	3.7
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.0</b>

Table 16: Special Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	12	12	13	5.0	5.0	7.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	9.0	7.0	6.0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6.2	6.8	4.7	3.7	3.1	2.7	3.0	5.2	6.4	5.4	4.2	4.2
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	13	4.5	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
<b>St. Charles</b>	5	6.0	3.0	8.0	3.5	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.5
<b>Warrenville</b>	4	2.0	5.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.5	3.5	2.5	2.0	2.0	1.0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.6</b>

According to the *RJ Consent Decree*, DJJ is required to have general education student to teacher ratios of 10 youth to 1 teacher and special education student to teacher ratios of 6 youth to 1 teacher.

Table 17: Overall Diplomas Awarded

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20	Total
<b>Chicago</b>	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	3	4	3	0	5	2	1	1	3	3	0	3	28
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	10
<b>St. Charles</b>	2	2	3	2	7	2	0	2	5	2	5	6	38
<b>Warrenville</b>	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	10
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>93</b>

Table 18: Percent of Special Education Students

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	29%	29%	43%	33%	35.7%	87.5%	50%	60%	33.3%	56.3%	53.8%	66.6%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	48%	72%	65%	73%	88%	76%	66.7%	83.9%	80%	79.4%	84%	67.7%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	45%	45%	50%	0%	33.3%	33.3%	36.4%	50%	100%	85.7%	85.7%	54.5%
<b>St. Charles</b>	42%	38%	19%	67%	53.8%	36.4%	29.4%	30.8%	42.8%	25.0%	22.2%	62.5%
<b>Warrenville</b>	29%	19%	29%	25%	14.3%	22.2%	37.3%	43.8%	29.4%	33.3%	30.8%	18.1%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>58.1%</b>	<b>57.6%</b>	<b>45.9%</b>	<b>60.6%</b>	<b>60.5%</b>	<b>60.5%</b>	<b>59.7%</b>	<b>57.1%</b>


Table 20: Youth in Continuing Education

	Post-Secondary	Collegiate
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	4	0
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	7
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	11	0
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	6
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>

Table 21: Number and Percent of Cancelled Whole School Days

	Number	Percent
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

**Chart 7: Student to Teacher Ratio by Facility**



## Section 5: Reportable Incident Data

Table 21a: Number of Reportable Incidents

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	11	9	7	9	0	1	0	2	2	5	9	2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	15	19	12	15	4	9	8	7	14	14	11	18
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	5	3	4	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	5	8
<b>St. Charles</b>	24	20	18	10	10	16	7	9	14	19	5	11
<b>Warrenville</b>	6	12	4	2	4	4	3	2	7	4	3	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>40</b>

Table 21b: Rate of Reportable Incidents per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	27.5	24.2	17.4	36.1	0	6.2	0	14.9	11.6	21.7	35.0	9.4	<b>17.0</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	18.1	24.1	17.9	30.8	9.7	25.6	22.5	16.5	28.3	35.2	33.3	47.5	<b>25.8</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	17.1	11.1	21.7	15.6	0	0	9.5	10.9	0	10.8	48.1	69.6	<b>17.9</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	52.9	35.7	32.7	23.2	25.4	47.6	19.3	25.7	36.5	48.5	13.6	35.7	<b>33.1</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	27.4	66.7	19.8	16.1	36.4	33.3	16.9	8.1	26	19.2	13.6	8.4	<b>24.3</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>27.3</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>26.3</b>	<b>32.6</b>	<b>25.8</b>	<b>31.9</b>	<b>25.2</b>

Table 22a: Number of Youth on Youth Assaults

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	4	1	1	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	9	7	7	5	3	8	1	3	3	6	4	8
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	6	6	8	3	1	5	2	2	3	5	0	2
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	3	2	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>

Table 22b: Rate of Youth on Youth Assaults per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	10	2.7	2.5	16.1	0	6.2	0	7.5	0	4.3	3.9	4.7	<b>4.8</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	10.8	8.9	10.4	10.3	7.3	22.8	2.8	7.1	6.1	15.1	12.1	21.1	<b>11.2</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6.8	3.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10.8	9.6	8.7	<b>3.3</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	13.2	10.7	14.5	7.0	2.5	14.9	5.5	5.7	7.8	12.8	0	6.5	<b>8.4</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	13.7	16.7	9.9	8.1	27.3	0	0	0	3.7	0	0	4.2	<b>7.0</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>7.9</b>

Table 23a: Number of Youth Fights

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5	7	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6	7	5	10	0	0	4	1	9	7	7	10
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4
<b>St. Charles</b>	13	12	7	5	3	9	3	2	6	3	3	6
<b>Warrenville</b>	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	1	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>20</b>

Table 23b: Rate of Youth Fights per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	12.5	18.8	9.9	3.0	0	0	0	0	5.8	8.7	7.8	0	5.5
<b>Harrisburg</b>	7.2	8.9	7.5	20.5	0	0	11.3	2.4	18.2	17.6	21.2	26.4	11.8
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6.8	3.7	21.7	0	0	0	9.5	0	0	0	38.5	34.8	9.6
<b>St. Charles</b>	28.6	21.4	12.7	11.6	7.6	26.8	8.3	5.7	15.6	7.7	8.2	19.5	14.5
<b>Warrenville</b>	9.1	11.1	0	0	0	0	5.6	0	18.6	9.6	4.5	0	4.9
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	12.8	13.3	10.0	12.5	2.7	8.8	7.8	2.4	14.9	10.6	13.3	16.0	10.4

Table 24a: Number of Youth on Staff Assaults


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	1	2	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	5	0	0	1	1	3	3	2	1	0	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
<b>St. Charles</b>	5	2	3	2	6	2	2	5	5	11	2	3
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	7	2	1	1	4	2	2	1	2	2	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	10	16	7	7	8	7	7	12	9	16	10	8

Table 24b: Rate of Youth on Staff Assaults per 100 Youth


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	5	2.7	5.0	12.0	0	0	0	7.5	5.8	8.7	23.3	4.7	6.2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	6.3	0	0	2.4	2.8	8.5	7.1	4	2.5	0	0	2.8
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3.4	3.7	0	15.6	0	0	0	10.9	0	0	0	26.1	5.0
<b>St. Charles</b>	11	3.6	5.5	4.6	15.2	6.0	5.5	14.3	13	28.1	5.4	9.7	10.2
<b>Warrenville</b>	4.6	38.9	9.9	8.1	9.1	33.3	11.2	8.1	3.7	9.6	9	4.2	12.5
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	4.6	7.3	3.5	5.2	7.2	6.9	6.1	9.6	6.4	12.1	7.8	6.4	6.9



**Chart 9: Rate of Reportable Incidents Per 100 Youth**



**Chart 10: Rate of Youth on Staff Assault Per 100 Youth**



## Section 6: Indicator Data

Table 25: Uses of Chemical Restraints

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
<b>Warrenville</b>	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 26: Uses of Mechanical Restraints

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	6	2	12	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5	6	6	1	4	1	2	2	6	1	2	3
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	4	2	3	3	1	6	6	11	2	2
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>9</b>

Uses of chemical and mechanical restraints have varied throughout the year, although the use in the current year is much lower than years past. Numbers and rates of uses of restraints should be related to population size and number and types of incidents. More important than how frequent they are is whether they are used according to policy and for appropriate reasons.

## Section 7: Confinement Information

Table 28a: Use of Behavioral Holds

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	10	15	15	2	1	0	4	1	8	11	3
<b>Harrisburg</b>	66	77	67	36	21	18	21	20	46	29	14	40
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4
<b>St. Charles</b>	43	70	45	21	29	50	18	40	24	28	6	22
<b>Warrenville</b>	14	23	13	10	7	6	18	12	18	21	10	15
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>84</b>

Table 28b: Rate of Behavioral Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	3	27	37	60	13	6	0	30	6	35	43	14
<b>Harrisburg</b>	80	98	100	74	51	51	59	47	93	73	42	105
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3	4	11	16	24	0	0	0	0	11	38	35
<b>St. Charles</b>	95	125	82	49	74	148	50	114	63	71	16	71
<b>Warrenville</b>	64	128	64	81	64	50	101	48	67	105	45	63
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>67</b>

Table 28c: Average Length of Behavioral Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	98	89	94	78	155	48	-	123	95	138	99	53
<b>Harrisburg</b>	165	112	147	148	132	125	133	173	144	118	111	160
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	40	17	292	30	14	0	-	-	-	33	53	93
<b>St. Charles</b>	107	95	82	80	94	62	63	84	91	88	55	107
<b>Warrenville</b>	62	35	111	57	60	187	108	129	94	103	92	88
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>126</b>

Table 29: Use of Crisis Care

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	3	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	3
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	1	-	1	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>

Table 30: Use of Medical Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	13	9	1	2	-	-	2	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	3	-	-	-	1	1	13	2	9	3	13	6
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6</b>


Table 31: Use of Administrative Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 32: Use of Investigative Status

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	7	-	3	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

Chart 12: Rate per 100 youth of Behavioral Holds



## Section 8: Aftercare Data

Table 33: Youth on Aftercare

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Total Number of Youth Assigned to Aftercare</b>	850	802	771	662	616	601	593	631	571	593	564	568
<b>Youth in Community</b>	498	466	478	370	348	330	299	348	272	291	287	277
<b>Youth in Facilities</b>	192	188	152	90	73	70	95	94	105	106	98	102
<b>Youth with Pending Criminal Cases</b>	68	61	58	141	148	154	157	143	155	156	147	
<b>Youth with Warrants and Out of State</b>	92	87	83	61	47	47	42	46	39	41	42	38

Table 34: Caseloads in Aftercare (per Specialist)

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Youth Assigned to Specialist</b>	15.7	14.9	14.3	10.5	9.6	9.1	9.0	10.0	8.6	9.0	8.9	8.6
<b>Youth in Community</b>	11.3	10.6	10.9	8.4	7.9	7.5	6.8	7.9	6.2	6.8	6.8	6.6
<b>Youth in Facilities</b>	4.4	4.3	3.4	2.1	1.7	1.6	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.2	2.1	2.0

Table 35: Average Specialist Caseload by Aftercare Office – December 2020

	Number of Specialists	Number of Youth	Average Caseload	Number of Youth in Community	Average Caseload in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	7	55	8	48	7.3
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	3	25	8.7	24	8
<b>Aurora</b>	3	20	7	17	5.7
<b>Rockford</b>	5	25	5.4	20	4.4
<b>Peoria</b>	4	35	9.5	31	7.8
<b>East St. Louis</b>	6	36	6.8	34	6
<b>Champaign</b>	3	27	10	15	5.7
<b>Springfield</b>	4	32	9	31	7.8
<b>Placement</b>	7	71	10.9	31	5.1
<b>Intensive</b>	2	39	21.5	31	17
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>6.8</b>

Table 36: Specialist Contact with Youth by Aftercare Office – December 2020

	Number of Overall Contacts	Contacts per Youth	Contacts with Youth in Community	Contacts per Youth in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	128	2.3	123	2.4
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	72	2.8	69	2.9
<b>Aurora</b>	68	3.2	67	3.9
<b>Rockford</b>	87	3.2	85	3.9
<b>Peoria</b>	91	2.4	88	2.8
<b>East St. Louis</b>	88	2.1	87	2.4
<b>Champaign</b>	72	2.4	65	3.8
<b>Springfield</b>	75	2.1	73	2.4
<b>Placement</b>	135	1.8	118	3.3
<b>Intensive</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>816</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>775</b>	<b>2.6</b>

Table 37a: Parole Revocations

	Parole Revocations Heard	Revocations Approved	Revocations Denied	Hearings Continued
<i>January</i>	8	6	2	0
<i>February</i>	15	6	7	2
<i>March</i>	13	9	4	0
<i>April</i>	1	1	0	0
<i>May</i>	2	1	1	0
<i>June</i>	1	0	1	0
<i>July</i>	12	11	1	0
<i>August</i>	7	2	5	0
<i>September</i>	11	7	4	0
<i>October</i>	5	5	0	0
<i>November</i>	14	7	6	1
<i>December</i>	10	5	4	1
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>0.3</b>

Table 37b: Parole Revocation Rates

	Percent of Revocations Approved	Percent of Revocations Denied	Percent of Hearings Continued
<i>January</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>February</i>	40%	46.7%	13.3%
<i>March</i>	69.2%	30.8%	0%
<i>April</i>	100%	0%	0%
<i>May</i>	50%	50%	0%
<i>June</i>	0%	100%	0%
<i>July</i>	91.7%	8.3%	0%
<i>August</i>	28.6%	71.4%	0%
<i>September</i>	63.6%	36.4%	0%
<i>October</i>	100%	0%	0%
<i>November</i>	50%	42.9%	7.1%
<i>December</i>	50%	40%	10%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>37.6%</b>	<b>2.5%</b>

With lower numbers of admission for technical parole violators, the numbers of parole revocation hearings held monthly has greatly decreased compared to previous years.

## Section 9: Population Stock/Flow

Table 38: Institutional Stock/Flow

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Number of Admissions per Month</b>	49	40	25	0	12	35	30	34	38	30	22	25
<b>Percent of Admissions Parole Violators</b>	8.2%	25%	24%	0%	33.3%	2.9%	16.7%	14.7%	7.9%	20%	22.7%	12%
<b>Number of Facility Exits per Month</b>	57	41	79	41	31	32	13	26	35	34	29	32
<b>Percent of Exits to Aftercare Supervision</b>	93%	90.2%	97.4%	90.2%	83.9%	87.5%	76.9%	100%	100%	94.1%	86.2%	93.8%

Table 39: Aftercare Stock/Flow


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<b>Number of New Supervised Youth</b>	56	37	77	37	27	33	10	27	37	33	26	33
<b>Number of Exits from Aftercare</b>	33	39	41	39	46	39	33	31	42	41	26	43

Table 40: Admissions to Facilities by Type

	December 2020	
	Number	Percent
<b>Court Evaluation</b>	1	4%
<b>Court Evaluation Return</b>	0	0%
<b>Discharged and Recommitted</b>	2	8%
<b>Initial Commitment</b>	13	52%
<b>New Commitment</b>	6	24%
<b>Technical Parole Violator</b>	3	12%
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	

The decrease in DJJ populations is a direct effect of both decreasing court admissions, decreasing admissions for technical violations, and decreases in length of stay during the fiscal year. Additionally, rates and numbers of discharges from Aftercare have increased as well, which has helped those numbers stay lower as well, which provides fewer youth to be readmitted into facilities. Looking at the types of admissions to DJJ, a greater percent of youth are initial commitments than in previous years.

**Chart 13: Admission Types to Facility, December 2020**





**Section 10: TRD Data for December 2020**

Table 41: Adjustments by Facility

	Reductions	Extensions
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	37	20
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	30	14
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	69	5
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	75	1
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	31	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>40</b>

Table 42: Types of Adjustments Used

	CHI	HRG	PER	STC	WRV	DJJ Overall
<i>BARJ Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Delinquent Program Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Ed/Voc Reduction</i>	0	3	0	35	4	42
<i>Grade Level Reduction</i>	2	0	0	4	1	7
<i>JSO Completion Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>No Maj. Sanc. Reductions</i>	6	8	6	8	6	26
<i>Other Tx Reduction</i>	0	0	0	3	12	15
<i>SA Completion Reduction</i>	9	2	11	5	3	30
<i>YASI Goal Reduction</i>	20	17	52	20	5	114
<i>Discipline Extension</i>	20	14	5	1	0	40

**Chart 14: Types of Adjustments used by Agency**




Table 43: Frequency of BARJ Adjustment

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	2	1	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 44: Average Length of BARJ Adjustment

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	10	7	8	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>


Table 45: Frequency of Discipline Extensions

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	5	20	18	43	14	2	4	2	1	7	8	20
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	24	22	22	9	0	9	1	3	16	18	6	14
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	24	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	5
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	9	4	36	15	1	9	4	0	11	10	1	1
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	3	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>40</b>

Table 46: Average Length of Discipline Extension

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	12/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	11	4	6	8	6	5	6	9	3	4	7	9
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	18	11	10	7	-	7	5	8	6	7	5	9
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	8	11	0	30	2	-	-	-	5	-	11	21
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	10	12	11	7	14	5	8	-	11	12	7	14
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	6	5	5	-	-	10	10	-	14	-	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>

Summed Total Adjustment Days by Month



## Section 11: YASI

Table 47: YASI Pre-Screens: December 2020

	Legal Risk	Social Risk	Protective	Overall Risk
<i>High</i>	130	74	4	93
<i>Moderate</i>	26	52	42	36
<i>Low</i>	2	5	85	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>131</b>


Table 48: YASI Full Assessments: Risk

	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	26	-	-
<i>High</i>	24	120	88
<i>Moderate-High</i>	34	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	31	2	34
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	6	-	-
<i>Low</i>	3	2	2
<i>None</i>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>124</b>

Table 49: YASI Full Assessments: Protective


	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	2	-	-
<i>High</i>	3	17	9
<i>Moderate-High</i>	31	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	39	23	51
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	29	-	-
<i>Low</i>	20	15	64
<i>None</i>	0	69	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>124</b>

**Chart 16: Risk and Protective Levels of Youth**




## Release Reviews

### Reviews by Type per Month



	Annual	Cont.	Director's Request	HSD/GED	Max Release Date	Substance Abuse	Target Release Date	Total
January	1	15	1	1	0	1	25	<b>44</b>
February	1	8	0	2	0	1	28	<b>40</b>
March	1	9	13	1	0	7	34	<b>65</b>
April	0	6	17	2	0	2	11	<b>38</b>
May	0	3	2	4	0	3	10	<b>22</b>
June	0	4	0	0	2	4	5	<b>16</b>
July	0	2	0	1	0	1	16	<b>20</b>
August	0	1	0	2	0	0	14	<b>17</b>
September	0	2	0	4	0	6	30	<b>42</b>
October	0	6	0	1	0	2	16	<b>25</b>
November	1	3	1	3	0	3	7	<b>18</b>
December	1	3	0	2	0	1	17	<b>24</b>

Percent of Release Reviews by Outcome and Month



## Demographic Profile for December 31st, 2020

Sex	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Male	110	94.8%	401	96.2%
Female	6	5.2%	16	3.8%

Age	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Average Age	17.6		18.4	
16 & Under	37	31.9%	62	15%
17 to 20	76	65.5%	323	78.2%
20.5 & Over	3	2.6%	28	6.8%

Race/Ethnicity	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	19	16.4%	81	19.4%
Black	77	66.4%	283	67.9%
Hispanic	14	12.1%	38	9.1%
American Indian	0	0%	1	0.2%
Asian	0	0%	0	0.0%
Multi/Biracial	6	5.2%	14	3.4%

Committing Counties <sup>i</sup>	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Cook	21	18.1%	120	28.8%
Collar Counties	6	5.2%	35	8.4%
Metro-East	11	9.5%	17	4.1%
Central	48	41.4%	134	32.1%
Southern	6	5.2%	39	9.4%
Northern	24	20.7%	57	13.7%
Other	0	0%	15	3.6%

Offense Class	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Murder	12	10.3%	1	0.2%
Class X Felony	36	31%	87	20.9%
Class 1 Felony	33	28.4%	121	29.0%
Class 2 Felony	25	21.6%	153	36.7%
Class 3 Felony	8	6.9%	20	4.8%
Class 4 Felony	2	1.7%	20	4.8%



Prefix	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Court Evaluation	2	1.7%	4	1%
Delinquent	58	50%	366	87.8%
Extended Jurisdiction	9	7.8%	12	2.9%
Felon	32	27.6%	2	0.5%
First Degree Murderer	4	3.4%	1	0.2%
Habitual Juvenile	7	6%	7	1.7%
Violent Juvenile	4	3.4%	10	2.4%
From Other State	0	0%	15	3.6%

---

<sup>1</sup> Committing Counties: Cook = Cook; Collar Counties = DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, Will; Metro East Counties = Madison, St. Clair; Central IL Counties = Adams, Bond, Brown, Calhoun, Cass, Champaign, Christian, Clark, Coles, Crawford, Cumberland, Dewitt, Douglas, Edgar, Effingham, Fayette, Ford, Fulton, Greene, Hancock, Henderson, Iroquois, Jasper, Jersey, Knox, Livingston, Logan, McDonough, McLean, Macon, Macoupin, Marshall, Mason, Menard, Montgomery, Morgan, Moultrie, Peoria, Piatt, Pike, Sangamon, Schuyler, Scott, Shelby, Stark, Tazewell, Vermillion Warren, Woodford; South IL Counties = Alexander, Clay, Clinton, Edwards, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Lawrence, Marion, Massac, Monroe, Perry, Pope, Pulaski, Randolph, Richland, Saline, Union, Wabash, Washington, Wayne, White, Williamson; North, IL Counties = Boone, Bureau, Carroll, DeKalb, Grundy, Henry, Jo-Daviess, Kankakee, Kendall, LaSalle, Lee, Mercer, Ogle, Putnam, Rock Island, Stephenson, Whiteside, Winnebago; Other = Out of State



DRAFT

**Monthly Report:  
November**

**FY2021**

## Section 1: Population and Staffing Data

Table 1a: Population by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	37	40	34	19	17	16	16	13	17	28	24
<b>Harrisburg</b>	79	71	57	46	38	31	40	43	48	29	30
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	30	27	10	3	3	9	12	10	8	11	13
<b>St. Charles</b>	50	65	46	41	33	32	34	38	37	42	32
<b>Warrenville</b>	20	16	17	11	11	15	21	27	23	20	24
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>123</b>


Table 1b: Average Daily Population by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	40.0	37.2	40.3	24.9	15.7	16.2	15.2	13.4	17.2	23.0	25.7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	83.0	78.8	67.0	48.7	41.2	35.1	35.5	42.4	49.5	39.8	33.0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	29.2	27.0	18.4	6.4	4.2	4.9	10.5	9.2	8.8	9.3	10.4
<b>St. Charles</b>	45.4	56.0	55.0	43.1	39.4	33.6	36.2	35.0	38.4	39.2	36.8
<b>Warrenville</b>	21.9	18.0	20.2	12.4	11	12.0	17.8	24.8	26.9	20.8	22.1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>219.6</b>	<b>218.0</b>	<b>200.8</b>	<b>135.5</b>	<b>111.5</b>	<b>101.7</b>	<b>115.2</b>	<b>124.8</b>	<b>140.7</b>	<b>132.1</b>	<b>128.1</b>

Table 2: Security Staff Headcount by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	91	92	92	88	89	87	85	84	82	81	82
<b>Harrisburg</b>	143	141	141	140	142	141	139	137	133	133	132
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	51	51	50	50	48	48	48	48	47	46	47
<b>St. Charles</b>	175	167	165	165	161	155	155	152	151	151	138
<b>Warrenville</b>	71	71	71	69	68	68	67	68	67	67	67
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>522</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>499</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>489</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>478</b>	<b>468</b>

**Chart 1: Facility Populations on Last Day of Month Last Seven Fiscal Years**



## Section 2: Mental Health Data

Table 5: Percent of Youth Psychotropic Medication

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	28%	62.2%	50%	55%	83.3%	76.2%	76.5%	78.9%	90.5%	89.7%	93.1%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	50.8%	56.1%	50.6%	43.5%	47.4%	37.7%	70%	63.5%	57.7%	42.4%	43.8%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	38.6%	64.9%	65.5%	70%	60%	53.8%	38.5%	33.3%	38.5%	33.3%	35.3%
<b>St. Charles</b>	60.1%	41.6%	51.9%	71.1%	60.5%	57.7%	51.1%	52.3%	38.5%	42.6%	35.8%
<b>Warrenville</b>	64.2%	71.4%	68%	70.6%	54.5%	70.6%	54.5%	62.9%	51.6%	56%	66.7%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>48.9%</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>54.2%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>53.7%</b>	<b>59.7%</b>	<b>59.7%</b>	<b>52.7%</b>	<b>50.5%</b>	<b>52.3%</b>


Table 7: Distribution of Mental Health Levels

	Mental Health Level 0	Mental Health Level 1	Mental Health Level 2	Mental Health Level 3	Mental Health Level 3.5	Mental Health Level 4
<b>January</b>	9.6%	53.5%	28.9%	7.5%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>February</b>	7.1%	53.5%	31.9%	6.6%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>March</b>	6.5%	50.6%	35.3%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>April</b>	7.4%	50.8%	33.6%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>May</b>	4.9%	57.3%	30.1%	7.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>June</b>	5.4%	50%	33.9%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>July</b>	4.6%	51.1%	33.6%	10.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>August</b>	3.8%	53.8%	36.4%	6.1%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>September</b>	3.6%	52.5%	36.7%	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>October</b>	3.8%	54.5%	34.8%	6.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>November</b>	3.1%	46.9%	43.8%	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>52.2%</b>	<b>34.4%</b>	<b>7.8%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.04%</b>

Table 8: Distribution of DSM V Diagnoses

	Youth with No Diagnosis	Youth with One Diagnosis	Youth with Two Diagnoses	Youth with Three Diagnoses	Youth with Four or More Diagnoses
<b>January</b>	8.27%	7.3%	20.95%	30.21%	37.91%
<b>February</b>	6.93%	5.63%	16.45%	29.87%	41.13%
<b>March</b>	5%	3.89%	11.11%	33.89%	46.11%
<b>April</b>	5.47%	3.91%	13.28%	33.59%	43.75%
<b>May</b>	1.92%	1.92%	15.38%	37.5%	43.27%
<b>June</b>	3.60%	1.80%	15.32%	31.53%	47.75%
<b>July</b>	2.94%	1.47%	19.12%	30.15%	46.32%
<b>August</b>	2.86%	2.86%	15%	35%	44.29%
<b>September</b>	2.72%	2.72%	12.93%	38.78%	42.86%
<b>October</b>	3.62%	2.17%	15.22%	30.43%	48.55%
<b>November</b>	3.68%	5.88%	13.24%	27.94%	49.26%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4.27%</b>	<b>3.60%</b>	<b>15.27%</b>	<b>32.63%</b>	<b>44.65%</b>

**Chart 3: Percent of Youth on Psychotropic Medication**



### Section 3: Substance Abuse Treatment Data

Table 9: Number of Treatment Participants

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	14	8	8	6	2	3	4	4	7	9	11
<b>Harrisburg</b>	24	24	14	11	6	12	11	17	16	11	8
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	35	37	10	10	5	13	13	15	13	18	17
<b>St. Charles</b>	9	8	10	10	9	5	4	6	9	7	8
<b>Warrenville</b>	10	9	8	6	2	3	5	4	13	9	6
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>50</b>

Table 10: Average Length of Stay for Completers

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	101	101	94	-	-	95	120	-	63	-	71
<b>Harrisburg</b>	97	56	99	49	110	75	-	-	56	80	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	147	110	-	76	46	93	-	-	-	98	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	114	-	-	172	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	60	60	-	61	60	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>71</b>

Table 11: Percent of Discharges by Reason


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Successful Completion</b>	52%	40.9%	37.5%	32.1%	50%	57.1%	28.6%	10%	34.8%	31.6%	13.3%
<b>Behavioral Discharge</b>	0%	4.5%	18.8%	0%	12.5%	0%	0%	10%	4.3%	5.3%	6.7%
<b>Youth Released</b>	40%	40.9%	31.2%	64.3%	37.5%	42.9%	57.1%	70%	60.9%	57.9%	73.3%
<b>Other Discharge</b>	8%	13.6%	12.5%	3.6%	0%	0%	14.3%	10%	4.3%	5.3%	6.7%

Table 12: Primary Substance Abused


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Marijuana</b>	71.7%	76.7%	74%	77.6%	79.2%	88.9%	97.3%	97.8%	89.7%	85.2%	78%
<b>Alcohol</b>	5.4%	7%	4%	6.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.2%	7.4%	8%
<b>Other Drugs</b>	20.7%	14%	22%	16.3%	20.8%	11.1%	2.7%	2.2%	5.2%	7.4%	12%
<b>No Diagnosis</b>	2.2%	2.3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%

For the youth whose primary substance abuse is not specified, four reported using amphetamines and two reported other drugs.

**Chart 5: Number of Treatment Participants by Facility**



**Chart 6: Discharges by Reason**





## Section 4: Education Data

Table 13: Students Enrolled in School

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	42	42	30	15	14	8	8	5	9	16	13
<b>Harrisburg</b>	64	57	51	30	25	25	27	31	40	34	25
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	29	20	6	3	3	6	11	6	6	7	7
<b>St. Charles</b>	24	32	32	24	13	11	17	13	14	12	9
<b>Warrenville</b>	14	11	17	8	7	9	11	16	17	12	13
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>67</b>

Table 14: Teachers Employed

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	7	7	7	7	7	8	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	17	17	16	16	16	16	15	16	16	16	16
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	6	6
<b>St. Charles</b>	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	8	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>41</b>

Table 15: General Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5.0	3	4.3	1.4	1.5	0.2	0.7	0.3	1.0	1.5	1.2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2.8	1.6	3.2	0.7	0.3	1.0	0.9	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.6
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3.2	2.2	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.8	1.4	0.6	0	0.4	0.4
<b>St. Charles</b>	2.8	4.0	4.5	1.6	1.2	1.4	2.4	2.3	1.6	1.8	1.4
<b>Warrenville</b>	2.5	2.3	3.4	1.8	1.5	1.8	2.7	3.0	4.7	4.0	4.0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>

Table 16: Special Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	12	12	13	5.0	5.0	7.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	9.0	7.0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6.2	6.8	4.7	3.7	3.1	2.7	3.0	5.2	6.4	5.4	4.2
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	13	4.5	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
<b>St. Charles</b>	5	6.0	3.0	8.0	3.5	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
<b>Warrenville</b>	4	2.0	5.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.5	3.5	2.5	2.0	2.0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.6</b>

According to the *RJ Consent Decree*, DJJ is required to have general education student to teacher ratios of 10 youth to 1 teacher and special education student to teacher ratios of 6 youth to 1 teacher.

Table 17: Overall Diplomas Awarded

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	Total
<b>Chicago</b>	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	3	4	3	0	5	2	1	1	3	3	0	25
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	10
<b>St. Charles</b>	2	2	3	2	7	2	0	2	5	2	5	32
<b>Warrenville</b>	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	1	0	9
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	11	8	10	4	13	7	3	6	10	6	5	83

Table 18: Percent of Special Education Students

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	29%	29%	43%	33%	35.7%	87.5%	50%	60%	33.3%	56.3%	53.8%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	48%	72%	65%	73%	88%	76%	66.7%	83.9%	80%	79.4%	84%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	45%	45%	50%	0%	33.3%	33.3%	36.4%	50%	100%	85.7%	85.7%
<b>St. Charles</b>	42%	38%	19%	67%	53.8%	36.4%	29.4%	30.8%	42.8%	25.0%	22.2%
<b>Warrenville</b>	29%	19%	29%	25%	14.3%	22.2%	37.3%	43.8%	29.4%	33.3%	30.8%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	41%	47%	44%	56%	58.1%	57.6%	45.9%	60.6%	60.5%	60.5%	59.7%


Table 20: Youth in Continuing Education

	Post-Secondary	Collegiate
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	4	0
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	5
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	7	0
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	6
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	11	11

Table 21: Number and Percent of Cancelled Whole School Days

	Number	Percent
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	13	76%
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	13	15%

**Chart 7: Student to Teacher Ratio by Facility**



## Section 5: Reportable Incident Data

Table 21a: Number of Reportable Incidents

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	11	9	7	9	0	1	0	2	2	5	9
<b>Harrisburg</b>	15	19	12	15	4	9	8	7	14	14	11
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	5	3	4	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	5
<b>St. Charles</b>	24	20	18	10	10	16	7	9	14	19	5
<b>Warrenville</b>	6	12	4	2	4	4	3	2	7	4	3
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>33</b>

Table 21b: Rate of Reportable Incidents per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	27.5	24.2	17.4	36.1	0	6.2	0	14.9	11.6	21.7	35.0	<b>17.7</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	18.1	24.1	17.9	30.8	9.7	25.6	22.5	16.5	28.3	35.2	33.3	<b>23.8</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	17.1	11.1	21.7	15.6	0	0	9.5	10.9	0	10.8	48.1	<b>13.2</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	52.9	35.7	32.7	23.2	25.4	47.6	19.3	25.7	36.5	48.5	13.6	<b>32.8</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	27.4	66.7	19.8	16.1	36.4	33.3	16.9	8.1	26	19.2	13.6	<b>25.8</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>27.3</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>26.3</b>	<b>32.6</b>	<b>25.8</b>	<b>24.6</b>

Table 22a: Number of Youth on Youth Assaults

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	4	1	1	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	9	7	7	5	3	8	1	3	3	6	4
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	6	6	8	3	1	5	2	2	3	5	0
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	3	2	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>

Table 22b: Rate of Youth on Youth Assaults per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	10	2.7	2.5	16.1	0	6.2	0	7.5	0	4.3	3.9	<b>4.8</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	10.8	8.9	10.4	10.3	7.3	22.8	2.8	7.1	6.1	15.1	12.1	<b>10.3</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6.8	3.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10.8	9.6	<b>2.8</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	13.2	10.7	14.5	7.0	2.5	14.9	5.5	5.7	7.8	12.8	0	<b>8.6</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	13.7	16.7	9.9	8.1	27.3	0	0	0	3.7	0	0	<b>7.2</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>7.7</b>

Table 23a: Number of Youth Fights

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5	7	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6	7	5	10	0	0	4	1	9	7	7
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
<b>St. Charles</b>	13	12	7	5	3	9	3	2	6	3	3
<b>Warrenville</b>	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>17</b>

Table 23b: Rate of Youth Fights per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	12.5	18.8	9.9	3.0	0	0	0	0	5.8	8.7	7.8	<b>6.0</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	7.2	8.9	7.5	20.5	0	0	11.3	2.4	18.2	17.6	21.2	<b>10.4</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6.8	3.7	21.7	0	0	0	9.5	0	0	0	38.5	<b>7.3</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	28.6	21.4	12.7	11.6	7.6	26.8	8.3	5.7	15.6	7.7	8.2	<b>14</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	9.1	11.1	0	0	0	0	5.6	0	18.6	9.6	4.5	<b>5.3</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>9.9</b>


Table 24a: Number of Youth on Staff Assaults

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	1	2	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	6
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	5	0	0	1	1	3	3	2	1	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	5	2	3	2	6	2	2	5	5	11	2
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	7	2	1	1	4	2	2	1	2	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10</b>


Table 24b: Rate of Youth on Staff Assaults per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	5	2.7	5.0	12.0	0	0	0	7.5	5.8	8.7	23.3	<b>6.4</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	6.3	0	0	2.4	2.8	8.5	7.1	4	2.5	0	<b>3.1</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3.4	3.7	0	15.6	0	0	0	10.9	0	0	0	<b>3.1</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	11	3.6	5.5	4.6	15.2	6.0	5.5	14.3	13	28.1	5.4	<b>10.2</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	4.6	38.9	9.9	8.1	9.1	33.3	11.2	8.1	3.7	9.6	9	<b>13.2</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>7.0</b>

**Chart 9: Rate of Reportable Incidents Per 100 Youth**



**Chart 10: Rate of Youth on Staff Assault Per 100 Youth**



## Section 6: Indicator Data

Table 25: Uses of Chemical Restraints

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
<b>Warrenville</b>	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 26: Uses of Mechanical Restraints

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	6	2	12
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5	6	6	1	4	1	2	2	6	1	2
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	4	2	3	3	1	6	6	11	2
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>

Uses of chemical and mechanical restraints have varied throughout the year, although the use in the current year is much lower than years past. Numbers and rates of uses of restraints should be related to population size and number and types of incidents. More important than how frequent they are is whether they are used according to policy and for appropriate reasons.

## Section 7: Confinement Information

Table 28a: Use of Behavioral Holds

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	10	15	15	2	1	0	4	1	8	11
<b>Harrisburg</b>	66	77	67	36	21	18	21	20	46	29	14
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	4
<b>St. Charles</b>	43	70	45	21	29	50	18	40	24	28	6
<b>Warrenville</b>	14	23	13	10	7	6	18	12	18	21	10
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>45</b>

Table 28b: Rate of Behavioral Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	3	27	37	60	13	6	0	30	6	35	43
<b>Harrisburg</b>	80	98	100	74	51	51	59	47	93	73	42
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3	4	11	16	24	0	0	0	0	11	38
<b>St. Charles</b>	95	125	82	49	74	148	50	114	63	71	16
<b>Warrenville</b>	64	128	64	81	64	50	101	48	67	105	45
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>35</b>

Table 28c: Average Length of Behavioral Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	98	89	94	78	155	48	-	123	95	138	99
<b>Harrisburg</b>	165	112	147	148	132	125	133	173	144	118	111
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	40	17	292	30	14	0	-	-	-	33	53
<b>St. Charles</b>	107	95	82	80	94	62	63	84	91	88	55
<b>Warrenville</b>	62	35	111	57	60	187	108	129	94	103	92
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>91</b>

Table 29: Use of Crisis Care

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	3
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	1	-	1	-	3	-	3	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>

Table 30: Use of Medical Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	13	9	1	2	-	-	2	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	3	-	-	-	1	1	13	2	9	3	13
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>14</b>




Table 31: Use of Administrative Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Table 32: Use of Investigative Status

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	7	-	3	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	3	1

Chart 12: Rate per 100 youth of Behavioral Holds



## Section 8: Aftercare Data

Table 33: Youth on Aftercare

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Total Number of Youth Assigned to Aftercare</b>	850	802	771	662	616	601	593	631	571	593	564
<b>Youth in Community</b>	498	466	478	370	348	330	299	348	272	291	287
<b>Youth in Facilities</b>	192	188	152	90	73	70	95	94	105	106	98
<b>Youth with Pending Criminal Cases</b>	68	61	58	141	148	154	157	143	155	156	147
<b>Youth with Warrants and Out of State</b>	92	87	83	61	47	47	42	46	39	41	42

Table 34: Caseloads in Aftercare (per Specialist)

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Youth Assigned to Specialist</b>	15.7	14.9	14.3	10.5	9.6	9.1	9.0	10.0	8.6	9.0	8.9
<b>Youth in Community</b>	11.3	10.6	10.9	8.4	7.9	7.5	6.8	7.9	6.2	6.8	6.8
<b>Youth in Facilities</b>	4.4	4.3	3.4	2.1	1.7	1.6	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.2	2.1

Table 35: Average Specialist Caseload by Aftercare Office – November 2020

	Number of Specialists	Number of Youth	Average Caseload	Number of Youth in Community	Average Caseload in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	7	5	8	51	7.3
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	3	2	8.7	24	8
<b>Aurora</b>	3	4	7	17	5.7
<b>Rockford</b>	5	5	5.4	22	4.4
<b>Peoria</b>	4	7	9.5	31	7.8
<b>East St. Louis</b>	6	5	6.8	36	6
<b>Champaign</b>	3	13	10	17	5.7
<b>Springfield</b>	4	5	9	31	7.8
<b>Placement</b>	7	40	10.9	36	5.1
<b>Intensive</b>	2	9	21.5	34	17
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>6.8</b>

Table 36: Specialist Contact with Youth by Aftercare Office – October 2020

	Number of Overall Contacts	Contacts per Youth	Contacts with Youth in Community	Contacts per Youth in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	106	1.5	98	1.8
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	48	1.5	44	1.6
<b>Aurora</b>	77	2.1	70	2
<b>Rockford</b>	85	2.5	86	2.5
<b>Peoria</b>	100	0.9	157	1.4
<b>East St. Louis</b>	74	1.6	66	1.6
<b>Champaign</b>	64	1.4	62	1.7
<b>Springfield</b>	82	1.8	77	1.7
<b>Placement</b>	342	2.2	101	2.7
<b>Intensive</b>	70	1.4	90	1.7
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>1048</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>851</b>	<b>1.8</b>

Table 37a: Parole Revocations

	Parole Revocations Heard	Revocations Approved	Revocations Denied	Hearings Continued
<i>January</i>	8	6	2	0
<i>February</i>	15	6	7	2
<i>March</i>	13	9	4	0
<i>April</i>	1	1	0	0
<i>May</i>	2	1	1	0
<i>June</i>	1	0	1	0
<i>July</i>	12	11	1	0
<i>August</i>	7	2	5	0
<i>September</i>	11	7	4	0
<i>October</i>	5	5	0	0
<i>November</i>	14	7	6	1
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>0.3</b>

Table 37b: Parole Revocation Rates

	Percent of Revocations Approved	Percent of Revocations Denied	Percent of Hearings Continued
<i>January</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>February</i>	40%	46.7%	13.3%
<i>March</i>	69.2%	30.8%	0%
<i>April</i>	100%	0%	0%
<i>May</i>	50%	50%	0%
<i>June</i>	0%	100%	0%
<i>July</i>	91.7%	8.3%	0%
<i>August</i>	28.6%	71.4%	0%
<i>September</i>	63.6%	36.4%	0%
<i>October</i>	100%	0%	0%
<i>November</i>	50%	42.9%	7.1%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>37.4%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>

With lower numbers of admission for technical parole violators, the numbers of parole revocation hearings held monthly has greatly decreased compared to previous years.

**Section 9: Population Stock/Flow**

Table 38: Institutional Stock/Flow

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Number of Admissions per Month</b>	49	40	25	0	12	35	30	34	38	30	22
<b>Percent of Admissions Parole Violators</b>	8.2%	25%	24%	0%	33.3%	2.9%	16.7%	14.7%	7.9%	20%	22.7%
<b>Number of Facility Exits per Month</b>	57	41	79	41	31	32	13	26	35	34	29
<b>Percent of Exits to Aftercare Supervision</b>	93%	90.2%	97.4%	90.2%	83.9%	87.5%	76.9%	100%	100%	94.1%	86.2%

Table 39: Aftercare Stock/Flow


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<b>Number of New Supervised Youth</b>	56	37	77	37	27	33	10	27	37	33	26
<b>Number of Exits from Aftercare</b>	33	39	41	39	46	39	33	31	42	41	26

Table 40: Admissions to Facilities by Type

	November 2020	
	Number	Percent
<b>Court Evaluation</b>	0	0%
<b>Court Evaluation Return</b>	2	9.1%
<b>Discharged and Recommitted</b>	2	9.1%
<b>Initial Commitment</b>	9	40.9%
<b>New Commitment</b>	4	18.2%
<b>Technical Parole Violator</b>	5	22.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	

The decrease in DJJ populations is a direct effect of both decreasing court admissions, decreasing admissions for technical violations, and decreases in length of stay during the fiscal year. Additionally, rates and numbers of discharges from Aftercare have increased as well, which has helped those numbers stay lower as well, which provides fewer youth to be readmitted into facilities. Looking at the types of admissions to DJJ, a greater percent of youth are initial commitments than in previous years.

**Chart 13: Admission Types to Facility, November 2020**



**Section 10: TRD Data for November 2020**

Table 41: Adjustments by Facility

	Reductions	Extensions
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	31	8
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	24	6
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	66	3
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	61	1
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	21	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>18</b>

Table 42: Types of Adjustments Used

	CHI	HRG	PER	STC	WRV	DJJ Overall
<i>BARJ Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Delinquent Program Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Ed/Voc Reduction</i>	4	0	0	25	6	35
<i>Grade Level Reduction</i>	3	0	1	2	0	6
<i>JSO Completion Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>No Maj. Sanc. Reductions</i>	3	12	2	5	2	24
<i>Other Tx Reduction</i>	1	0	0	3	7	11
<i>SA Completion Reduction</i>	6	1	7	2	2	18
<i>YASI Goal Reduction</i>	14	11	56	24	4	109
<i>Discipline Extension</i>	8	6	3	1	0	18

**Chart 14: Types of Adjustments used by Agency**




Table 43: Frequency of BARJ Adjustment

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	2	1	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 44: Average Length of BARJ Adjustment

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	10	7	8	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>


Table 45: Frequency of Discipline Extensions

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	12/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	5	20	18	43	14	2	4	2	1	7	8
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	24	22	22	9	0	9	1	3	16	18	6
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	24	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	3
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	9	4	36	15	1	9	4	0	11	10	1
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	3	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>18</b>

Table 46: Average Length of Discipline Extension

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	11/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	11	4	6	8	6	5	6	9	3	4	7
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	18	11	10	7	-	7	5	8	6	7	5
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	8	11	0	30	2	-	-	-	5	-	11
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	10	12	11	7	14	5	8	-	11	12	7
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	6	5	5	-	-	10	10	-	14	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>

Summed Total Adjustment Days by Month





## Section 11: YASI

Table 47: YASI Pre-Screens: November 2020

	Legal Risk	Social Risk	Protective	Overall Risk
<i>High</i>	88	68	4	78
<i>Moderate</i>	26	37	41	34
<i>Low</i>	0	9	69	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>114</b>


Table 48: YASI Full Assessments: Risk

	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	26	-	-
<i>High</i>	16	105	73
<i>Moderate-High</i>	30	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	21	2	32
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	8	-	-
<i>Low</i>	6	0	2
<i>None</i>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>107</b>

Table 49: YASI Full Assessments: Protective


	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	3	-	-
<i>High</i>	6	17	13
<i>Moderate-High</i>	29	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	24	29	46
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	33	-	-
<i>Low</i>	12	9	48
<i>None</i>	0	52	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>107</b>

**Chart 16: Risk and Protective Levels of Youth**



## Release Reviews

### Reviews by Type per Month



	Annual	Cont.	Director's Request	HSD/GED	Max Release Date	Substance Abuse	Target Release Date	Total
January	1	15	1	1	0	1	25	<b>44</b>
February	1	8	0	2	0	1	28	<b>40</b>
March	1	9	13	1	0	7	34	<b>65</b>
April	0	6	17	2	0	2	11	<b>38</b>
May	0	3	2	4	0	3	10	<b>22</b>
June	0	4	0	0	2	4	5	<b>16</b>
July	0	2	0	1	0	1	16	<b>20</b>
August	0	1	0	2	0	0	14	<b>17</b>
September	0	2	0	4	0	6	30	<b>42</b>
October	0	6	0	1	0	2	16	<b>25</b>
November	1	3	1	3	0	3	7	<b>18</b>

Percent of Release Reviews by Outcome and Month



## Demographic Profile for November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2020

Sex	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Male	118	95.9%	416	95.9%
Female	5	4.1%	18	4.1%

Age	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Average Age	17.7		18.5	
16 & Under	41	33.3	61	14.2%
17 to 20	79	64.2	342	79.7%
20.5 & Over	3	2.4	26	6.1%

Race/Ethnicity	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	21	17.1%	81	18.7%
Black	83	67.5%	297	68.4%
Hispanic	14	11.4%	39	9.0%
American Indian	0	0%	1	0.2%
Asian	0	0%	0	0%
Multi/Biracial	5	4.1%	16	3.7%

Committing Counties <sup>i</sup>	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Cook	28	22.8%	124	28.6%
Collar Counties	7	5.7%	40	9.2%
Metro-East	5	4.1%	20	4.6%
Central	49	39.8%	134	30.9%
Southern	9	7.3%	38	8.8%
Northern	25	20.3%	64	14.7%
Other	0	0%	14	3.2%

Offense Class	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Murder	11	8.9%	1	0.2%
Class X Felony	40	32.5%	90	20.7%
Class 1 Felony	31	25.2%	126	29%
Class 2 Felony	25	20.3%	166	38.2%
Class 3 Felony	11	8.9%	20	4.6%
Class 4 Felony	5	4.1%	17	3.9%

Prefix	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Court Evaluation	3	2.4%	4	0.9%
Delinquent	62	50.4%	385	88.7%
Extended Jurisdiction	10	8.1%	12	2.8%
Felon	32	26%	2	0.5%
First Degree Murderer	4	3.3%	1	0.2%
Habitual Juvenile	7	5.7%	7	1.6%
Violent Juvenile	5	4.1%	9	2.1%
From Other State	0	0%	14	3.2%

---

<sup>1</sup> Committing Counties: Cook = Cook; Collar Counties = DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, Will; Metro East Counties = Madison, St. Clair; Central IL Counties = Adams, Bond, Brown, Calhoun, Cass, Champaign, Christian, Clark, Coles, Crawford, Cumberland, Dewitt, Douglas, Edgar, Effingham, Fayette, Ford, Fulton, Greene, Hancock, Henderson, Iroquois, Jasper, Jersey, Knox, Livingston, Logan, McDonough, McLean, Macon, Macoupin, Marshall, Mason, Menard, Montgomery, Morgan, Moultrie, Peoria, Piatt, Pike, Sangamon, Schuyler, Scott, Shelby, Stark, Tazewell, Vermillion Warren, Woodford; South IL Counties = Alexander, Clay, Clinton, Edwards, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Lawrence, Marion, Massac, Monroe, Perry, Pope, Pulaski, Randolph, Richland, Saline, Union, Wabash, Washington, Wayne, White, Williamson; North, IL Counties = Boone, Bureau, Carroll, DeKalb, Grundy, Henry, Jo-Daviess, Kankakee, Kendall, LaSalle, Lee, Mercer, Ogle, Putnam, Rock Island, Stephenson, Whiteside, Winnebago; Other = Out of State



DRAFT

Monthly Report:  
October

FY2021

## Section 1: Population and Staffing Data

Table 1a: Population by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	37	40	34	19	17	16	16	13	17	28
<b>Harrisburg</b>	79	71	57	46	38	31	40	43	48	29
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	30	27	10	3	3	9	12	10	8	11
<b>St. Charles</b>	50	65	46	41	33	32	34	38	37	42
<b>Warrenville</b>	20	16	17	11	11	15	21	27	23	20
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>130</b>

Table 1b: Average Daily Population by Facility


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	40.0	37.2	40.3	24.9	15.7	16.2	15.2	13.4	17.2	23.0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	83.0	78.8	67.0	48.7	41.2	35.1	35.5	42.4	49.5	39.8
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	29.2	27.0	18.4	6.4	4.2	4.9	10.5	9.2	8.8	9.3
<b>St. Charles</b>	45.4	56.0	55.0	43.1	39.4	33.6	36.2	35.0	38.4	39.2
<b>Warrenville</b>	21.9	18.0	20.2	12.4	11	12.0	17.8	24.8	26.9	20.8
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>219.6</b>	<b>218.0</b>	<b>200.8</b>	<b>135.5</b>	<b>111.5</b>	<b>101.7</b>	<b>115.2</b>	<b>124.8</b>	<b>140.7</b>	<b>132.1</b>

Table 2: Security Staff Headcount by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	91	92								
<b>Harrisburg</b>	143	141								
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	51	51								
<b>St. Charles</b>	175	167								
<b>Warrenville</b>	71	71								
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>522</b>								



**Chart 1: Facility Populations on Last Day of Month Last Five Fiscal Years**



## Section 2: Mental Health Data

Table 5: Percent of Youth Psychotropic Medication

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	28%	62.2%	50%	55%	83.3%	76.2%	76.5%	78.9%	90.5%	89.7%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	50.8%	56.1%	50.6%	43.5%	47.4%	37.7%	70%	63.5%	57.7%	42.4%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	38.6%	64.9%	65.5%	70%	60%	53.8%	38.5%	33.3%	38.5%	33.3%
<b>St. Charles</b>	60.1%	41.6%	51.9%	71.1%	60.5%	57.7%	51.1%	52.3%	38.5%	42.6%
<b>Warrenville</b>	64.2%	71.4%	68%	70.6%	54.5%	70.6%	54.5%	62.9%	51.6%	56%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>48.9%</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>54.2%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>53.7%</b>	<b>59.7%</b>	<b>59.7%</b>	<b>52.7%</b>	<b>50.5%</b>


Table 7: Distribution of Mental Health Levels

	Mental Health Level 0	Mental Health Level 1	Mental Health Level 2	Mental Health Level 3	Mental Health Level 3.5	Mental Health Level 4
<b>January</b>	9.6%	53.5%	28.9%	7.5%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>February</b>	7.1%	53.5%	31.9%	6.6%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>March</b>	6.5%	50.6%	35.3%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>April</b>	7.4%	50.8%	33.6%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>May</b>	4.9%	57.3%	30.1%	7.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>June</b>	5.4%	50%	33.9%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>July</b>	4.6%	51.1%	33.6%	10.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>August</b>	3.8%	53.8%	36.4%	6.1%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>September</b>	3.6%	52.5%	36.7%	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>October</b>	3.8%	54.5%	34.8%	6.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>5.7%</b>	<b>52.8%</b>	<b>33.5%</b>	<b>7.9%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.04%</b>

Table 8: Distribution of DSM V Diagnoses

	Youth with No Diagnosis	Youth with One Diagnosis	Youth with Two Diagnoses	Youth with Three Diagnoses	Youth with Four or More Diagnoses
<b>January</b>	8.27%	7.3%	20.95%	30.21%	37.91%
<b>February</b>	6.93%	5.63%	16.45%	29.87%	41.13%
<b>March</b>	5%	3.89%	11.11%	33.89%	46.11%
<b>April</b>	5.47%	3.91%	13.28%	33.59%	43.75%
<b>May</b>	1.92%	1.92%	15.38%	37.5%	43.27%
<b>June</b>	3.60%	1.80%	15.32%	31.53%	47.75%
<b>July</b>	2.94%	1.47%	19.12%	30.15%	46.32%
<b>August</b>	2.86%	2.86%	15%	35%	44.29%
<b>September</b>	2.72%	2.72%	12.93%	38.78%	42.86%
<b>October</b>	3.62%	2.17%	15.22%	30.43%	48.55%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4.33%</b>	<b>3.37%</b>	<b>15.48%</b>	<b>33.10%</b>	<b>44.19%</b>

**Chart 3: Percent of Youth on Psychotropic Medication**



### Section 3: Substance Abuse Treatment Data

Table 9: Number of Treatment Participants

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	14	8	8	6	2	3	4	4	7	9
<b>Harrisburg</b>	24	24	14	11	6	12	11	17	16	11
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	35	37	10	10	5	13	13	15	13	18
<b>St. Charles</b>	9	8	10	10	9	5	4	6	9	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	10	9	8	6	2	3	5	4	13	9
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>54</b>

Table 10: Average Length of Stay for Completers

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	101	101	94	-	-	95	120	-	63	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	97	56	99	49	110	75	-	-	56	80
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	147	110	-	76	46	93	-	-	-	98
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	114	-	-	172	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	60	60	-	61	60	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>88</b>

Table 11: Percent of Discharges by Reason


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Successful Completion</b>	52%	40.9%	37.5%	32.1%	50%	57.1%	28.6%	10%	34.8%	31.6%
<b>Behavioral Discharge</b>	0%	4.5%	18.8%	0%	12.5%	0%	0%	10%	4.3%	5.3%
<b>Youth Released</b>	40%	40.9%	31.2%	64.3%	37.5%	42.9%	57.1%	70%	60.9%	57.9%
<b>Other Discharge</b>	8%	13.6%	12.5%	3.6%	0%	0%	14.3%	10%	4.3%	5.3%

Table 12: Primary Substance Abused


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Marijuana</b>	71.7%	76.7%	74%	77.6%	79.2%	88.9%	97.3%	97.8%	89.7%	85.2%
<b>Alcohol</b>	5.4%	7%	4%	6.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.2%	7.4%
<b>Other Drugs</b>	20.7%	14%	22%	16.3%	20.8%	11.1%	2.7%	2.2%	5.2%	7.4%
<b>No Diagnosis</b>	2.2%	2.3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

For the youth whose primary substance abuse is not specified, three reported using amphetamines and one reported other drugs.

**Chart 5: Number of Treatment Participants by Facility**



**Chart 6: Discharges by Reason**



## Section 4: Education Data

Table 13: Students Enrolled in School

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	42	42	30	15	14	8	8	5	9	16
<b>Harrisburg</b>	64	57	51	30	25	25	27	31	40	34
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	29	20	6	3	3	6	11	6	6	7
<b>St. Charles</b>	24	32	32	24	13	11	17	13	14	12
<b>Warrenville</b>	14	11	17	8	7	9	11	16	17	12
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>81</b>

Table 14: Teachers Employed

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	7	7	7	7	7	8	7	7	7	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	17	17	16	16	16	16	15	16	16	16
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	6
<b>St. Charles</b>	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	8
<b>Warrenville</b>	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>42</b>

Table 15: General Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5.0	3	4.3	1.4	1.5	0.2	0.7	0.3	1.0	1.5
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2.8	1.6	3.2	0.7	0.3	1.0	0.9	0.5	0.7	0.6
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3.2	2.2	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.8	1.4	0.6	0	0.4
<b>St. Charles</b>	2.8	4.0	4.5	1.6	1.2	1.4	2.4	2.3	1.6	1.8
<b>Warrenville</b>	2.5	2.3	3.4	1.8	1.5	1.8	2.7	3.0	4.7	4.0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.3</b>

Table 16: Special Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	12	12	13	5.0	5.0	7.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	9.0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6.2	6.8	4.7	3.7	3.1	2.7	3.0	5.2	6.4	5.4
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	13	4.5	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	6.0	6.0
<b>St. Charles</b>	5	6.0	3.0	8.0	3.5	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.0	1.0
<b>Warrenville</b>	4	2.0	5.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.5	3.5	2.5	2.0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.1</b>

According to the *RJ Consent Decree*, DJJ is required to have general education student to teacher ratios of 10 youth to 1 teacher and special education student to teacher ratios of 6 youth to 1 teacher.

Table 17: Overall Diplomas Awarded

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	Total
<b>Chicago</b>	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	3	4	3	0	5	2	1	1	3	3	25
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	10
<b>St. Charles</b>	2	2	3	2	7	2	0	2	5	2	27
<b>Warrenville</b>	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	1	9
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	11	8	10	4	13	7	3	6	10	6	78

Table 18: Percent of Special Education Students

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	29%	29%	43%	33%	35.7%	87.5%	50%	60%	33.3%	56.3%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	48%	72%	65%	73%	88%	76%	66.7%	83.9%	80%	79.4%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	45%	45%	50%	0%	33.3%	33.3%	36.4%	50%	100%	85.7%
<b>St. Charles</b>	42%	38%	19%	67%	53.8%	36.4%	29.4%	30.8%	42.8%	25.0%
<b>Warrenville</b>	29%	19%	29%	25%	14.3%	22.2%	37.3%	43.8%	29.4%	33.3%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	41%	47%	44%	56%	58.1%	57.6%	45.9%	60.6%	60.5%	60.5%


Table 20: Youth in Continuing Education

	Post-Secondary	Collegiate
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	4	0
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	5
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	4	0
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	4
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	8	9

Table 21: Number and Percent of Cancelled Whole School Days

	Number	Percent
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	1	6%
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	1	6%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	2	2%

**Chart 7: Student to Teacher Ratio by Facility**





## Section 5: Reportable Incident Data

Table 21a: Number of Reportable Incidents

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	11	9	7	9	0	1	0	2	2	5
<b>Harrisburg</b>	15	19	12	15	4	9	8	7	14	14
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	5	3	4	1	0	0	1	1	0	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	24	20	18	10	10	16	7	9	14	19
<b>Warrenville</b>	6	12	4	2	4	4	3	2	7	4
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>43</b>

Table 21b: Rate of Reportable Incidents per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	27.5	24.2	17.4	36.1	0	6.2	0	14.9	11.6	21.7	<b>16.0</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	18.1	24.1	17.9	30.8	9.7	25.6	22.5	16.5	28.3	35.2	<b>22.9</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	17.1	11.1	21.7	15.6	0	0	9.5	10.9	0	10.8	<b>9.7</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	52.9	35.7	32.7	23.2	25.4	47.6	19.3	25.7	36.5	48.5	<b>34.7</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	27.4	66.7	19.8	16.1	36.4	33.3	16.9	8.1	26	19.2	<b>27.0</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>27.3</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>26.3</b>	<b>32.6</b>	<b>24.5</b>

Table 22a: Number of Youth on Youth Assaults

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	4	1	1	4	0	1	0	1	0	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	9	7	7	5	3	8	1	3	3	6
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	6	6	8	3	1	5	2	2	3	5
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	3	2	1	3	0	0	0	1	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>13</b>

Table 22b: Rate of Youth on Youth Assaults per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	10	2.7	2.5	16.1	0	6.2	0	7.5	0	4.3	<b>4.9</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	10.8	8.9	10.4	10.3	7.3	22.8	2.8	7.1	6.1	15.1	<b>10.2</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6.8	3.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10.8	<b>2.1</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	13.2	10.7	14.5	7.0	2.5	14.9	5.5	5.7	7.8	12.8	<b>9.5</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	13.7	16.7	9.9	8.1	27.3	0	0	0	3.7	0	<b>7.9</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>8.0</b>

Table 23a: Number of Youth Fights

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5	7	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6	7	5	10	0	0	4	1	9	7
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	13	12	7	5	3	9	3	2	6	3
<b>Warrenville</b>	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>

Table 23b: Rate of Youth Fights per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	12.5	18.8	9.9	3.0	0	0	0	0	5.8	8.7	<b>5.9</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	7.2	8.9	7.5	20.5	0	0	11.3	2.4	18.2	17.6	<b>9.4</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6.8	3.7	21.7	0	0	0	9.5	0	0	0	<b>4.2</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	28.6	21.4	12.7	11.6	7.6	26.8	8.3	5.7	15.6	7.7	<b>14.6</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	9.1	11.1	0	0	0	0	5.6	0	18.6	9.6	<b>5.4</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>9.6</b>


Table 24a: Number of Youth on Staff Assaults

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	1	2	3	0	0	0	1	1	2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	5	0	0	1	1	3	3	2	1
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	5	2	3	2	6	2	2	5	5	11
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	7	2	1	1	4	2	2	1	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>16</b>


Table 24b: Rate of Youth on Staff Assaults per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	5	2.7	5.0	12.0	0	0	0	7.5	5.8	8.7	<b>4.7</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	6.3	0	0	2.4	2.8	8.5	7.1	4	2.5	<b>3.4</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3.4	3.7	0	15.6	0	0	0	10.9	0	0	<b>3.4</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	11	3.6	5.5	4.6	15.2	6.0	5.5	14.3	13	28.1	<b>10.7</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	4.6	38.9	9.9	8.1	9.1	33.3	11.2	8.1	3.7	9.6	<b>13.7</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>6.9</b>

**Chart 9: Rate of Reportable Incidents Per 100 Youth**



**Chart 10: Rate of Youth on Staff Assault Per 100 Youth**



## Section 6: Indicator Data

Table 25: Uses of Chemical Restraints

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0
<b>Warrenville</b>	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>

Table 26: Uses of Mechanical Restraints

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	6	2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5	6	6	1	4	1	2	2	6	1
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	4	2	3	3	1	6	6	11
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>

Uses of chemical and mechanical restraints have varied throughout the year, although the use in the current year is much lower than years past. Numbers and rates of uses of restraints should be related to population size and number and types of incidents. More important than how frequent they are is whether they are used according to policy and for appropriate reasons.

## Section 7: Confinement Information

Table 28a: Use of Behavioral Holds

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	10	15	15	2	1	0	4	1	8
<b>Harrisburg</b>	66	77	67	36	21	18	21	20	46	29
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	43	70	45	21	29	50	18	40	24	28
<b>Warrenville</b>	14	23	13	10	7	6	18	12	18	21
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>87</b>

Table 28b: Rate of Behavioral Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	3	27	37	60	13	6	0	30	6	35
<b>Harrisburg</b>	80	98	100	74	51	51	59	47	93	73
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3	4	11	16	24	0	0	0	0	11
<b>St. Charles</b>	95	125	82	49	74	148	50	114	63	71
<b>Warrenville</b>	64	128	64	81	64	50	101	48	67	105
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>66</b>

Table 28c: Average Length of Behavioral Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	98	89	94	78	155	48	-	123	95	138
<b>Harrisburg</b>	165	112	147	148	132	125	133	173	144	118
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	40	17	292	30	14	0	-	-	-	33
<b>St. Charles</b>	107	95	82	80	94	62	63	84	91	88
<b>Warrenville</b>	62	35	111	57	60	187	108	129	94	103
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>106</b>

Table 29: Use of Crisis Care

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	1	-	1	-	3	-	3	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>

Table 30: Use of Medical Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	13	9	1	2	-	-	2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	3	-	-	-	1	1	13	2	9	3
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>


Table 31: Use of Administrative Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 32: Use of Investigative Status

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	7	-	3
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	3

Chart 12: Rate per 100 youth of Behavioral Holds



## Section 8: Aftercare Data

Table 33: Youth on Aftercare

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Total Number of Youth Assigned to Aftercare</b>	850	802	771	662	616	601	593	631	571	593
<b>Youth in Community</b>	498	466	478	370	348	330	299	348	272	291
<b>Youth in Facilities</b>	192	188	152	90	73	70	95	94	105	106
<b>Youth with Pending Criminal Cases</b>	68	61	58	141	148	154	157	143	155	156
<b>Youth with Warrants and Out of State</b>	92	87	83	61	47	47	42	46	39	41

Table 34: Caseloads in Aftercare (per Specialist)

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Youth Assigned to Specialist</b>	15.7	14.9	14.3	10.5	9.6	9.1	9.0	10.0	8.6	9.0
<b>Youth in Community</b>	11.3	10.6	10.9	8.4	7.9	7.5	6.8	7.9	6.2	6.8
<b>Youth in Facilities</b>	4.4	4.3	3.4	2.1	1.7	1.6	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.2

Table 35: Average Specialist Caseload by Aftercare Office – October 2020

	Number of Specialists	Number of Youth	Average Caseload	Number of Youth in Community	Average Caseload in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	7	5	8	51	7.3
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	3	2	8.7	24	8
<b>Aurora</b>	3	4	7	17	5.7
<b>Rockford</b>	5	5	5.4	22	4.4
<b>Peoria</b>	4	7	9.5	31	7.8
<b>East St. Louis</b>	6	5	6.8	36	6
<b>Champaign</b>	3	13	10	17	5.7
<b>Springfield</b>	4	5	9	31	7.8
<b>Placement</b>	7	40	10.9	36	5.1
<b>Intensive</b>	2	9	21.5	34	17
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>6.8</b>

Table 36: Specialist Contact with Youth by Aftercare Office – October 2020

	Number of Overall Contacts	Contacts per Youth	Contacts with Youth in Community	Contacts per Youth in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	128	2.3	123	2.4
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	72	2.8	69	2.9
<b>Aurora</b>	68	3.2	67	3.9
<b>Rockford</b>	87	3.2	85	3.9
<b>Peoria</b>	91	2.4	88	2.8
<b>East St. Louis</b>	88	2.1	87	2.4
<b>Champaign</b>	72	2.4	65	3.8
<b>Springfield</b>	75	2.1	73	2.4
<b>Placement</b>	135	1.8	118	3.3
<b>Intensive</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>816</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>775</b>	<b>2.6</b>

Table 37a: Parole Revocations

	Parole Revocations Heard	Revocations Approved	Revocations Denied	Hearings Continued
<i>January</i>	8	6	2	0
<i>February</i>	15	6	7	2
<i>March</i>	13	9	4	0
<i>April</i>	1	1	0	0
<i>May</i>	2	1	1	0
<i>June</i>	1	0	1	0
<i>July</i>	12	11	1	0
<i>August</i>	7	2	5	0
<i>September</i>	11	7	4	0
<i>October</i>	5	5	0	0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>0.2</b>

Table 37b: Parole Revocation Rates

	Percent of Revocations Approved	Percent of Revocations Denied	Percent of Hearings Continued
<i>January</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>February</i>	40%	46.7%	13.3%
<i>March</i>	69.2%	30.8%	0%
<i>April</i>	100%	0%	0%
<i>May</i>	50%	50%	0%
<i>June</i>	0%	100%	0%
<i>July</i>	91.7%	8.3%	0%
<i>August</i>	28.6%	71.4%	0%
<i>September</i>	63.6%	36.4%	0%
<i>October</i>	100%	0%	0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>61.8%</b>	<b>36.9%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>

With lower numbers of admission for technical parole violators, the numbers of parole revocation hearings held monthly has greatly decreased compared to previous years.



## Section 9: Population Stock/Flow

Table 38: Institutional Stock/Flow

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Number of Admissions per Month</b>	49	40	25	0	12	35	30	34	38	30
<b>Percent of Admissions Parole Violators</b>	8.2%	25%	24%	0%	33.3%	2.9%	16.7%	14.7%	7.9%	20%
<b>Number of Facility Exits per Month</b>	57	41	79	41	31	32	13	26	35	34
<b>Percent of Exits to Aftercare Supervision</b>	93%	90.2%	97.4%	90.2%	83.9%	87.5%	76.9%	100%	100%	94.1%

Table 39: Aftercare Stock/Flow


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<b>Number of New Supervised Youth</b>	56	37	77	37	27	33	10	27	37	33
<b>Number of Exits from Aftercare</b>	33	39	41	39	46	39	33	31	42	41

Table 40: Admissions to Facilities by Type

	October 2020	
	Number	Percent
<b>Court Evaluation</b>	4	13.3%
<b>Court Evaluation Return</b>	0	0%
<b>Discharged and Recommitted</b>	3	10%
<b>Initial Commitment</b>	12	40%
<b>New Commitment</b>	5	16.7%
<b>Technical Parole Violator</b>	6	20%
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	

The decrease in DJJ populations is a direct effect of both decreasing court admissions, decreasing admissions for technical violations, and decreases in length of stay during the fiscal year. Additionally, rates and numbers of discharges from Aftercare have increased as well, which has helped those numbers stay lower as well, which provides fewer youth to be readmitted into facilities. Looking at the types of admissions to DJJ, a greater percent of youth are initial commitments than in previous years.

**Chart 13: Admission Types to Facility, October 2020**



**Section 10: TRD Data for October 2020**

Table 41: Adjustments by Facility

	Reductions	Extensions
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	50	7
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	42	18
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	68	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	82	10
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	39	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>36</b>

Table 42: Types of Adjustments Used

	CHI	HRG	PER	STC	WRV	DJJ Overall
<i>BARJ Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>Delinquent Program Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>Ed/Voc Reduction</i>	3	0	0	34	10	<b>47</b>
<i>Grade Level Reduction</i>	2	5	2	2	3	<b>14</b>
<i>JSO Completion Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>No Maj. Sanc. Reductions</i>	9	11	8	10	4	<b>42</b>
<i>Other Tx Reduction</i>	0	2	0	4	11	<b>17</b>
<i>SA Completion Reduction</i>	3	6	8	4	4	<b>25</b>
<i>YASI Goal Reduction</i>	33	18	50	28	7	<b>136</b>
<i>Discipline Extension</i>	7	18	0	10	1	<b>36</b>

**Chart 14: Types of Adjustments used by Agency**




Table 43: Frequency of BARJ Adjustment

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	2	1	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 44: Average Length of BARJ Adjustment

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	10	7	8	10	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>


Table 45: Frequency of Discipline Extensions

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	5	20	18	43	14	2	4	2	1	7
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	24	22	22	9	0	9	1	3	16	18
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	24	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	9	4	36	15	1	9	4	0	11	10
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	3	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>36</b>

Table 46: Average Length of Discipline Extension

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	10/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	11	4	6	8	6	5	6	9	3	4
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	18	11	10	7	-	7	5	8	6	7
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	8	11	0	30	2	-	-	-	5	-
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	10	12	11	7	14	5	8	-	11	12
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	6	5	5	-	-	10	10	-	14
<b>Average</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>

Summed Total Adjustment Days by Month



## Section 11: YASI

Table 47: YASI Pre-Screens: October 2020

	Legal Risk	Social Risk	Protective	Overall Risk
<i>High</i>	113	67	4	99
<i>Moderate</i>	23	66	52	38
<i>Low</i>	2	5	82	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>138</b>


Table 48: YASI Full Assessments: Risk

	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	15	-	-
<i>High</i>	30	127	93
<i>Moderate-High</i>	42	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	28	0	34
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	7	-	-
<i>Low</i>	6	1	1
<i>None</i>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>128</b>

Table 49: YASI Full Assessments: Protective


	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	4	-	-
<i>High</i>	8	20	17
<i>Moderate-High</i>	28	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	49	26	62
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	28	-	-
<i>Low</i>	10	18	48
<i>None</i>	1	64	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>128</b>

**Chart 16: Risk and Protective Levels of Youth**



## Release Reviews


### Reviews by Type per Month



	Annual	Cont.	Director's Request	HSD/GED	Max Release Date	Substance Abuse	Target Release Date	Total
January	1	15	1	1	0	1	25	<b>44</b>
February	1	8	0	2	0	1	28	<b>40</b>
March	1	9	13	1	0	7	34	<b>65</b>
April	0	6	17	2	0	2	11	<b>38</b>
May	0	3	2	4	0	3	10	<b>22</b>
June	0	4	0	0	2	4	5	<b>16</b>
July	0	2	0	1	0	1	16	<b>20</b>
August	0	1	0	2	0	0	14	<b>17</b>
September	0	2	0	4	0	6	30	<b>42</b>
October	0	6	0	1	0	2	16	<b>25</b>



Percent of Release Reviews by Outcome and Month



## Demographic Profile for October 31<sup>th</sup>, 2020

Sex	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Male	124	95.4%	425	95.9%
Female	6	4.6%	18	4.1%

Age	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Average Age	17.7		18.4	
16 & Under	44	33.8%	65	14.8%
17 to 20	83	63.8%	349	79.7%
20.5 & Over	3	2.3%	24	5.5%

Race/Ethnicity	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	20	15.4%	80	18.1%
Black	91	70.0%	302	68.2%
Hispanic	16	12.3%	40	9.0%
American Indian	0	0.0%	1	0.2%
Asian	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Multi/Biracial	3	2.3%	20	4.5%

Committing Counties <sup>i</sup>	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Cook	29	22.3%	134	30.2%
Collar Counties	8	6.2%	39	8.8%
Metro-East	6	4.6%	18	4.1%
Central	54	41.5%	131	29.6%
Southern	10	7.7%	38	8.6%
Northern	23	17.7%	70	15.8%
Other	0	0.0%	13	3.0%

Offense Class	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Murder	11	8.5%	1	0.2%
Class X Felony	39	30.0%	93	21.0%
Class 1 Felony	29	22.3%	133	30.0%
Class 2 Felony	31	23.8%	173	39.1%
Class 3 Felony	12	9.2%	15	3.4%
Class 4 Felony	8	6.2%	15	3.4%

Prefix	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Court Evaluation	5	3.8%	4	0.9%
Delinquent	68	52.3%	395	89.2%
Extended Jurisdiction	9	6.9%	11	2.5%
Felon	33	25.4%	3	0.7%
First Degree Murderer	4	3.1%	1	0.2%
Habitual Juvenile	6	4.6%	7	1.6%
Violent Juvenile	5	3.8%	9	2.0%
From Other State	0	0.0%	13	2.9%

---

<sup>1</sup> Committing Counties: Cook = Cook; Collar Counties = DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, Will; Metro East Counties = Madison, St. Clair; Central IL Counties = Adams, Bond, Brown, Calhoun, Cass, Champaign, Christian, Clark, Coles, Crawford, Cumberland, Dewitt, Douglas, Edgar, Effingham, Fayette, Ford, Fulton, Greene, Hancock, Henderson, Iroquois, Jasper, Jersey, Knox, Livingston, Logan, McDonough, McLean, Macon, Macoupin, Marshall, Mason, Menard, Montgomery, Morgan, Moultrie, Peoria, Piatt, Pike, Sangamon, Schuyler, Scott, Shelby, Stark, Tazewell, Vermillion Warren, Woodford; South IL Counties = Alexander, Clay, Clinton, Edwards, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Lawrence, Marion, Massac, Monroe, Perry, Pope, Pulaski, Randolph, Richland, Saline, Union, Wabash, Washington, Wayne, White, Williamson; North, IL Counties = Boone, Bureau, Carroll, DeKalb, Grundy, Henry, Jo-Daviess, Kankakee, Kendall, LaSalle, Lee, Mercer, Ogle, Putnam, Rock Island, Stephenson, Whiteside, Winnebago; Other = Out of State



DRAFT

Monthly Report:  
September

FY2021

## Section 1: Population and Staffing Data

Table 1a: Population by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	37	40	34	19	17	16	16	13	17
<b>Harrisburg</b>	79	71	57	46	38	31	40	43	48
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	30	27	10	3	3	9	12	10	8
<b>St. Charles</b>	50	65	46	41	33	32	34	38	37
<b>Warrenville</b>	20	16	17	11	11	15	21	27	23
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>133</b>


Table 1b: Average Daily Population by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	40.0	37.2	40.3	24.9	15.7	16.2	15.2	13.4	17.2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	83.0	78.8	67.0	48.7	41.2	35.1	35.5	42.4	49.5
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	29.2	27.0	18.4	6.4	4.2	4.9	10.5	9.2	8.8
<b>St. Charles</b>	45.4	56.0	55.0	43.1	39.4	33.6	36.2	35.0	38.4
<b>Warrenville</b>	21.9	18.0	20.2	12.4	11	12.0	17.8	24.8	26.9
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>219.6</b>	<b>218.0</b>	<b>200.8</b>	<b>135.5</b>	<b>111.5</b>	<b>101.7</b>	<b>115.2</b>	<b>124.8</b>	<b>140.7</b>

Table 2: Security Staff Headcount by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	91	92							
<b>Harrisburg</b>	143	141							
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	51	51							
<b>St. Charles</b>	175	167							
<b>Warrenville</b>	71	71							
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>522</b>							

**Chart 1: Facility Populations on Last Day of Month Last Five Fiscal Years**



## Section 2: Mental Health Data

Table 5: Percent of Youth Psychotropic Medication

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	28%	62.2%	50%	55%	83.3%	76.2%	76.5%	78.9%	90.5%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	50.8%	56.1%	50.6%	43.5%	47.4%	37.7%	70%	63.5%	57.7%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	38.6%	64.9%	65.5%	70%	60%	53.8%	38.5%	33.3%	38.5%
<b>St. Charles</b>	60.1%	41.6%	51.9%	71.1%	60.5%	57.7%	51.1%	52.3%	38.5%
<b>Warrenville</b>	64.2%	71.4%	68%	70.6%	54.5%	70.6%	54.5%	62.9%	51.6%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>48.9%</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>54.2%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>53.7%</b>	<b>59.7%</b>	<b>59.7%</b>	<b>52.7%</b>


Table 7: Distribution of Mental Health Levels

	Mental Health Level 0	Mental Health Level 1	Mental Health Level 2	Mental Health Level 3	Mental Health Level 3.5	Mental Health Level 4
<b>January</b>	9.6%	53.5%	28.9%	7.5%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>February</b>	7.1%	53.5%	31.9%	6.6%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>March</b>	6.5%	50.6%	35.3%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>April</b>	7.4%	50.8%	33.6%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>May</b>	4.9%	57.3%	30.1%	7.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>June</b>	5.4%	50%	33.9%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>July</b>	4.6%	51.1%	33.6%	10.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>August</b>	3.8%	53.8%	36.4%	6.1%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>September</b>	3.6%	52.5%	36.7%	7.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>52.6%</b>	<b>33.4%</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>

Table 8: Distribution of DSM V Diagnoses

	Youth with No Diagnosis	Youth with One Diagnosis	Youth with Two Diagnoses	Youth with Three Diagnoses	Youth with Four or More Diagnoses
<b>January</b>	8.27%	7.3%	20.95%	30.21%	37.91%
<b>February</b>	6.93%	5.63%	16.45%	29.87%	41.13%
<b>March</b>	5%	3.89%	11.11%	33.89%	46.11%
<b>April</b>	5.47%	3.91%	13.28%	33.59%	43.75%
<b>May</b>	1.92%	1.92%	15.38%	37.5%	43.27%
<b>June</b>	3.60%	1.80%	15.32%	31.53%	47.75%
<b>July</b>	2.94%	1.47%	19.12%	30.15%	46.32%
<b>August</b>	2.86%	2.86%	15%	35%	44.29%
<b>September</b>	2.72%	2.72%	12.93%	38.78%	42.86%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4.41%</b>	<b>3.50%</b>	<b>15.50%</b>	<b>33.39%</b>	<b>43.71%</b>

**Chart 3: Percent of Youth on Psychotropic Medication**





### Section 3: Substance Abuse Treatment Data

Table 9: Number of Treatment Participants

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	14	8	8	6	2	3	4	4	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	24	24	14	11	6	12	11	17	16
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	35	37	10	10	5	13	13	15	13
<b>St. Charles</b>	9	8	10	10	9	5	4	6	9
<b>Warrenville</b>	10	9	8	6	2	3	5	4	13
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>58</b>

Table 10: Average Length of Stay for Completers

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	101	101	94	-	-	95	120	-	63
<b>Harrisburg</b>	97	56	99	49	110	75	-	-	56
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	147	110	-	76	46	93	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	114	-	-	172	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	60	60	-	61	60	-	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>60</b>

Table 11: Percent of Discharges by Reason


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Successful Completion</b>	52%	40.9%	37.5%	32.1%	50%	57.1%	28.6%	10%	34.8%
<b>Behavioral Discharge</b>	0%	4.5%	18.8%	0%	12.5%	0%	0%	10%	4.3%
<b>Youth Released</b>	40%	40.9%	31.2%	64.3%	37.5%	42.9%	57.1%	70%	60.9%
<b>Other Discharge</b>	8%	13.6%	12.5%	3.6%	0%	0%	14.3%	10%	4.3%

Table 12: Primary Substance Abused


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Marijuana</b>	71.7%	76.7%	74%	77.6%	79.2%	88.9%	97.3%	97.8%	89.7%
<b>Alcohol</b>	5.4%	7%	4%	6.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5.2%
<b>Other Drugs</b>	20.7%	14%	22%	16.3%	20.8%	11.1%	2.7%	2.2%	5.2%
<b>No Diagnosis</b>	2.2%	2.3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

For the youth whose primary substance abuse is not specified, they reported using amphetamines.

**Chart 5: Number of Treatment Participants by Facility**



**Chart 6: Discharges by Reason**



## Section 4: Education Data

Table 13: Students Enrolled in School

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	42	42	30	15	14	8	8	5	9
<b>Harrisburg</b>	64	57	51	30	25	25	27	31	40
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	29	20	6	3	3	6	11	6	6
<b>St. Charles</b>	24	32	32	24	13	11	17	13	14
<b>Warrenville</b>	14	11	17	8	7	9	11	16	17
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>86</b>

Table 14: Teachers Employed

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	7	7	7	7	7	8	7	7	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	17	17	16	16	16	16	15	16	16
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	7
<b>St. Charles</b>	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	6
<b>Warrenville</b>	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>41</b>

Table 15: General Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5.0	3	4.3	1.4	1.5	0.2	0.7	0.3	1.0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2.8	1.6	3.2	0.7	0.3	1.0	0.9	0.5	0.7
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3.2	2.2	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.8	1.4	0.6	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	2.8	4.0	4.5	1.6	1.2	1.4	2.4	2.3	1.6
<b>Warrenville</b>	2.5	2.3	3.4	1.8	1.5	1.8	2.7	3.0	4.7
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.2</b>

Table 16: Special Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	12	12	13	5.0	5.0	7.0	4.0	3.0	3.0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6.2	6.8	4.7	3.7	3.1	2.7	3.0	5.2	6.4
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	13	4.5	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	4.0	3.0	6.0
<b>St. Charles</b>	5	6.0	3.0	8.0	3.5	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.0
<b>Warrenville</b>	4	2.0	5.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.5	3.5	2.5
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.3</b>

According to the *RJ Consent Decree*, DJJ is required to have general education student to teacher ratios of 10 youth to 1 teacher and special education student to teacher ratios of 6 youth to 1 teacher.

Table 17: Overall Diplomas Awarded

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	Total
<b>Chicago</b>	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	3	4	3	0	5	2	1	1	3	22
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	10
<b>St. Charles</b>	2	2	3	2	7	2	0	2	5	25
<b>Warrenville</b>	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	8
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>72</b>

Table 18: Percent of Special Education Students

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	29%	29%	43%	33%	35.7%	87.5%	50%	60%	33.3%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	48%	72%	65%	73%	88%	76%	66.7%	83.9%	80%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	45%	45%	50%	0%	33.3%	33.3%	36.4%	50%	100%
<b>St. Charles</b>	42%	38%	19%	67%	53.8%	36.4%	29.4%	30.8%	42.8%
<b>Warrenville</b>	29%	19%	29%	25%	14.3%	22.2%	37.3%	43.8%	29.4%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>58.1%</b>	<b>57.6%</b>	<b>45.9%</b>	<b>60.6%</b>	<b>60.5%</b>


Table 20: Youth in Continuing Education

	Post-Secondary	Collegiate
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	4	0
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	6
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	1	0
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	4
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>

Table 21: Number and Percent of Cancelled Whole School Days

	Number	Percent
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

**Chart 7: Student to Teacher Ratio by Facility**



## Section 5: Reportable Incident Data

Table 21a: Number of Reportable Incidents

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	11	9	7	9	0	1	0	2	2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	15	19	12	15	4	9	8	7	14
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	5	3	4	1	0	0	1	1	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	24	20	18	10	10	16	7	9	14
<b>Warrenville</b>	6	12	4	2	4	4	3	2	7
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>37</b>

Table 21b: Rate of Reportable Incidents per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	27.5	24.2	17.4	36.1	0	6.2	0	14.9	11.6	<b>15.4</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	18.1	24.1	17.9	30.8	9.7	25.6	22.5	16.5	28.3	<b>21.5</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	17.1	11.1	21.7	15.6	0	0	9.5	10.9	0	<b>9.5</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	52.9	35.7	32.7	23.2	25.4	47.6	19.3	25.7	36.5	<b>33.2</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	27.4	66.7	19.8	16.1	36.4	33.3	16.9	8.1	26	<b>27.9</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>27.3</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>26.3</b>	<b>23.6</b>

Table 22a: Number of Youth on Youth Assaults

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	4	1	1	4	0	1	0	1	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	9	7	7	5	3	8	1	3	3
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	6	6	8	3	1	5	2	2	3
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	3	2	1	3	0	0	0	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>

Table 22b: Rate of Youth on Youth Assaults per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	10	2.7	2.5	16.1	0	6.2	0	7.5	0	<b>5</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	10.8	8.9	10.4	10.3	7.3	22.8	2.8	7.1	6.1	<b>9.6</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6.8	3.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>1.2</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	13.2	10.7	14.5	7.0	2.5	14.9	5.5	5.7	7.8	<b>9.1</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	13.7	16.7	9.9	8.1	27.3	0	0	0	3.7	<b>8.8</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>7.8</b>

Table 23a: Number of Youth Fights

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5	7	4	2	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6	7	5	10	0	0	4	1	9
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	13	12	7	5	3	9	3	2	6
<b>Warrenville</b>	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>21</b>

Table 23b: Rate of Youth Fights per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	12.5	18.8	9.9	3.0	0	0	0	0	5.8	<b>5.6</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	7.2	8.9	7.5	20.5	0	0	11.3	2.4	18.2	<b>8.4</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6.8	3.7	21.7	0	0	0	9.5	0	0	<b>4.6</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	28.6	21.4	12.7	11.6	7.6	26.8	8.3	5.7	15.6	<b>15.4</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	9.1	11.1	0	0	0	0	5.6	0	18.6	<b>4.9</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>9.5</b>


Table 24a: Number of Youth on Staff Assaults

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	1	2	3	0	0	0	1	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	5	0	0	1	1	3	3	2
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	5	2	3	2	6	2	2	5	5
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	7	2	1	1	4	2	2	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>


Table 24b: Rate of Youth on Staff Assaults per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	5	2.7	5.0	12.0	0	0	0	7.5	5.8	<b>4.2</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	6.3	0	0	2.4	2.8	8.5	7.1	4	<b>3.5</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3.4	3.7	0	15.6	0	0	0	10.9	0	<b>3.7</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	11	3.6	5.5	4.6	15.2	6.0	5.5	14.3	13	<b>8.7</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	4.6	38.9	9.9	8.1	9.1	33.3	11.2	8.1	3.7	<b>14.1</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>6.3</b>

**Chart 9: Rate of Reportable Incidents Per 100 Youth**



**Chart 10: Rate of Youth on Staff Assault Per 100 Youth**





## Section 6: Indicator Data

Table 25: Uses of Chemical Restraints

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
<b>Warrenville</b>	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>

Table 26: Uses of Mechanical Restraints

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	6
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5	6	6	1	4	1	2	2	6
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	4	2	3	3	1	6	6
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>18</b>

Uses of chemical and mechanical restraints have varied throughout the year, although the use in the current year is much lower than years past. Numbers and rates of uses of restraints should be related to population size and number and types of incidents. More important than how frequent they are is whether they are used according to policy and for appropriate reasons.

## Section 7: Confinement Information

Table 28a: Use of Behavioral Holds

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	10	15	15	2	1	0	4	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	66	77	67	36	21	18	21	20	46
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	43	70	45	21	29	50	18	40	24
<b>Warrenville</b>	14	23	13	10	7	6	18	12	18
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>89</b>

Table 28b: Rate of Behavioral Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	3	27	37	60	13	6	0	30	6
<b>Harrisburg</b>	80	98	100	74	51	51	59	47	93
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3	4	11	16	24	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	95	125	82	49	74	148	50	114	63
<b>Warrenville</b>	64	128	64	81	64	50	101	48	67
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>63</b>

Table 28c: Average Length of Behavioral Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	98	89	94	78	155	48	-	123	95
<b>Harrisburg</b>	165	112	147	148	132	125	133	173	144
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	40	17	292	30	14	0	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	107	95	82	80	94	62	63	84	91
<b>Warrenville</b>	62	35	111	57	60	187	108	129	94
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>119</b>

Table 29: Use of Crisis Care

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	1	-	1	-	3	-	3	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 30: Use of Medical Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	13	9	1	2	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	3	-	-	-	1	1	13	2	9
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>


Table 31: Use of Administrative Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 32: Use of Investigative Status

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	7	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>

Chart 12: Rate per 100 youth of Behavioral Holds



## Section 8: Aftercare Data

Table 33: Youth on Aftercare

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Total Number of Youth Assigned to Aftercare</b>	850	802	771	662	616	601	593	631	571
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	498	466	478	370	348	330	299	348	272
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	192	188	152	90	73	70	95	94	105
<b>Number of Youth with Pending Criminal Cases</b>	68	61	58	141	148	154	157	143	155
<b>Number of Youth with Warrants and Out of State</b>	92	87	83	61	47	47	42	46	39

Table 34: Caseloads in Aftercare (per Specialist)

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Number of Youth Assigned to Specialist</b>	15.7	14.9	14.3	10.5	9.6	9.1	9.0	10.0	8.6
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	11.3	10.6	10.9	8.4	7.9	7.5	6.8	7.9	6.2
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	4.4	4.3	3.4	2.1	1.7	1.6	2.2	2.1	2.4

Table 35: Average Specialist Caseload by Aftercare Office – September 2020

	Number of Specialists	Number of Youth	Average Caseload	Number of Youth in Community	Average Caseload in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	7	47	6.7	42	6
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	3	20	6.7	17	5.7
<b>Aurora</b>	3	23	7.7	20	6.7
<b>Rockford</b>	5	23	4.6	22	4.4
<b>Peoria</b>	4	35	8.8	26	6.5
<b>East St. Louis</b>	6	35	5.8	28	4.7
<b>Champaign</b>	3	28	9.3	21	7
<b>Springfield</b>	4	37	9.3	31	7.8
<b>Placement</b>	7	79	11.3	34	4.9
<b>Intensive</b>	2	50	25	31	15.5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>377</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>6.2</b>

Table 36: Specialist Contact with Youth by Aftercare Office – September 2020

	Number of Overall Contacts	Contacts per Youth	Contacts with Youth in Community	Contacts per Youth in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	158	3.4	133	3.2
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	82	4.1	78	4.6
<b>Aurora</b>	79	3.4	79	4.0
<b>Rockford</b>	101	4.4	96	4.4
<b>Peoria</b>	106	3.0	98	3.8
<b>East St. Louis</b>	91	2.6	99	3.5
<b>Champaign</b>	84	3.0	76	3.6
<b>Springfield</b>	90	2.4	83	2.7
<b>Placement</b>	159	2.0	138	4.1
<b>Intensive</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>950</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>880</b>	<b>3.2</b>

Table 37a: Parole Revocations

	Parole Revocations Heard	Revocations Approved	Revocations Denied	Hearings Continued
<i>January</i>	8	6	2	0
<i>February</i>	15	6	7	2
<i>March</i>	13	9	4	0
<i>April</i>	1	1	0	0
<i>May</i>	2	1	1	0
<i>June</i>	1	0	1	0
<i>July</i>	12	11	1	0
<i>August</i>	7	2	5	0
<i>September</i>	11	7	4	0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>0.3</b>

Table 37b: Parole Revocation Rates

	Percent of Revocations Approved	Percent of Revocations Denied	Percent of Hearings Continued
<i>January</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>February</i>	40%	46.7%	13.3%
<i>March</i>	69.2%	30.8%	0%
<i>April</i>	100%	0%	0%
<i>May</i>	50%	50%	0%
<i>June</i>	0%	100%	0%
<i>July</i>	91.7%	8.3%	0%
<i>August</i>	28.6%	71.4%	0%
<i>September</i>	63.6%	36.4%	0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>1.5%</b>

With lower numbers of admission for technical parole violators, the numbers of parole revocation hearings held monthly has greatly decreased compared to previous years.

## Section 9: Population Stock/Flow

Table 38: Institutional Stock/Flow

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Number of Admissions per Month</b>	49	40	25	0	12	35	30	34	38
<b>Percent of Admissions Parole Violators</b>	8.2%	25%	24%	0%	33.3%	2.9%	16.7%	14.7%	7.9%
<b>Number of Facility Exits per Month</b>	57	41	79	41	31	32	13	26	35
<b>Percent of Exits to Aftercare Supervision</b>	93%	90.2%	97.4%	90.2%	83.9%	87.5%	76.9%	100%	100%

Table 39: Aftercare Stock/Flow


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<b>Number of New Supervised Youth</b>	56	37	77	37	27	33	10	27	37
<b>Number of Exits from Aftercare</b>	33	39	41	39	46	39	33	31	42

Table 40: Admissions to Facilities by Type

	September 2020	
	Number	Percent
<b>Court Evaluation</b>	4	10.5%
<b>Court Evaluation Return</b>	0	0%
<b>Discharged and Recommitted</b>	8	21.1%
<b>Initial Commitment</b>	16	42.1%
<b>New Commitment</b>	7	18.4%
<b>Technical Parole Violator</b>	3	7.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	

The decrease in DJJ populations is a direct effect of both decreasing court admissions, decreasing admissions for technical violations, and decreases in length of stay during the fiscal year. Additionally, rates and numbers of discharges from Aftercare have increased as well, which has helped those numbers stay lower as well, which provides fewer youth to be readmitted into facilities. Looking at the types of admissions to DJJ, a greater percent of youth are initial commitments than in previous years.

**Chart 13: Admission Types to Facility, September 2020**



## Section 10: TRD Data for September 2020

Table 41: Adjustments by Facility

	Reductions	Extensions
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	16	1
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	52	16
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	76	1
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	91	11
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	48	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>29</b>

Table 42: Types of Adjustments Used

	CHI	HRG	PER	STC	WRV	DJJ Overall
<i>BARJ Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>Delinquent Program Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>Ed/Voc Reduction</i>	2	0	1	46	11	<b>60</b>
<i>Grade Level Reduction</i>	1	4	1	3	3	<b>12</b>
<i>JSO Completion Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>No Maj. Sanc. Reductions</i>	2	14	5	5	12	<b>38</b>
<i>Other Tx Reduction</i>	0	5	0	1	10	<b>16</b>
<i>SA Completion Reduction</i>	2	10	9	7	2	<b>30</b>
<i>YASI Goal Reduction</i>	9	19	60	29	10	<b>127</b>
<i>Discipline Extension</i>	1	16	1	11	0	<b>29</b>

Chart 14: Types of Adjustments used by Agency






Table 43: Frequency of BARJ Adjustment

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	2	1	6	5	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 44: Average Length of BARJ Adjustment

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	10	7	8	10	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>


Table 45: Frequency of Discipline Extensions

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	5	20	18	43	14	2	4	2	1
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	24	22	22	9	0	9	1	3	16
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	24	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	9	4	36	15	1	9	4	0	11
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	3	1	1	0	0	1	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>29</b>

Table 46: Average Length of Discipline Extension

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	9/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	11	4	6	8	6	5	6	9	3
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	18	11	10	7	-	7	5	8	6
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	8	11	0	30	2	-	-	-	5
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	10	12	11	7	14	5	8	-	11
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	6	5	5	-	-	10	10	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>

Summed Total Adjustment Days by Month



## Section 11: YASI

Table 47: YASI Pre-Screens: September 2020

	Legal Risk	Social Risk	Protective	Overall Risk
<i>High</i>	115	65	7	92
<i>Moderate</i>	30	75	46	52
<i>Low</i>	1	6	93	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>146</b>


Table 48: YASI Full Assessments: Risk

	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	27	-	-
<i>High</i>	18	131	90
<i>Moderate-High</i>	41	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	32	3	44
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	11	-	-
<i>Low</i>	6	1	1
<i>None</i>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>135</b>

Table 49: YASI Full Assessments: Protective


	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	4	-	-
<i>High</i>	10	21	18
<i>Moderate-High</i>	31	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	46	22	58
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	26	-	-
<i>Low</i>	18	20	59
<i>None</i>	0	72	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>135</b>

**Chart 16: Risk and Protective Levels of Youth**




## Release Reviews

### Reviews by Type per Month



	Annual	Cont.	Director's Request	HSD/GED	Max Release Date	Substance Abuse	Target Release Date	Total
January	1	15	1	1	0	1	25	<b>44</b>
February	1	8	0	2	0	1	28	<b>40</b>
March	1	9	13	1	0	7	34	<b>65</b>
April	0	6	17	2	0	2	11	<b>38</b>
May	0	3	2	4	0	3	10	<b>22</b>
June	0	4	0	0	2	4	5	<b>16</b>
July	0	2	0	1	0	1	16	<b>20</b>
August	0	1	0	2	0	0	14	<b>17</b>
September	0	2	0	4	0	6	30	<b>42</b>

Percent of Release Reviews by Outcome and Month



## Demographic Profile for September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2020

Sex	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Male	125	6%	441	95%
Female	8	94%	21	5%

Age	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Average Age	17.7		18.4	
16 & Under	40	30%	72	16%
17 to 20	90	68%	361	79%
20.5 & Over	3	2%	27	6%

Race/Ethnicity	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	28	21%	76	16%
Black	86	65%	328	71%
Hispanic	13	10%	40	9%
American Indian	0	0%	1	1%
Asian	0	0%	1	1%
Multi/Biracial	6	5%	19	4%

Committing Counties <sup>i</sup>	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Cook	22	17%	144	31%
Collar Counties	10	8%	42	9%
Metro-East	7	5%	17	4%
Central	54	41%	139	30%
Southern	16	12%	34	7%
Northern	24	18%	75	16%
Other	0	0%	14	3%

Offense Class	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Murder	10	8%	3	1%
Class X Felony	39	29%	98	21%
Class 1 Felony	35	26%	132	28%
Class 2 Felony	28	21%	189	41%
Class 3 Felony	13	10%	13	3%
Class 4 Felony	8	6%	16	3%

Prefix	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Court Evaluation	5	4%	3	1%
Delinquent	75	56%	413	89%
Extended Jurisdiction	4	3%	15	3%
Felon	33	25%	3	1%
First Degree Murderer	4	3%	2	1%
Habitual Juvenile	7	5%	7	2%
Violent Juvenile	5	4%	9	2%

---

<sup>1</sup> Committing Counties: Cook = Cook; Collar Counties = DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, Will; Metro East Counties = Madison, St. Clair; Central IL Counties = Adams, Bond, Brown, Calhoun, Cass, Champaign, Christian, Clark, Coles, Crawford, Cumberland, Dewitt, Douglas, Edgar, Effingham, Fayette, Ford, Fulton, Greene, Hancock, Henderson, Iroquois, Jasper, Jersey, Knox, Livingston, Logan, McDonough, McLean, Macon, Macoupin, Marshall, Mason, Menard, Montgomery, Morgan, Moultrie, Peoria, Piatt, Pike, Sangamon, Schuyler, Scott, Shelby, Stark, Tazewell, Vermillion Warren, Woodford; South IL Counties = Alexander, Clay, Clinton, Edwards, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Lawrence, Marion, Massac, Monroe, Perry, Pope, Pulaski, Randolph, Richland, Saline, Union, Wabash, Washington, Wayne, White, Williamson; North, IL Counties = Boone, Bureau, Carroll, DeKalb, Grundy, Henry, Jo-Daviess, Kankakee, Kendall, LaSalle, Lee, Mercer, Ogle, Putnam, Rock Island, Stephenson, Whiteside, Winnebago; Other = Out of State





DRAFT

Monthly Report:  
August

FY2021

## Section 1: Population and Staffing Data

Table 1a: Population by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	37	40	34	19	17	16	16	13
<b>Harrisburg</b>	79	71	57	46	38	31	40	43
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	30	27	10	3	3	9	12	10
<b>St. Charles</b>	50	65	46	41	33	32	34	38
<b>Warrenville</b>	20	16	17	11	11	15	21	27
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>131</b>


Table 1b: Average Daily Population by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	40.0	37.2	40.3	24.9	15.7	16.2	15.2	13.4
<b>Harrisburg</b>	83.0	78.8	67.0	48.7	41.2	35.1	35.5	42.4
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	29.2	27.0	18.4	6.4	4.2	4.9	10.5	9.2
<b>St. Charles</b>	45.4	56.0	55.0	43.1	39.4	33.6	36.2	35.0
<b>Warrenville</b>	21.9	18.0	20.2	12.4	11	12.0	17.8	24.8
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>219.6</b>	<b>218.0</b>	<b>200.8</b>	<b>135.5</b>	<b>111.5</b>	<b>101.7</b>	<b>115.2</b>	<b>124.8</b>

Table 2: Security Staff Headcount by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	91	92						
<b>Harrisburg</b>	143	141						
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	51	51						
<b>St. Charles</b>	175	167						
<b>Warrenville</b>	71	71						
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>522</b>						

**Chart 1: Facility Populations on Last Day of Month Last Five Fiscal Years**



## Section 2: Mental Health Data

Table 5: Percent of Youth Psychotropic Medication

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	28%	62.2%	50%	55%	83.3%	76.2%	76.5%	78.9%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	50.8%	56.1%	50.6%	43.5%	47.4%	37.7%	70%	63.5%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	38.6%	64.9%	65.5%	70%	60%	53.8%	38.5%	33.3%
<b>St. Charles</b>	60.1%	41.6%	51.9%	71.1%	60.5%	57.7%	51.1%	52.3%
<b>Warrenville</b>	64.2%	71.4%	68%	70.6%	54.5%	70.6%	54.5%	62.9%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>48.9%</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>54.2%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>53.7%</b>	<b>59.7%</b>	<b>59.7%</b>


Table 7: Distribution of Mental Health Levels

	Mental Health Level 0	Mental Health Level 1	Mental Health Level 2	Mental Health Level 3	Mental Health Level 3.5	Mental Health Level 4
<b>January</b>	9.6%	53.5%	28.9%	7.5%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>February</b>	7.1%	53.5%	31.9%	6.6%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>March</b>	6.5%	50.6%	35.3%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>April</b>	7.4%	50.8%	33.6%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>May</b>	4.9%	57.3%	30.1%	7.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>June</b>	5.4%	50%	33.9%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>July</b>	4.6%	51.1%	33.6%	10.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>August</b>	3.8%	53.8%	36.4%	6.1%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>52.6%</b>	<b>33.0%</b>	<b>8.2%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>

Table 8: Distribution of DSM V Diagnoses

	Youth with No Diagnosis	Youth with One Diagnosis	Youth with Two Diagnoses	Youth with Three Diagnoses	Youth with Four or More Diagnoses
<b>January</b>	8.27%	7.3%	20.95%	30.21%	37.91%
<b>February</b>	6.93%	5.63%	16.45%	29.87%	41.13%
<b>March</b>	5%	3.89%	11.11%	33.89%	46.11%
<b>April</b>	5.47%	3.91%	13.28%	33.59%	43.75%
<b>May</b>	1.92%	1.92%	15.38%	37.5%	43.27%
<b>June</b>	3.60%	1.80%	15.32%	31.53%	47.75%
<b>July</b>	2.94%	1.47%	19.12%	30.15%	46.32%
<b>August</b>	2.86%	2.86%	15%	35%	44.29%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4.62%</b>	<b>3.60%</b>	<b>15.83%</b>	<b>32.71%</b>	<b>43.82%</b>

**Chart 3: Percent of Youth on Psychotropic Medication**



### Section 3: Substance Abuse Treatment Data

Table 9: Number of Treatment Participants

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	14	8	8	6	2	3	4	4
<b>Harrisburg</b>	24	24	14	11	6	12	11	17
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	35	37	10	10	5	13	13	15
<b>St. Charles</b>	9	8	10	10	9	5	4	6
<b>Warrenville</b>	10	9	8	6	2	3	5	4
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>46</b>

Table 10: Average Length of Stay for Completers

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	101	101	94	-	-	95	120	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	97	56	99	49	110	75	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	147	110	-	76	46	93	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	114	-	-	172
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	60	60	-	61	60	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>172</b>

Table 11: Percent of Discharges by Reason


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Successful Completion</b>	52%	40.9%	37.5%	32.1%	50%	57.1%	28.6%	10%
<b>Behavioral Discharge</b>	0%	4.5%	18.8%	0%	12.5%	0%	0%	10%
<b>Youth Released</b>	40%	40.9%	31.2%	64.3%	37.5%	42.9%	57.1%	70%
<b>Other Discharge</b>	8%	13.6%	12.5%	3.6%	0%	0%	14.3%	10%

Table 12: Primary Substance Abused


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Marijuana</b>	71.7%	76.7%	74%	77.6%	79.2%	88.9%	97.3%	97.8%
<b>Alcohol</b>	5.4%	7%	4%	6.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Other Drugs</b>	20.7%	14%	22%	16.3%	20.8%	11.1%	2.7%	2.2%
<b>No Diagnosis</b>	2.2%	2.3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

For the youth whose primary substance abuse is not specified, they reported using benzodiazepines.

**Chart 5: Number of Treatment Participants by Facility**



**Chart 6: Discharges by Reason**



## Section 4: Education Data

Table 13: Students Enrolled in School

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	42	42	30	15	14	8	8	5
<b>Harrisburg</b>	64	57	51	30	25	25	27	31
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	29	20	6	3	3	6	11	6
<b>St. Charles</b>	24	32	32	24	13	11	17	13
<b>Warrenville</b>	14	11	17	8	7	9	11	16
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>71</b>

Table 14: Teachers Employed

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	7	7	7	7	7	8	7	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	17	17	16	16	16	16	15	16
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7
<b>St. Charles</b>	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>

Table 15: General Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5.0	3	4.3	1.4	1.5	0.2	0.7	0.3
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2.8	1.6	3.2	0.7	0.3	1.0	0.9	0.5
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3.2	2.2	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.8	1.4	0.6
<b>St. Charles</b>	2.8	4.0	4.5	1.6	1.2	1.4	2.4	2.3
<b>Warrenville</b>	2.5	2.3	3.4	1.8	1.5	1.8	2.7	3.0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.0</b>

Table 16: Special Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	12	12	13	5.0	5.0	7.0	4.0	3.0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6.2	6.8	4.7	3.7	3.1	2.7	3.0	5.2
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	13	4.5	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	4.0	3.0
<b>St. Charles</b>	5	6.0	3.0	8.0	3.5	2.0	2.5	2.0
<b>Warrenville</b>	4	2.0	5.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.5	3.5
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.9</b>

According to the *RJ Consent Decree*, DJJ is required to have general education student to teacher ratios of 10 youth to 1 teacher and special education student to teacher ratios of 6 youth to 1 teacher.



Table 17: Overall Diplomas Awarded

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	Total
<b>Chicago</b>	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	3	4	3	0	5	2	1	1	19
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	8
<b>St. Charles</b>	2	2	3	2	7	2	0	2	20
<b>Warrenville</b>	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	8
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	11	8	10	4	13	7	3	6	62

Table 18: Percent of Special Education Students

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	29%	29%	43%	33%	35.7%	87.5%	50%	60%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	48%	72%	65%	73%	88%	76%	66.7%	83.9%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	45%	45%	50%	0%	33.3%	33.3%	36.4%	50%
<b>St. Charles</b>	42%	38%	19%	67%	53.8%	36.4%	29.4%	30.8%
<b>Warrenville</b>	29%	19%	29%	25%	14.3%	22.2%	37.3%	43.8%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	41%	47%	44%	56%	58.1%	57.6%	45.9%	60.6%


Table 20: Youth in Continuing Education

	Post-Secondary	Collegiate
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	4	0
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	8
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	3	0
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	2
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	7	10

Table 21: Number and Percent of Cancelled Whole School Days

	Number	Percent
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	15	94%
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	15	19%

**Chart 7: Student to Teacher Ratio by Facility**



## Section 5: Reportable Incident Data

Table 21a: Number of Reportable Incidents

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	11	9	7	9	0	1	0	2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	15	19	12	15	4	9	8	7
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	5	3	4	1	0	0	1	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	24	20	18	10	10	16	7	9
<b>Warrenville</b>	6	12	4	2	4	4	3	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>

Table 21b: Rate of Reportable Incidents per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	27.5	24.2	17.4	36.1	0	6.2	0	14.9	<b>15.8</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	18.1	24.1	17.9	30.8	9.7	25.6	22.5	16.5	<b>20.7</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	17.1	11.1	21.7	15.6	0	0	9.5	10.9	<b>10.7</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	52.9	35.7	32.7	23.2	25.4	47.6	19.3	25.7	<b>32.8</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	27.4	66.7	19.8	16.1	36.4	33.3	16.9	8.1	<b>28.1</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>27.3</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>23.2</b>

Table 22a: Number of Youth on Youth Assaults

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	4	1	1	4	0	1	0	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	9	7	7	5	3	8	1	3
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	6	6	8	3	1	5	2	2
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	3	2	1	3	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>

Table 22b: Rate of Youth on Youth Assaults per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	10	2.7	2.5	16.1	0	6.2	0	7.5	<b>5.6</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	10.8	8.9	10.4	10.3	7.3	22.8	2.8	7.1	<b>10.0</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6.8	3.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>1.3</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	13.2	10.7	14.5	7.0	2.5	14.9	5.5	5.7	<b>9.3</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	13.7	16.7	9.9	8.1	27.3	0	0	0	<b>9.5</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>8.2</b>

Table 23a: Number of Youth Fights

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5	7	4	2	0	0	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6	7	5	10	0	0	4	1
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	1	4	0	0	0	1	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	13	12	7	5	3	9	3	2
<b>Warrenville</b>	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>

Table 23b: Rate of Youth Fights per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	12.5	18.8	9.9	3.0	0	0	0	0	<b>5.5</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	7.2	8.9	7.5	20.5	0	0	11.3	2.4	<b>7.2</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6.8	3.7	21.7	0	0	0	9.5	0	<b>5.2</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	28.6	21.4	12.7	11.6	7.6	26.8	8.3	5.7	<b>15.3</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	9.1	11.1	0	0	0	0	5.6	0	<b>3.2</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>8.8</b>


Table 24a: Number of Youth on Staff Assaults

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	1	2	3	0	0	0	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	5	0	0	1	1	3	3
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	5	2	3	2	6	2	2	5
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	7	2	1	1	4	2	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>


Table 24b: Rate of Youth on Staff Assaults per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	5	2.7	5.0	12.0	0	0	0	7.5	<b>4.0</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	6.3	0	0	2.4	2.8	8.5	7.1	<b>3.4</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3.4	3.7	0	15.6	0	0	0	10.9	<b>4.2</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	11	3.6	5.5	4.6	15.2	6.0	5.5	14.3	<b>8.2</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	4.6	38.9	9.9	8.1	9.1	33.3	11.2	8.1	<b>15.4</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>6.3</b>

**Chart 9: Rate of Reportable Incidents Per 100 Youth**



**Chart 10: Rate of Youth on Staff Assault Per 100 Youth**



## Section 6: Indicator Data

Table 25: Uses of Chemical Restraints

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	1
<b>Warrenville</b>	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

Table 26: Uses of Mechanical Restraints

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5	6	6	1	4	1	2	2
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	4	2	3	3	1	6
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>

Uses of chemical and mechanical restraints have varied throughout the year, although the use in the current year is much lower than years past. Numbers and rates of uses of restraints should be related to population size and number and types of incidents. More important than how frequent they are is whether they are used according to policy and for appropriate reasons.

## Section 7: Confinement Information

Table 28a: Use of Behavioral Holds

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	10	15	15	2	1	0	4
<b>Harrisburg</b>	66	77	67	36	21	18	21	20
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	43	70	45	21	29	50	18	40
<b>Warrenville</b>	14	23	13	10	7	6	18	12
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>76</b>

Table 28b: Rate of Behavioral Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	3	27	37	60	13	6	0	30
<b>Harrisburg</b>	80	98	100	74	51	51	59	47
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3	4	11	16	24	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	95	125	82	49	74	148	50	114
<b>Warrenville</b>	64	128	64	81	64	50	101	48
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>61</b>

Table 28c: Average Length of Behavioral Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	98	89	94	78	155	48	-	123
<b>Harrisburg</b>	165	112	147	148	132	125	133	173
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	40	17	292	30	14	0	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	107	95	82	80	94	62	63	84
<b>Warrenville</b>	62	35	111	57	60	187	108	129
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>117</b>

Table 29: Use of Crisis Care

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	1	-	1	-	3	-	3
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>

Table 30: Use of Medical Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	13	9	1	2	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	3	-	-	-	1	1	13	2
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>


Table 31: Use of Administrative Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 32: Use of Investigative Status

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8

Chart 12: Rate per 100 youth of Behavioral Holds





## Section 8: Aftercare Data

Table 33: Youth on Aftercare

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Total Number of Youth Assigned to Aftercare</b>	850	802	771	662	616	601	593	631
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	498	466	478	370	348	330	299	348
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	192	188	152	90	73	70	95	94
<b>Number of Youth with Pending Criminal Cases</b>	68	61	58	141	148	154	157	143
<b>Number of Youth with Warrants and Out of State</b>	92	87	83	61	47	47	42	46

Table 34: Caseloads in Aftercare (per Specialist)

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Number of Youth Assigned to Specialist</b>	15.7	14.9	14.3	10.5	9.6	9.1	9.0	10.0
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	11.3	10.6	10.9	8.4	7.9	7.5	6.8	7.9
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	4.4	4.3	3.4	2.1	1.7	1.6	2.2	2.1

Table 35: Average Specialist Caseload by Aftercare Office – July 2020

	Number of Specialists	Number of Youth	Average Caseload	Number of Youth in Community	Average Caseload in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	7	67	9.6	54	7.7
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	3	37	12.3	32	10.7
<b>Aurora</b>	3	30	10	23	7.7
<b>Rockford</b>	5	38	7.6	27	5.4
<b>Peoria</b>	4	50	12.5	38	9.5
<b>East St. Louis</b>	6	23	3.8	50	8.3
<b>Champaign</b>	3	23	7.7	15	5
<b>Springfield</b>	4	46	11.5	36	9
<b>Placement</b>	7	83	11.9	43	6.1
<b>Intensive</b>	2	45	22.5	30	15
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>442</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>7.9</b>

Table 36: Specialist Contact with Youth by Aftercare Office – July 2020

	Number of Overall Contacts	Contacts per Youth	Contacts with Youth in Community	Contacts per Youth in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	124	1.9	121	2.2
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	75	2.0	73	2.3
<b>Aurora</b>	64	2.1	61	2.7
<b>Rockford</b>	94	2.5	94	3.5
<b>Peoria</b>	96	1.9	93	2.4
<b>East St. Louis</b>	92	4	89	1.8
<b>Champaign</b>	71	3.1	68	4.5
<b>Springfield</b>	86	1.9	83	2.3
<b>Placement</b>	128	1.5	113	2.6
<b>Intensive</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>830</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>795</b>	<b>2.3</b>

Table 37a: Parole Revocations

	Parole Revocations Heard	Revocations Approved	Revocations Denied	Hearings Continued
<i>January</i>	8	6	2	0
<i>February</i>	15	6	7	2
<i>March</i>	13	9	4	0
<i>April</i>	1	1	0	0
<i>May</i>	2	1	1	0
<i>June</i>	1	0	1	0
<i>July</i>	12	11	1	0
<i>August</i>	7	2	5	0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>0.3</b>

Table 37b: Parole Revocation Rates

	Percent of Revocations Approved	Percent of Revocations Denied	Percent of Hearings Continued
<i>January</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>February</i>	40%	46.7%	13.3%
<i>March</i>	69.2%	30.8%	0%
<i>April</i>	100%	0%	0%
<i>May</i>	50%	50%	0%
<i>June</i>	0%	100%	0%
<i>July</i>	91.7%	8.3%	0%
<i>August</i>	28.6%	71.4%	0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>56.8%</b>	<b>41.5%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>

With lower numbers of admission for technical parole violators, the numbers of parole revocation hearings held monthly has greatly decreased compared to previous years.

## Section 9: Population Stock/Flow

Table 38: Institutional Stock/Flow

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Number of Admissions per Month</b>	49	40	25	0	12	35	30	34
<b>Percent of Admissions Parole Violators</b>	8.2%	25%	24%	0%	33.3%	2.9%	16.7%	14.7%
<b>Number of Facility Exits per Month</b>	57	41	79	41	31	32	13	26
<b>Percent of Exits to Aftercare Supervision</b>	93%	90.2%	97.4%	90.2%	83.9%	87.5%	76.9%	100%

Table 39: Aftercare Stock/Flow


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<b>Number of New Supervised Youth</b>	56	37	77	37	27	33	10	27
<b>Number of Exits from Aftercare</b>	33	39	41	39	46	39	33	31

Table 40: Admissions to Facilities by Type

	August 2020	
	Number	Percent
<b>Court Evaluation</b>	0	0.0%
<b>Court Evaluation Return</b>	1	2.9%
<b>Discharged and Recommitted</b>	6	17.6%
<b>Initial Commitment</b>	15	44.1%
<b>New Commitment</b>	7	20.6%
<b>Technical Parole Violator</b>	5	14.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	

The decrease in DJJ populations is a direct effect of both decreasing court admissions, decreasing admissions for technical violations, and decreases in length of stay during the fiscal year. Additionally, rates and numbers of discharges from Aftercare have increased as well, which has helped those numbers stay lower as well, which provides fewer youth to be readmitted into facilities. Looking at the types of admissions to DJJ, a greater percent of youth are initial commitments than in previous years.

**Chart 13: Admission Types to Facility, August 2020**



## Section 10: TRD Data for August 2020

Table 41: Adjustments by Facility

	Reductions	Extensions
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	36	2
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	42	3
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	94	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	68	0
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	23	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>6</b>

Table 42: Types of Adjustments Used

	CHI	HRG	PER	STC	WRV	DJJ Overall
<i>BARJ Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Delinquent Program Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Ed/Voc Reduction</i>	2	2	2	2	6	14
<i>Grade Level Reduction</i>	3	5	3	3	2	16
<i>JSO Completion Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>No Maj. Sanc. Reductions</i>	2	13	6	11	3	35
<i>Other Tx Reduction</i>	1	2	0	6	5	14
<i>SA Completion Reduction</i>	1	5	8	3	3	20
<i>YASI Goal Reduction</i>	27	15	75	43	4	164
<i>Discipline Extension</i>	2	3	0	0	1	6

Chart 14: Types of Adjustments used by Agency




Table 43: Frequency of BARJ Adjustment

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	2	1	6	5	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 44: Average Length of BARJ Adjustment

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	10	7	8	10	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>


Table 45: Frequency of Discipline Extensions

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	5	20	18	43	14	2	4	2
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	24	22	22	9	0	9	1	3
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	24	10	0	1	1	0	0	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	9	4	36	15	1	9	4	0
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	3	1	1	0	0	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>

Table 46: Average Length of Discipline Extension

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	8/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	11	4	6	8	6	5	6	9
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	18	11	10	7	-	7	5	8
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	8	11	0	30	2	-	-	-
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	10	12	11	7	14	5	8	-
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	6	5	5	-	-	10	10
<b>Average</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>

Summed Total Adjustment Days by Month



## Section 11: YASI

Table 47: YASI Pre-Screens: August 2020

	Legal Risk	Social Risk	Protective	Overall Risk
<i>High</i>	86	58	4	73
<i>Moderate</i>	21	43	39	34
<i>Low</i>	2	8	66	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>109</b>

Table 48: YASI Full Assessments: Risk


	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	25	-	-
<i>High</i>	20	99	71
<i>Moderate-High</i>	24	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	23	2	29
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	5	-	-
<i>Low</i>	5	1	2
<i>None</i>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>102</b>

Table 49: YASI Full Assessments: Protective

	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	1	-	-
<i>High</i>	6	21	10
<i>Moderate-High</i>	25	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	25	21	43
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	28	-	-
<i>Low</i>	17	10	49
<i>None</i>	0	50	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>102</b>




**Chart 16: Risk and Protective Levels of Youth**



## Release Reviews

### Reviews by Type per Month



	Annual	Cont.	Director's Request	HSD/GED	Max Release Date	Substance Abuse	Target Release Date	Total
January	1	15	1	1	0	1	25	<b>44</b>
February	1	8	0	2	0	1	28	<b>40</b>
March	1	9	13	1	0	7	34	<b>65</b>
April	0	6	17	2	0	2	11	<b>38</b>
May	0	3	2	4	0	3	10	<b>22</b>
June	0	4	0	0	2	4	5	<b>16</b>
July	0	2	0	1	0	1	16	<b>20</b>
August	0	1	0	2	0	0	14	<b>17</b>

Percent of Release Reviews by Outcome and Month



## Demographic Profile

Sex	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Male	123	94%	458	95%
Female	8	6%	24	5%

Age	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Average Age	17.7		18.4	
16 & Under	38	29%	75	16%
17 to 20	91	69%	374	78%
20.5 & Over	2	2%	28	6%

Race/Ethnicity	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
White	26	20%	84	17%
Black	89	68%	333	69%
Hispanic	12	9%	40	8%
American Indian	0	0%	1	1%
Asian	0	0%	1	1%
Multi/Biracial	4	3%	23	5%

Committing Counties <sup>i</sup>	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Cook	23	18%	149	31%
Collar Counties	10	8%	43	9%
Metro-East	7	5%	16	3%
Central	52	40%	147	31%
Southern	13	10%	41	9%
Northern	26	20%	77	16%
Other	0	0%	9	2%

Offense Class	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Murder	9	7%	3	1%
Class X Felony	38	29%	97	20%
Class 1 Felony	37	28%	133	28%
Class 2 Felony	30	23%	196	41%
Class 3 Felony	12	9%	19	4%
Class 4 Felony	5	4%	24	5%

Jurisdiction	Institutions		Aftercare	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Juvenile Court Commitments	101	77%	476	99%
Criminal Court Sentences	30	23%	6	1%

---

<sup>1</sup> Committing Counties: Cook = Cook; Collar Counties = DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, Will; Metro East Counties = Madison, St. Clair; Central IL Counties = Adams, Bond, Brown, Calhoun, Cass, Champaign, Christian, Clark, Coles, Crawford, Cumberland, Dewitt, Douglas, Edgar, Effingham, Fayette, Ford, Fulton, Greene, Hancock, Henderson, Iroquois, Jasper, Jersey, Knox, Livingston, Logan, McDonough, McLean, Macon, Macoupin, Marshall, Mason, Menard, Montgomery, Morgan, Moultrie, Peoria, Piatt, Pike, Sangamon, Schuyler, Scott, Shelby, Stark, Tazewell, Vermillion Warren, Woodford; South IL Counties = Alexander, Clay, Clinton, Edwards, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Lawrence, Marion, Massac, Monroe, Perry, Pope, Pulaski, Randolph, Richland, Saline, Union, Wabash, Washington, Wayne, White, Williamson; North, IL Counties = Boone, Bureau, Carroll, DeKalb, Grundy, Henry, Jo-Daviess, Kankakee, Kendall, LaSalle, Lee, Mercer, Ogle, Putnam, Rock Island, Stephenson, Whiteside, Winnebago; Other = Out of State



DRAFT

Monthly Report:  
July

FY2021

## Section 1: Population and Staffing Data

Table 1a: Population by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	37	40	34	19	17	16	16
<b>Harrisburg</b>	79	71	57	46	38	31	40
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	30	27	10	3	3	9	12
<b>St. Charles</b>	50	65	46	41	33	32	34
<b>Warrenville</b>	20	16	17	11	11	15	21
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>123</b>


Table 1b: Average Daily Population by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	40.0	37.2	40.3	24.9	15.7	16.2	15.2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	83.0	78.8	67.0	48.7	41.2	35.1	35.5
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	29.2	27.0	18.4	6.4	4.2	4.9	10.5
<b>St. Charles</b>	45.4	56.0	55.0	43.1	39.4	33.6	36.2
<b>Warrenville</b>	21.9	18.0	20.2	12.4	11	12.0	17.8
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>219.6</b>	<b>218.0</b>	<b>200.8</b>	<b>135.5</b>	<b>111.5</b>	<b>101.7</b>	<b>115.2</b>

Table 2: Security Staff Headcount by Facility

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	91	92					
<b>Harrisburg</b>	143	141					
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	51	51					
<b>St. Charles</b>	175	167					
<b>Warrenville</b>	71	71					
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>522</b>					

**Chart 1: Facility Populations on Last Day of Month Last Five Fiscal Years**





## Section 2: Mental Health Data

Table 5: Percent of Youth Psychotropic Medication

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	28%	62.2%	50%	55%	83.3%	76.2%	76.5%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	50.8%	56.1%	50.6%	43.5%	47.4%	37.7%	70%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	38.6%	64.9%	65.5%	70%	60%	53.8%	38.5%
<b>St. Charles</b>	60.1%	41.6%	51.9%	71.1%	60.5%	57.7%	51.1%
<b>Warrenville</b>	64.2%	71.4%	68%	70.6%	54.5%	70.6%	54.5%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>48.9%</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>54.2%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>53.7%</b>	<b>59.7%</b>


Table 7: Distribution of Mental Health Levels

	Mental Health Level 0	Mental Health Level 1	Mental Health Level 2	Mental Health Level 3	Mental Health Level 3.5	Mental Health Level 4
<b>January</b>	9.6%	53.5%	28.9%	7.5%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>February</b>	7.1%	53.5%	31.9%	6.6%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>March</b>	6.5%	50.6%	35.3%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>April</b>	7.4%	50.8%	33.6%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>May</b>	4.9%	57.3%	30.1%	7.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>June</b>	5.4%	50%	33.9%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>July</b>	4.6%	51.1%	33.6%	10.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>6.5%</b>	<b>52.4%</b>	<b>32.5%</b>	<b>8.5%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>

Table 8: Distribution of DSM V Diagnoses

	Youth with No Diagnosis	Youth with One Diagnosis	Youth with Two Diagnoses	Youth with Three Diagnoses	Youth with Four or More Diagnoses
<b>January</b>	8.27%	7.3%	20.95%	30.21%	37.91%
<b>February</b>	6.93%	5.63%	16.45%	29.87%	41.13%
<b>March</b>	5%	3.89%	11.11%	33.89%	46.11%
<b>April</b>	5.47%	3.91%	13.28%	33.59%	43.75%
<b>May</b>	1.92%	1.92%	15.38%	37.5%	43.27%
<b>June</b>	3.60%	1.80%	15.32%	31.53%	47.75%
<b>July</b>	2.94%	1.47%	19.12%	30.15%	46.32%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>5.20%</b>	<b>4.08%</b>	<b>15.42%</b>	<b>32.77%</b>	<b>43.32%</b>

**Chart 3: Percent of Youth on Psychotropic Medication**



### Section 3: Substance Abuse Treatment Data

Table 9: Number of Treatment Participants

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	14	8	8	6	2	3	4
<b>Harrisburg</b>	24	24	14	11	6	12	11
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	35	37	10	10	5	13	13
<b>St. Charles</b>	9	8	10	10	9	5	4
<b>Warrenville</b>	10	9	8	6	2	3	5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>37</b>

Table 10: Average Length of Stay for Completers

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	101	101	94	-	-	95	120
<b>Harrisburg</b>	97	56	99	49	110	75	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	147	110	-	76	46	93	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	114	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	60	60	-	61	60
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>90</b>

Table 11: Percent of Discharges by Reason


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Successful Completion</b>	52%	40.9%	37.5%	32.1%	50%	57.1%	28.6%
<b>Behavioral Discharge</b>	0%	4.5%	18.8%	0%	12.5%	0%	0%
<b>Youth Released</b>	40%	40.9%	31.2%	64.3%	37.5%	42.9%	57.1%
<b>Other Discharge</b>	8%	13.6%	12.5%	3.6%	0%	0%	14.3%

Table 12: Primary Substance Abused


	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Marijuana</b>	71.7%	76.7%	74%	77.6%	79.2%	88.9%	97.3%
<b>Alcohol</b>	5.4%	7%	4%	6.1%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Other Drugs</b>	20.7%	14%	22%	16.3%	20.8%	11.1%	2.7%
<b>No Diagnosis</b>	2.2%	2.3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

For the youth whose primary substance abuse is not specified, they reported using benzodiazepines.

**Chart 5: Number of Treatment Participants by Facility**



**Chart 6: Discharges by Reason**



## Section 4: Education Data

Table 13: Students Enrolled in School

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	42	42	30	15	14	8	8
<b>Harrisburg</b>	64	57	51	30	25	25	27
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	29	20	6	3	3	6	11
<b>St. Charles</b>	24	32	32	24	13	11	17
<b>Warrenville</b>	14	11	17	8	7	9	11
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>74</b>

Table 14: Teachers Employed

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	7	7	7	7	7	8	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	17	17	16	16	16	16	15
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>St. Charles</b>	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>40</b>

Table 15: General Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5.0	3	4.3	1.4	1.5	0.2	0.7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2.8	1.6	3.2	0.7	0.3	1.0	0.9
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3.2	2.2	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.8	1.4
<b>St. Charles</b>	2.8	4.0	4.5	1.6	1.2	1.4	2.4
<b>Warrenville</b>	2.5	2.3	3.4	1.8	1.5	1.8	2.7
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>1.4</b>

Table 16: Special Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	12	12	13	5.0	5.0	7.0	4.0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6.2	6.8	4.7	3.7	3.1	2.7	3.0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	13	4.5	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	4.0
<b>St. Charles</b>	5	6.0	3.0	8.0	3.5	2.0	2.5
<b>Warrenville</b>	4	2.0	5.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.5
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.8</b>

According to the *RJ Consent Decree*, DJJ is required to have general education student to teacher ratios of 10 youth to 1 teacher and special education student to teacher ratios of 6 youth to 1 teacher.

Table 17: Overall Diplomas Awarded

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	Total
<b>Chicago</b>	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	<b>5</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	3	4	3	0	5	2	1	<b>18</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	2	2	0	0	1	0	<b>7</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	2	2	3	2	7	2	0	<b>18</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	<b>8</b>
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>56</b>

Table 18: Percent of Special Education Students

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	29%	29%	43%	33%	35.7%	87.5%	50%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	48%	72%	65%	73%	88%	76%	66.7%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	45%	45%	50%	0%	33.3%	33.3%	36.4%
<b>St. Charles</b>	42%	38%	19%	67%	53.8%	36.4%	29.4%
<b>Warrenville</b>	29%	19%	29%	25%	14.3%	22.2%	37.3%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>58.1%</b>	<b>57.6%</b>	<b>45.9%</b>


Table 20: Youth in Continuing Education

	Post-Secondary	Collegiate
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	5	0
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	7
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	7	0
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	3
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>

Table 21: Number and Percent of Cancelled Whole School Days

	Number	Percent
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	9	100%
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	1	11%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>22%</b>

**Chart 7: Student to Teacher Ratio by Facility**



## Section 5: Reportable Incident Data

Table 21a: Number of Reportable Incidents

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	11	9	7	9	0	1	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	15	19	12	15	4	9	8
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	5	3	4	1	0	0	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	24	20	18	10	10	16	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	6	12	4	2	4	4	3
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>19</b>

Table 21b: Rate of Reportable Incidents per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	27.5	24.2	17.4	36.1	0	6.2	0	<b>15.9</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	18.1	24.1	17.9	30.8	9.7	25.6	22.5	<b>21.2</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	17.1	11.1	21.7	15.6	0	0	9.5	<b>10.7</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	52.9	35.7	32.7	23.2	25.4	47.6	19.3	<b>33.8</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	27.4	66.7	19.8	16.1	36.4	33.3	16.9	<b>30.9</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>27.3</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>24.1</b>

Table 22a: Number of Youth on Youth Assaults

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	4	1	1	4	0	1	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	9	7	7	5	3	8	1
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	6	6	8	3	1	5	2
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	3	2	1	3	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>

Table 22b: Rate of Youth on Youth Assaults per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	10	2.7	2.5	16.1	0	6.2	0	<b>5.4</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	10.8	8.9	10.4	10.3	7.3	22.8	2.8	<b>10.5</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6.8	3.7	0	0	0	0	0	<b>1.5</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	13.2	10.7	14.5	7.0	2.5	14.9	5.5	<b>9.8</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	13.7	16.7	9.9	8.1	27.3	0	0	<b>10.8</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>8.6</b>

Table 23a: Number of Youth Fights

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5	7	4	2	0	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6	7	5	10	0	0	4
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	1	4	0	0	0	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	13	12	7	5	3	9	3
<b>Warrenville</b>	2	2	0	0	0	0	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>



Table 23b: Rate of Youth Fights per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	12.5	18.8	9.9	3.0	0	0	0	<b>6.3</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	7.2	8.9	7.5	20.5	0	0	11.3	<b>7.9</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	6.8	3.7	21.7	0	0	0	9.5	<b>6.0</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	28.6	21.4	12.7	11.6	7.6	26.8	8.3	<b>16.7</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	9.1	11.1	0	0	0	0	5.6	<b>3.7</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>9.7</b>


Table 24a: Number of Youth on Staff Assaults

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	1	2	3	0	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	5	0	0	1	1	3
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	5	2	3	2	6	2	2
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	7	2	1	1	4	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>


Table 24b: Rate of Youth on Staff Assaults per 100 Youth

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	5	2.7	5.0	12.0	0	0	0	<b>3.5</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	6.3	0	0	2.4	2.8	8.5	<b>2.9</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3.4	3.7	0	15.6	0	0	0	<b>3.2</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	11	3.6	5.5	4.6	15.2	6.0	5.5	<b>7.3</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	4.6	38.9	9.9	8.1	9.1	33.3	11.2	<b>16.4</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>5.8</b>

**Chart 9: Rate of Reportable Incidents Per 100 Youth**



**Chart 10: Rate of Youth on Staff Assault Per 100 Youth**



## Section 6: Indicator Data

Table 25: Uses of Chemical Restraints

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	0	2	0	1	1	1	0
<b>Warrenville</b>	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 26: Uses of Mechanical Restraints

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	0	2	1	1	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5	6	6	1	4	1	2
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	4	2	3	3	1
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	2	0	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>

Uses of chemical and mechanical restraints have varied throughout the year, although the use in the current year is much lower than years past. Numbers and rates of uses of restraints should be related to population size and number and types of incidents. More important than how frequent they are is whether they are used according to policy and for appropriate reasons.

## Section 7: Confinement Information

Table 28a: Use of Behavioral Holds

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	10	15	15	2	1	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	66	77	67	36	21	18	21
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	1	2	1	1	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	43	70	45	21	29	50	18
<b>Warrenville</b>	14	23	13	10	7	6	18
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>57</b>

Table 28b: Rate of Behavioral Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	3	27	37	60	13	6	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	80	98	100	74	51	51	59
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3	4	11	16	24	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	95	125	82	49	74	148	50
<b>Warrenville</b>	64	128	64	81	64	50	101
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>49</b>

Table 28c: Average Length of Behavioral Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	98	89	94	78	155	48	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	165	112	147	148	132	125	133
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	40	17	292	30	14	0	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	107	95	82	80	94	62	63
<b>Warrenville</b>	62	35	111	57	60	187	108
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>103</b>

Table 29: Use of Crisis Care

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	-	-	1	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	1	-	1	-	3	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 30: Use of Medical Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	13	9	1	2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	3	-	-	-	1	1	13
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>


Table 31: Use of Administrative Hold

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	5	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 32: Use of Investigative Status

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>

Chart 12: Rate per 100 youth of Behavioral Holds



## Section 8: Aftercare Data

Table 33: Youth on Aftercare

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Total Number of Youth Assigned to Aftercare</b>	850	802	771	662	616	601	593
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	498	466	478	370	348	330	299
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	192	188	152	90	73	70	95
<b>Number of Youth with Pending Criminal Cases</b>	68	61	58	141	148	154	157
<b>Number of Youth with Warrants and Out of State</b>	92	87	83	61	47	47	42

Table 34: Caseloads in Aftercare (per Specialist)

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Number of Youth Assigned to Specialist</b>	15.7	14.9	14.3	10.5	9.6	9.1	9.0
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	11.3	10.6	10.9	8.4	7.9	7.5	6.8
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	4.4	4.3	3.4	2.1	1.7	1.6	2.2

Table 35: Average Specialist Caseload by Aftercare Office – July 2020

	Number of Specialists	Number of Youth	Average Caseload	Number of Youth in Community	Average Caseload in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	7	5	8	51	7.3
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	3	2	8.7	24	8
<b>Aurora</b>	3	4	7	17	5.7
<b>Rockford</b>	5	5	5.4	22	4.4
<b>Peoria</b>	4	7	9.5	31	7.8
<b>East St. Louis</b>	6	5	6.8	36	6
<b>Champaign</b>	3	13	10	17	5.7
<b>Springfield</b>	4	5	9	31	7.8
<b>Placement</b>	7	40	10.9	36	5.1
<b>Intensive</b>	2	9	21.5	34	17
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>6.8</b>

Table 36: Specialist Contact with Youth by Aftercare Office – July 2020

	Number of Overall Contacts	Contacts per Youth	Contacts with Youth in Community	Contacts per Youth in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	128	2.3	123	2.4
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	72	2.8	69	2.9
<b>Aurora</b>	68	3.2	67	3.9
<b>Rockford</b>	87	3.2	85	3.9
<b>Peoria</b>	91	2.4	88	2.8
<b>East St. Louis</b>	88	2.1	87	2.4
<b>Champaign</b>	72	2.4	65	3.8
<b>Springfield</b>	75	2.1	73	2.4
<b>Placement</b>	135	1.8	118	3.3
<b>Intensive</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>816</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>775</b>	<b>2.6</b>

Table 37a: Parole Revocations

	Parole Revocations Heard	Revocations Approved	Revocations Denied	Hearings Continued
<i>January</i>	8	6	2	0
<i>February</i>	15	6	7	2
<i>March</i>	13	9	4	0
<i>April</i>	1	1	0	0
<i>May</i>	2	1	1	0
<i>June</i>	1	0	1	0
<i>July</i>	12	11	1	0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>0.3</b>

Table 37b: Parole Revocation Rates

	Percent of Revocations Approved	Percent of Revocations Denied	Percent of Hearings Continued
<i>January</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>February</i>	40%	46.7%	13.3%
<i>March</i>	69.2%	30.8%	0%
<i>April</i>	100%	0%	0%
<i>May</i>	50%	50%	0%
<i>June</i>	0%	100%	0%
<i>July</i>	91.7%	8.3%	0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>60.8%</b>	<b>37.3%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>

With lower numbers of admission for technical parole violators, the numbers of parole revocation hearings held monthly has greatly decreased compared to previous years.

**Section 9: Population Stock/Flow**

Table 38: Institutional Stock/Flow

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Number of Admissions per Month</b>	49	40	25	0	12	35	30
<b>Percent of Admissions Parole Violators</b>	8.2%	25%	24%	0%	33.3%	2.9%	16.7%
<b>Number of Facility Exits per Month</b>	57	41	79	41	31	32	13
<b>Percent of Exits to Aftercare Supervision</b>	93%	90.2%	97.4%	90.2%	83.9%	87.5%	76.9%

Table 39: Aftercare Stock/Flow

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<b>Number of New Supervised Youth</b>	56	37	77	37	27	33	10
<b>Number of Exits from Aftercare</b>	33	39	41	39	46	39	33


Table 40: Admissions to Facilities by Type

	July 2020	
	Number	Percent
<b>Court Evaluation</b>	0	0%
<b>Court Evaluation Return</b>	1	3.3%
<b>Discharged and Recommitted</b>	3	10%
<b>Initial Commitment</b>	14	46.7%
<b>New Commitment</b>	7	23.3%
<b>Technical Parole Violator</b>	5	16.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	

The decrease in DJJ populations is a direct effect of both decreasing court admissions, decreasing admissions for technical violations, and decreases in length of stay during the fiscal year. Additionally, rates and numbers of discharges from Aftercare have increased as well, which has helped those numbers stay lower as well, which provides fewer youth to be readmitted into facilities. Looking at the types of admissions to DJJ, a greater percent of youth are initial commitments than in previous years.



**Chart 13: Admission Types to Facility, July 2020**



## Section 10: TRD Data for July 2020

Table 41: Adjustments by Facility

	Reductions	Extensions
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	55	4
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	26	1
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	70	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	25	4
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	9	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>10</b>

Table 42: Types of Adjustments Used

	CHI	HRG	PER	STC	WRV	DJJ Overall
<i>BARJ Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>Delinquent Program Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>Ed/Voc Reduction</i>	10	0	0	0	1	<b>11</b>
<i>Grade Level Reduction</i>	2	0	4	0	0	<b>6</b>
<i>JSO Completion Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>No Maj. Sanc. Reductions</i>	5	11	4	5	2	<b>27</b>
<i>Other Tx Reduction</i>	2	0	0	4	2	<b>8</b>
<i>SA Completion Reduction</i>	1	4	7	3	1	<b>16</b>
<i>YASI Goal Reduction</i>	35	11	55	13	3	<b>117</b>
<i>Discipline Extension</i>	4	1	0	4	1	<b>10</b>

Chart 14: Types of Adjustments used by Agency




Table 43: Frequency of BARJ Adjustment

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	2	1	6	5	0	0	0
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 44: Average Length of BARJ Adjustment

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	10	7	8	10	-	-	-
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	15	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>


Table 45: Frequency of Discipline Extensions

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	5	20	18	43	14	2	4
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	24	22	22	9	0	9	1
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	24	10	0	1	1	0	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	9	4	36	15	1	9	4
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	3	1	1	0	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>

Table 46: Average Length of Discipline Extension

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	7/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	11	4	6	8	6	5	6
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	18	11	10	7	-	7	5
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	8	11	0	30	2	-	-
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	10	12	11	7	14	5	8
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	6	5	5	-	-	10
<b>Average</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>

Summed Total Adjustment Days by Month



## Section 11: YASI

Table 47: YASI Pre-Screens: July 2020

	Legal Risk	Social Risk	Protective	Overall Risk
<i>High</i>	112	80	9	103
<i>Moderate</i>	30	55	50	38
<i>Low</i>	1	8	84	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>143</b>


Table 48: YASI Full Assessments: Risk

	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	30	-	-
<i>High</i>	20	137	100
<i>Moderate-High</i>	44	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	26	1	37
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	10	-	-
<i>Low</i>	8	0	1
<i>None</i>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>138</b>

Table 49: YASI Full Assessments: Protective


	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	3	-	-
<i>High</i>	11	24	22
<i>Moderate-High</i>	32	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	41	36	53
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	36	-	-
<i>Low</i>	15	13	63
<i>None</i>	0	65	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>138</b>

**Chart 16: Risk and Protective Levels of Youth**




## Release Reviews

### Reviews by Type per Month



	Annual	Cont.	Director's Request	HSD/GED	Max Release Date	Substance Abuse	Target Release Date	Total
January	1	15	1	1	0	1	25	<b>44</b>
February	1	8	0	2	0	1	28	<b>40</b>
March	1	9	13	1	0	7	34	<b>65</b>
April	0	6	17	2	0	2	11	<b>38</b>
May	0	3	2	4	0	3	10	<b>22</b>
June	0	4	0	0	2	4	5	<b>16</b>
July	0	2	0	1	0	1	16	<b>20</b>

Percent of Release Reviews by Outcome and Month







**Monthly Report:  
June**

**FY2020**

## Section 1: Population and Staffing Data

Table 1a: Population by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	55	61	45	44	46	41	37	40	34	19	17	16
<b>Harrisburg</b>	82	101	87	97	91	90	79	71	57	46	38	31
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	25	21	20	17	28	23	30	27	10	3	3	9
<b>St. Charles</b>	72	63	78	61	60	48	50	65	46	41	33	32
<b>Warrenville</b>	30	32	33	32	28	23	20	16	17	11	11	15
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>103</b>


Table 1b: Average Daily Population by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	50.5	55.9	54.7	45.6	46.0	45.9	40.0	37.2	40.3	24.9	15.7	16.2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	79.5	91.1	93.0	91.7	92.2	90.1	83.0	78.8	67.0	48.7	41.2	35.1
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	21.4	22.9	19.0	18.1	25.1	25.2	29.2	27.0	18.4	6.4	4.2	4.9
<b>St. Charles</b>	76.2	66.6	70.7	69.9	63.3	54.1	45.4	56.0	55.0	43.1	39.4	33.6
<b>Warrenville</b>	28.7	29.7	33.9	36.4	29.4	25.0	21.9	18.0	20.2	12.4	11	12.0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>256.2</b>	<b>266.2</b>	<b>271.2</b>	<b>261.7</b>	<b>256.1</b>	<b>240.3</b>	<b>219.6</b>	<b>218.0</b>	<b>200.8</b>	<b>135.5</b>	<b>111.5</b>	<b>101.7</b>

Table 2: Security Staff Headcount by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	90	89	84	95	96	94	91	92				
<b>Harrisburg</b>	150	151	143	143	142	140	143	141				
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	52	50	49	54	55	49	51	51				
<b>St. Charles</b>	169	163	152	164	164	162	175	167				
<b>Warrenville</b>	69	66	66	74	74	73	71	71				
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>522</b>				

**Chart 1: Facility Populations on Last Day of Month Last Five Fiscal Years**



## Section 2: Mental Health Data

Table 5: Percent of Youth Psychotropic Medication

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	32.7%	32.3%	33.3%	29.2%	25.6%	38.2%	28%	62.2%	50%	55%	83.3%	76.2%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	47.0%	41.6%	50.0%	52.6%	69.2%	67.4%	50.8%	56.1%	50.6%	43.5%	47.4%	37.7%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	44.0%	61.9%	60.0%	61.1%	42.9%	52.2%	38.6%	64.9%	65.5%	70%	60%	53.8%
<b>St. Charles</b>	57.9%	54.8%	51.8%	62.3%	65.5%	74%	60.1%	41.6%	51.9%	71.1%	60.5%	57.7%
<b>Warrenville</b>	60.0%	62.5%	60.2%	69.7%	67.9%	69.6%	64.2%	71.4%	68%	70.6%	54.5%	70.6%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>48.3%</b>	<b>50.6%</b>	<b>51.1%</b>	<b>53.3%</b>	<b>57.7%</b>	<b>63.1%</b>	<b>48.9%</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>54.2%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>53.7%</b>

Table 6: Rate of Suicide Attempts by Severity per 100 Youth

	Threats w/o Intent or Action	Mild Suicide Attempts	Moderately Severe Suicide Attempts	Severe Suicide Attempts
<b>July</b>	4.54	1.13	0.00	0.00
<b>August</b>	5.53	1.38	0.34	0.00
<b>September</b>	4.30	2.90	0.00	0.00
<b>October</b>	2.67	1.91	1.15	0.00
<b>November</b>	4.69	0.78	0.00	0.00
<b>December</b>	3.33	1.66	0.83	0.42
<b>January</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>February</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>March</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>April</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>May</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>June</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a


Table 7: Distribution of Mental Health Levels

	Mental Health Level 0	Mental Health Level 1	Mental Health Level 2	Mental Health Level 3	Mental Health Level 3.5	Mental Health Level 4
<b>July</b>	13.2%	41.6%	39.1%	5.8%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>August</b>	13.1%	53.7%	29.7%	3.2%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>September</b>	16.9%	49.5%	27.1%	6.1%	0.0%	0.3%
<b>October</b>	14.0%	47.7%	31.8%	6.1%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>November</b>	13.6%	52.5%	28.3%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>December</b>	11.4%	54.7%	25.8%	7.2%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>January</b>	9.6%	53.5%	28.9%	7.5%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>February</b>	7.1%	53.5%	31.9%	6.6%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>March</b>	6.5%	50.6%	35.3%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>April</b>	7.4%	50.8%	33.6%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>May</b>	4.9%	57.3%	30.1%	7.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>June</b>	5.4%	50%	33.9%	10.7%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>10.3%</b>	<b>51.3%</b>	<b>31.3%</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>


Table 8: Distribution of DSM V Diagnoses

	Youth with No Diagnosis	Youth with One Diagnosis	Youth with Two Diagnoses	Youth with Three Diagnoses	Youth with Four or More Diagnoses
<i>July</i>	8.71%	9.09%	26.89%	31.06%	38.26%
<i>August</i>	8.99%	7.95%	22.49%	30.44%	35.64%
<i>September</i>	7.97%	6.88%	21.37%	31.52%	40.57%
<i>October</i>	7.01%	7.38%	20.30%	27.31%	38.01%
<i>November</i>	7.20%	6.40%	17.60%	29.60%	39.20%
<i>December</i>	9.76%	6.10%	17.07%	31.30%	35.77%
<i>January</i>	8.27%	7.3%	20.95%	30.21%	37.91%
<i>February</i>	6.93%	5.63%	16.45%	29.87%	41.13%
<i>March</i>	5%	3.89%	11.11%	33.89%	46.11%
<i>April</i>	5.47%	3.91%	13.28%	33.59%	43.75%
<i>May</i>	1.92%	1.92%	15.38%	37.5%	43.27%
<i>June</i>	3.60%	1.80%	15.32%	31.53%	47.75%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>6.74%</b>	<b>5.69%</b>	<b>18.18%</b>	<b>31.49%</b>	<b>40.61%</b>

**Chart 3: Percent of Youth on Psychotropic Medication**



**Chart 4: Rate of Suicide Attempts and Threats by Type**



### Section 3: Substance Abuse Treatment Data

Table 9: Number of Treatment Participants

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	17	15	14	16	15	12	14	8	8	6	2	
<b>Harrisburg</b>	31	29	27	19	16	19	24	24	14	11	6	
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	27	28	29	26	35	35	35	37	10	10	5	
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	10	11	11	9	9	8	10	10	9	
<b>Warrenville</b>	7	5	7	13	15	13	10	9	8	6	2	
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>24</b>	

Table 10: Average Length of Stay for Completers

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	98	107	95	98	99	83	101	101	94	-	-	
<b>Harrisburg</b>	90	94	109	97	96	71	97	56	99	49	110	
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	96	87	115	100	65	117	147	110	-	76	46	
<b>St. Charles</b>	94	91	94	91	92	-	-	-	-	-	114	
<b>Warrenville</b>	60	60	-	-	-	7	-	-	60	60	-	
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>58</b>	

Table 11: Percent of Discharges by Reason


	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Successful Completion</b>	58.3%	73.9%	72.4%	36.4%	42.3%	33.3%	52%	40.9%	37.5%	32.1%	50%	
<b>Behavioral Discharge</b>	8.3%	8.7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.5%	18.8%	0%	12.5%	
<b>Youth Released</b>	12.5%	8.7%	20.7%	36.4%	30.8%	43.3%	40%	40.9%	31.2%	64.3%	37.5%	
<b>Other Discharge</b>	0%	0%	13.8%	27.3%	26.9%	23.3%	8%	13.6%	12.5%	3.6%	0%	

Table 12: Primary Substance Abused


	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Marijuana</b>	78.5%	79.8%	78.2%	68.2%	77.2%	76.1%	71.7%	76.7%	74%	77.6%	79.2%	
<b>Alcohol</b>	3.2%	4.5%	5.8%	3.5%	7.6%	6.8%	5.4%	7%	4%	6.1%	0%	
<b>Other Drugs</b>	18.3%	15.7%	14.9%	25.9%	14.1%	15.9%	20.7%	14%	22%	16.3%	20.8%	
<b>No Diagnosis</b>	0%	1.1%	1.2%	2.4%	1.1%	1.1%	2.2%	2.3%	0%	0%	0%	

For the youth whose primary substance abuse is not specified, 2 used methamphetamines, 1 used hallucinogens, and 2 used benzodiazepines.

**Chart 5: Number of Treatment Participants by Facility**



**Chart 6: Discharges by Reason**





## Section 4: Education Data

Table 13: Students Enrolled in School

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	55	55	40	39	35	35	42	42	30	15	14	8
<b>Harrisburg</b>	58	69	57	65	73	62	64	57	51	30	25	25
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	15	19	15	15	20	24	29	20	6	3	3	6
<b>St. Charles</b>	40	42	46	37	25	25	24	32	32	24	13	11
<b>Warrenville</b>	22	25	32	33	26	25	14	11	17	8	7	9
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>59</b>

Table 14: Teachers Employed

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	8	8	8	8	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	8
<b>Harrisburg</b>	18	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	16	16	16	16
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	7	7	7	7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>

Table 15: General Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5.3	5.3	3.9	3.6	4.0	3.7	5.0	3	4.3	1.4	1.5	0.2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	1.9	3.4	2	2.5	3.3	2.8	2.8	1.6	3.2	0.7	0.3	1.0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3	2.4	3.4	2.6	1.8	2.4	3.2	2.2	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.8
<b>St. Charles</b>	3.2	3.5	4.4	3.8	2.4	2.4	2.8	4.0	4.5	1.6	1.2	1.4
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	3.4	4	3.4	4.8	5.3	2.5	2.3	3.4	1.8	1.5	1.8
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.7</b>

Table 16: Special Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	9	9	6.5	14	11	13	12	12	13	5.0	5.0	7.0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6.6	5.6	5.5	7	6.6	5.8	6.2	6.8	4.7	3.7	3.1	2.7
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2.5	3.5	6	5	11	12	13	4.5	3.0	3.0	1.0	2.0
<b>St. Charles</b>	5.3	5.3	8	9	6.5	6.5	5	6.0	3.0	8.0	3.5	2.0
<b>Warrenville</b>	3.5	4	4	8	7	4	4	2.0	5.0	2.0	1.0	2.0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.8</b>

According to the *RJ Consent Decree*, DJJ is required to have general education student to teacher ratios of 10 youth to 1 teacher and special education student to teacher ratios of 6 youth to 1 teacher.

Table 17: Overall Diplomas Awarded

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	Total
<b>Chicago</b>	1	3	0	0	3	3	2	0	2	1	0	0	15
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	9	5	4	4	4	3	4	3	0	5	2	43
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	1	2	1	0	2	2	2	0	0	1	11
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	4	2	5	4	4	2	2	3	2	7	2	38
<b>Warrenville</b>	0	1	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	1	1	2	12
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	2	17	8	10	14	14	11	8	10	4	13	7	118

Table 18: Percent of Special Education Students

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	33%	33%	33%	36%	31%	37%	29%	29%	43%	33%	35.7%	87.5%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	57%	41%	58%	54%	45%	49%	48%	72%	65%	73%	88%	76%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	33%	37%	40%	33%	55%	50%	45%	45%	50%	0%	33.3%	33.3%
<b>St. Charles</b>	53%	50%	52%	49%	52%	52%	42%	38%	19%	67%	53.8%	36.4%
<b>Warrenville</b>	32%	32%	38%	49%	27%	16%	29%	19%	29%	25%	14.3%	22.2%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	44%	39%	46%	47%	42%	42%	41%	47%	44%	56%	58.1%	57.6%


Table 20: Youth in Continuing Education

	Post-Secondary	Collegiate
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	4	0
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	7	7
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	1	0
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	6	6
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	18	13

Table 21: Number and Percent of Cancelled Whole School Days

	Number	Percent
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	0%

**Chart 7: Student to Teacher Ratio by Facility**



## Section 5: Reportable Incident Data

Table 21a: Number of Reportable Incidents

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	28	20	26	6	11	7	11	9	7	9	0	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	26	19	24	42	24	32	15	19	12	15	4	9
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	5	6	2	11	22	11	5	3	4	1	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	49	55	72	104	47	17	24	20	18	10	10	16
<b>Warrenville</b>	28	30	22	18	10	8	6	12	4	2	4	4
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>30</b>

Table 21b: Rate of Reportable Incidents per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	50.9	32.3	57.8	13.2	23.9	15.3	27.5	24.2	17.4	36.1	0	6.2	<b>25.4</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	30.6	18.8	27.3	45.8	26.0	35.5	18.1	24.1	17.9	30.8	9.7	25.6	<b>25.9</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	20.0	28.6	10.0	60.8	87.6	43.7	17.1	11.1	21.7	15.6	0	0	<b>26.4</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	71.0	75.3	84.7	148.8	74.2	31.4	52.9	35.7	32.7	23.2	25.4	47.6	<b>58.8</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	93.3	93.8	57.9	49.5	34.0	32	27.4	66.7	19.8	16.1	36.4	33.3	<b>46.7</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>51.52</b>	<b>44.98</b>	<b>52.90</b>	<b>69.2</b>	<b>44.5</b>	<b>31.2</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>27.3</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>37.2</b>

Table 22a: Number of Youth on Youth Assaults

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	4	5	2	1	3	2	4	1	1	4	0	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5	11	11	17	13	17	9	7	7	5	3	8
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	4	1	3	3	3	2	1	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	9	29	15	31	10	3	6	6	8	3	1	5
<b>Warrenville</b>	5	4	2	1	1	2	3	3	2	1	3	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14</b>

Table 22b: Rate of Youth on Youth Assaults per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	7.3	8.1	4.4	2.2	6.5	4.4	10	2.7	2.5	16.1	0	6.2	<b>5.9</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5.9	10.9	12.5	18.5	14.1	18.9	10.8	8.9	10.4	10.3	7.3	22.8	<b>12.6</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	4.0	19.0	5.0	16.6	12.0	11.9	6.8	3.7	0	0	0	0	<b>6.6</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	13.0	39.7	17.6	44.3	15.8	5.5	13.2	10.7	14.5	7.0	2.5	14.9	<b>16.6</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	16.7	12.5	5.3	2.7	3.4	8	13.7	16.7	9.9	8.1	27.3	0	<b>10.4</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>11.6</b>

Table 23a: Number of Youth Fights

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	12	4	14	5	8	3	5	7	4	2	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	13	3	8	18	10	13	6	7	5	10	0	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	4	1	3	10	4	2	1	4	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	13	23	60	25	7	13	12	7	5	3	9
<b>Warrenville</b>	11	2	9	11	3	5	2	2	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>

Table 23b: Rate of Youth Fights per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	21.8	6.5	31.1	11	17.4	6.5	12.5	18.8	9.9	3.0	0	0	<b>11.5</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	15.3	3.0	9.1	19.6	10.8	14.4	7.2	8.9	7.5	20.5	0	0	<b>9.7</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	4.0	19.0	5.0	16.6	39.8	15.9	6.8	3.7	21.7	0	0	0	<b>11.0</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	14.5	17.8	27.1	85.8	39.5	12.9	28.6	21.4	12.7	11.6	7.6	26.8	<b>25.5</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	36.7	6.3	23.7	30.2	10.2	20.0	9.1	11.1	0	0	0	0	<b>12.3</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>19.9</b>	<b>37.1</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>14.9</b>


Table 24a: Number of Youth on Staff Assaults

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5	2	3	0	0	2	2	1	2	3	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2	4	4	7	1	2	0	5	0	0	1	1
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	2	0	5	9	4	1	1	0	1	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	3	9	13	13	11	7	5	2	3	2	6	2
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	4	1	6	6	1	1	7	2	1	1	4
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>


Table 24b: Rate of Youth on Staff Assaults per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	9.1	3.2	6.7	0	0	4.4	5	2.7	5.0	12.0	0	0	<b>4.0</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2.4	4.0	4.5	7.6	1.1	2.2	0	6.3	0	0	2.4	2.8	<b>2.8</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	8.0	9.5	0.0	27.6	35.9	15.9	3.4	3.7	0	15.6	0	0	<b>10.0</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	4.3	12.3	15.3	18.6	17.4	12.9	11	3.6	5.5	4.6	15.2	6.0	<b>10.6</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	10.0	12.5	2.6	16.5	20.4	4	4.6	38.9	9.9	8.1	9.1	33.3	<b>14.2</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>11.8</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>7.0</b>

**Chart 9: Rate of Reportable Incidents Per 100 Youth**



**Chart 10: Rate of Youth on Staff Assault Per 100 Youth**



## Section 6: Indicator Data

Table 25: Uses of Chemical Restraints

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	0	2	2	7	3	0	0	2	0	1	1	1
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

Table 26: Uses of Mechanical Restraints

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	4	0	0	3	1	1	0	2	1	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6	4	7	9	7	3	5	6	6	1	4	1
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	2	8	4	1	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>		18	8	24	7	8	10	10	4	2	3	3
<b>Warrenville</b>	10	5	7	11	0	2	3	2	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>

Uses of chemical and mechanical restraints have varied throughout the year, although the use in the current year is much lower than years past. Numbers and rates of uses of restraints should be related to population size and number and types of incidents. More important than how frequent they are is whether they are used according to policy and for appropriate reasons.

## Section 7: Confinement Information

Table 28a: Use of Behavioral Holds

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	26	28	48	7	10	16	1	10	15	15	2	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	87	66	77	74	58	112	66	77	67	36	21	18
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	3	0	4	12	5	1	1	2	1	1	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	36	48	40	46	68	34	43	70	45	21	29	50
<b>Warrenville</b>	30	17	31	35	16	19	14	23	13	10	7	6
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>75</b>

Table 28b: Rate of Behavioral Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	54	57	94	15	22	35	3	27	37	60	13	6
<b>Harrisburg</b>	116	78	109	81	63	124	80	98	100	74	51	51
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	10	0	22	48	20	3	4	11	16	24	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	35	49	39	66	107	63	95	125	82	49	74	148
<b>Warrenville</b>	115	59	119	96	54	76	64	128	64	81	64	50
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>74</b>

Table 28c: Average Length of Behavioral Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	78	82	88	73	62	143	98	89	94	78	155	48
<b>Harrisburg</b>	117	114	93	128	110	123	165	112	147	148	132	125
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	38	0	62	78	64	40	17	292	30	14	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	73	65	85	168	69	174	107	95	82	80	94	62
<b>Warrenville</b>	111	87	108	93	86	56	62	35	111	57	60	187
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>87</b>

Table 29: Use of Crisis Care

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	1	2	4	3	1	1	1	-	-	1	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	4	15	10	2	1	1	1	1	-	1	-	3
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	2	2	3	3	1	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>

Table 30: Use of Medical Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	13	9	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	2	2	2	1	-	1	3	-	-	-	1	1
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>




Table 31: Use of Administrative Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	18	-	1	5	-	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	1	0	1	19	0	1	6	0	0	0	0

Table 32: Use of Investigative Status

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0

Chart 12: Rate per 100 youth of Behavioral Holds



## Section 8: Aftercare Data

Table 33: Youth on Aftercare

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Total Number of Youth Assigned to Aftercare</b>	850	802	771	662	616	601
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	498	466	478	370	348	330
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	192	188	152	90	73	70
<b>Number of Youth with Pending Criminal Cases</b>	68	61	58	141	148	154
<b>Number of Youth with Warrants and Out of State</b>	92	87	83	61	47	47

Table 34: Caseloads in Aftercare (per Specialist)

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Number of Youth Assigned to Specialist</b>	15.7	14.9	14.3	10.5	9.6	9.1
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	11.3	10.6	10.9	8.4	7.9	7.5
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	4.4	4.3	3.4	2.1	1.7	1.6

Table 35: Average Specialist Caseload by Aftercare Office – June 2020

	Number of Specialists	Number of Youth	Average Caseload	Number of Youth in Community	Average Caseload in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	7	58	8.3	52	7.4
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	3	31	10.3	30	10
<b>Aurora</b>	3	22	7.3	21	7
<b>Rockford</b>	5	31	6.2	27	5.4
<b>Peoria</b>	4	43	10.8	36	9
<b>East St. Louis</b>	6	49	8.2	48	8
<b>Champaign</b>	3	14	4.7	11	3.7
<b>Springfield</b>	4	40	10	35	8.8
<b>Placement</b>	7	76	10.9	42	6
<b>Intensive</b>	2	36	18	28	14
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>7.5</b>

Table 36: Specialist Contact with Youth by Aftercare Office – June 2020

	Number of Overall Contacts	Contacts per Youth	Contacts with Youth in Community	Contacts per Youth in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	112	1.9	111	2.1
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	63	2.0	63	2.1
<b>Aurora</b>	52	2.4	51	2.4
<b>Rockford</b>	84	2.7	84	3.1
<b>Peoria</b>	84	2.0	84	2.3
<b>East St. Louis</b>	80	1.6	79	1.6
<b>Champaign</b>	59	4.2	58	5.3
<b>Springfield</b>	74	1.9	73	2.1
<b>Placement</b>	127	1.7	103	2.5
<b>Intensive</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>735</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>706</b>	<b>2.1</b>

Table 37a: Parole Revocations

	Parole Revocations Heard	Revocations Approved	Revocations Denied	Hearings Continued
<i>July</i>	29	18	10	1
<i>August</i>	25	16	7	2
<i>September</i>	20	11	9	0
<i>October</i>	18	12	6	0
<i>November</i>	12	9	3	0
<i>December</i>	16	11	5	0
<i>January</i>	8	6	2	0
<i>February</i>	15	6	7	2
<i>March</i>	13	9	4	0
<i>April</i>	1	1	0	0
<i>May</i>	2	1	1	0
<i>June</i>	1	0	1	0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>0.4</b>

Table 37b: Parole Revocation Rates

	Percent of Revocations Approved	Percent of Revocations Denied	Percent of Hearings Continued
<i>July</i>	62.1%	34.5%	3.4%
<i>August</i>	64%	28%	8%
<i>September</i>	55%	45%	0%
<i>October</i>	66.7%	33.3%	0%
<i>November</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>December</i>	68.8%	31.3%	0%
<i>January</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>February</i>	40%	46.7%	13.3%
<i>March</i>	69.2%	30.8%	0%
<i>April</i>	100%	0%	0%
<i>May</i>	50%	50%	0%
<i>June</i>	0%	100%	0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>60.4%</b>	<b>37.5%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>

With lower numbers of admission for technical parole violators, the numbers of parole revocation hearings held monthly has greatly decreased compared to previous years.

## Section 9: Population Stock/Flow

Table 38: Institutional Stock/Flow

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Number of Admissions per Month</b>	73	67	51	50	51	36	49	40	25	0	12	35
<b>Percent of Admissions Parole Violators</b>	23.3%	19.4%	15.7%	14%	19.6%	13.9%	8.2%	25%	24%	0%	33.3%	2.9%
<b>Number of Facility Exits per Month</b>	62	49	61	66	52	65	57	41	79	41	31	32
<b>Percent of Exits to Aftercare Supervision</b>	91.9%	87.7%	88.5%	86.4%	94.2%	92.3%	93%	90.2%	97.4%	90.2%	83.9%	87.5%

Table 39: Aftercare Stock/Flow


	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<b>Number of New Supervised Youth</b>	57	43	54	57	49	60	56	37	77	37	27	33
<b>Number of Exits from Aftercare</b>	47	37	40	32	42	46	33	39	41	39	46	39

Table 40: Admissions to Facilities by Type

	June 2020	
	Number	Percent
<b>Court Evaluation</b>	1	2.9%
<b>Court Evaluation Return</b>	1	2.9%
<b>Discharged and Recommitted</b>	5	14.3%
<b>Initial Commitment</b>	22	62.9%
<b>New Commitment</b>	5	14.3%
<b>Technical Parole Violator</b>	1	2.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	

The decrease in DJJ populations is a direct effect of both decreasing court admissions, decreasing admissions for technical violations, and decreases in length of stay during the fiscal year. Additionally, rates and numbers of discharges from Aftercare have increased as well, which has helped those numbers stay lower as well, which provides fewer youth to be readmitted into facilities. Looking at the types of admissions to DJJ, a greater percent of youth are initial commitments than in previous years.

**Chart 13: Admission Types to Facility, June 2020**



**Section 10: TRD Data for June 2020**

Table 41: Adjustments by Facility

	Reductions	Extensions
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	87	2
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	30	9
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	35	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	36	10
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	24	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>20</b>

Table 42: Types of Adjustments Used

	CHI	HRG	PER	STC	WRV	DJJ Overall
<i>BARJ Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>Delinquent Program Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>Ed/Voc Reduction</i>	6	1	1	3	8	<b>19</b>
<i>Grade Level Reduction</i>	6	4	0	3	1	<b>14</b>
<i>JSO Completion Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>No Maj. Sanc. Reductions</i>	12	6	2	5	3	<b>28</b>
<i>Other Tx Reduction</i>	4	1	0	0	6	<b>11</b>
<i>SA Completion Reduction</i>	11	5	3	2	3	<b>24</b>
<i>YASI Goal Reduction</i>	48	13	29	23	3	<b>116</b>
<i>Discipline Extension</i>	2	9	0	9	0	<b>20</b>

**Chart 14: Types of Adjustments used by Agency**




Table 43: Frequency of BARJ Adjustment

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	1	3	4	1	2	1	2	1	6	5	0	0
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 44: Average Length of BARJ Adjustment

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	10	7	6	4	7	5	10	7	8	10	-	-
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>


Table 45: Frequency of Discipline Extensions

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	46	46	10	41	14	41	5	20	18	43	14	2
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	30	13	21	18	14	37	24	22	22	9	0	9
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	5	11	5	6	6	22	24	10	0	1	1	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	9	28	36	46	21	21	9	4	36	15	1	9
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	33	11	19	20	3	5	5	3	1	1	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20</b>

Table 46: Average Length of Discipline Extension

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	6/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	6	5	7	5	9	5	11	4	6	8	6	5
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	8	9	12	11	11	11	18	11	10	7	-	7
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	19	11	5	5	7	12	8	11	0	30	2	-
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	8	5	8	11	7	7	10	12	11	7	14	5
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	6	5	5	-	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>

Summed Total Adjustment Days by Month





## Section 11: YASI

Table 47: YASI Pre-Screens: April 2020

	Legal Risk	Social Risk	Protective	Overall Risk
<i>High</i>	111	60	8	91
<i>Moderate</i>	27	69	43	46
<i>Low</i>	0	9	87	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>138</b>


Table 48: YASI Full Assessments: Risk

	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	22	-	-
<i>High</i>	22	132	91
<i>Moderate-High</i>	47	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	26	5	45
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	8	-	-
<i>Low</i>	12	0	1
<i>None</i>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>137</b>

Table 49: YASI Full Assessments: Protective


	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	5	-	-
<i>High</i>	13	27	20
<i>Moderate-High</i>	27	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	44	23	59
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	29	-	-
<i>Low</i>	18	19	57
<i>None</i>	1	68	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>137</b>

**Chart 16: Risk and Protective Levels of Youth**




## Release Reviews

### Reviews by Type per Month



	Annual	Cont.	Director's Request	HSD/GED	Max Release Date	Substance Abuse	Target Release Date	Total
July	0	11	2	5	0	10	15	<b>43</b>
August	0	10	0	7	0	3	30	<b>50</b>
September	1	5	2	3	1	5	36	<b>53</b>
October	0	10	0	4	1	3	44	<b>62</b>
November	1	11	1	4	0	3	33	<b>53</b>
December	1	16	2	4	2	3	35	<b>63</b>
January	1	15	1	1	0	1	25	<b>44</b>
February	1	8	0	2	0	1	28	<b>40</b>
March	1	9	13	1	0	7	34	<b>65</b>
April	0	6	17	2	0	2	11	<b>38</b>
May	0	3	2	4	0	3	10	<b>22</b>
June	0	4	0	0	2	4	5	<b>16</b>

Percent of Release Reviews by Outcome and Month





**Monthly Report:  
May**

**FY2020**

## Section 1: Population and Staffing Data

Table 1a: Population by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	55	61	45	44	46	41	37	40	34	19	17
<b>Harrisburg</b>	82	101	87	97	91	90	79	71	57	46	38
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	25	21	20	17	28	23	30	27	10	3	3
<b>St. Charles</b>	72	63	78	61	60	48	50	65	46	41	33
<b>Warrenville</b>	30	32	33	32	28	23	20	16	17	11	11
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>102</b>


Table 1b: Average Daily Population by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	50.5	55.9	54.7	45.6	46.0	45.9	40.0	37.2	40.3	24.9	15.7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	79.5	91.1	93.0	91.7	92.2	90.1	83.0	78.8	67.0	48.7	41.2
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	21.4	22.9	19.0	18.1	25.1	25.2	29.2	27.0	18.4	6.4	4.2
<b>St. Charles</b>	76.2	66.6	70.7	69.9	63.3	54.1	45.4	56.0	55.0	43.1	39.4
<b>Warrenville</b>	28.7	29.7	33.9	36.4	29.4	25.0	21.9	18.0	20.2	12.4	11
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>256.2</b>	<b>266.2</b>	<b>271.2</b>	<b>261.7</b>	<b>256.1</b>	<b>240.3</b>	<b>219.6</b>	<b>218.0</b>	<b>200.8</b>	<b>135.5</b>	<b>111.5</b>

Table 2: Security Staff Headcount by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	90	89	84	95	96	94	91	92			
<b>Harrisburg</b>	150	151	143	143	142	140	143	141			
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	52	50	49	54	55	49	51	51			
<b>St. Charles</b>	169	163	152	164	164	162	175	167			
<b>Warrenville</b>	69	66	66	74	74	73	71	71			
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>522</b>			

**Chart 1: Facility Populations on Last Day of Month Last Five Fiscal Years**



## Section 2: Mental Health Data

Table 5: Percent of Youth Psychotropic Medication

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	32.7%	32.3%	33.3%	29.2%	25.6%	38.2%	28%	62.2%	50%	55%	83.3%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	47.0%	41.6%	50.0%	52.6%	69.2%	67.4%	50.8%	56.1%	50.6%	43.5%	47.4%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	44.0%	61.9%	60.0%	61.1%	42.9%	52.2%	38.6%	64.9%	65.5%	70%	60%
<b>St. Charles</b>	57.9%	54.8%	51.8%	62.3%	65.5%	74%	60.1%	41.6%	51.9%	71.1%	60.5%
<b>Warrenville</b>	60.0%	62.5%	60.2%	69.7%	67.9%	69.6%	64.2%	71.4%	68%	70.6%	54.5%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>48.3%</b>	<b>50.6%</b>	<b>51.1%</b>	<b>53.3%</b>	<b>57.7%</b>	<b>63.1%</b>	<b>48.9%</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>54.2%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>

Table 6: Rate of Suicide Attempts by Severity per 100 Youth

	Threats w/o Intent or Action	Mild Suicide Attempts	Moderately Severe Suicide Attempts	Severe Suicide Attempts
<b>July</b>	4.54	1.13	0.00	0.00
<b>August</b>	5.53	1.38	0.34	0.00
<b>September</b>	4.30	2.90	0.00	0.00
<b>October</b>	2.67	1.91	1.15	0.00
<b>November</b>	4.69	0.78	0.00	0.00
<b>December</b>	3.33	1.66	0.83	0.42
<b>January</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>February</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>March</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>April</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>May</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Table 7: Distribution of Mental Health Levels


	Mental Health Level 0	Mental Health Level 1	Mental Health Level 2	Mental Health Level 3	Mental Health Level 3.5	Mental Health Level 4
<b>July</b>	13.2%	41.6%	39.1%	5.8%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>August</b>	13.1%	53.7%	29.7%	3.2%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>September</b>	16.9%	49.5%	27.1%	6.1%	0.0%	0.3%
<b>October</b>	14.0%	47.7%	31.8%	6.1%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>November</b>	13.6%	52.5%	28.3%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>December</b>	11.4%	54.7%	25.8%	7.2%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>January</b>	9.6%	53.5%	28.9%	7.5%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>February</b>	7.1%	53.5%	31.9%	6.6%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>March</b>	6.5%	50.6%	35.3%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>April</b>	7.4%	50.8%	33.6%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>May</b>	4.9%	57.3%	30.1%	7.8%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>10.7%</b>	<b>51.4%</b>	<b>31.1%</b>	<b>6.5%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>




Table 8: Distribution of DSM V Diagnoses

	Youth with No Diagnosis	Youth with One Diagnosis	Youth with Two Diagnoses	Youth with Three Diagnoses	Youth with Four or More Diagnoses
<i>July</i>	8.71%	9.09%	26.89%	31.06%	38.26%
<i>August</i>	8.99%	7.95%	22.49%	30.44%	35.64%
<i>September</i>	7.97%	6.88%	21.37%	31.52%	40.57%
<i>October</i>	7.01%	7.38%	20.30%	27.31%	38.01%
<i>November</i>	7.20%	6.40%	17.60%	29.60%	39.20%
<i>December</i>	9.76%	6.10%	17.07%	31.30%	35.77%
<i>January</i>	8.27%	7.3%	20.95%	30.21%	37.91%
<i>February</i>	6.93%	5.63%	16.45%	29.87%	41.13%
<i>March</i>	5%	3.89%	11.11%	33.89%	46.11%
<i>April</i>	5.47%	3.91%	13.28%	33.59%	43.75%
<i>May</i>	1.92%	1.92%	15.38%	37.5%	43.27%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>7.02%</b>	<b>6.04%</b>	<b>18.44%</b>	<b>31.48%</b>	<b>39.97%</b>

**Chart 3: Percent of Youth on Psychotropic Medication**



**Chart 4: Rate of Suicide Attempts and Threats by Type**



### Section 3: Substance Abuse Treatment Data

Table 9: Number of Treatment Participants

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	17	15	14	16	15	12	14	8	8	6	2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	31	29	27	19	16	19	24	24	14	11	6
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	27	28	29	26	35	35	35	37	10	10	5
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	10	11	11	9	9	8	10	10	9
<b>Warrenville</b>	7	5	7	13	15	13	10	9	8	6	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>24</b>

Table 10: Average Length of Stay for Completers

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	98	107	95	98	99	83	101	101	94	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	90	94	109	97	96	71	97	56	99	49	110
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	96	87	115	100	65	117	147	110	-	76	46
<b>St. Charles</b>	94	91	94	91	92	-	-	-	-	-	114
<b>Warrenville</b>	60	60	-	-	-	7	-	-	60	60	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>58</b>

Table 11: Percent of Discharges by Reason


	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Successful Completion</b>	58.3%	73.9%	72.4%	36.4%	42.3%	33.3%	52%	40.9%	37.5%	32.1%	50%
<b>Behavioral Discharge</b>	8.3%	8.7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.5%	18.8%	0%	12.5%
<b>Youth Released</b>	12.5%	8.7%	20.7%	36.4%	30.8%	43.3%	40%	40.9%	31.2%	64.3%	37.5%
<b>Other Discharge</b>	0%	0%	13.8%	27.3%	26.9%	23.3%	8%	13.6%	12.5%	3.6%	0%

Table 12: Primary Substance Abused


	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Marijuana</b>	78.5%	79.8%	78.2%	68.2%	77.2%	76.1%	71.7%	76.7%	74%	77.6%	79.2%
<b>Alcohol</b>	3.2%	4.5%	5.8%	3.5%	7.6%	6.8%	5.4%	7%	4%	6.1%	0%
<b>Other Drugs</b>	18.3%	15.7%	14.9%	25.9%	14.1%	15.9%	20.7%	14%	22%	16.3%	20.8%
<b>No Diagnosis</b>	0%	1.1%	1.2%	2.4%	1.1%	1.1%	2.2%	2.3%	0%	0%	0%

For the youth whose primary substance abuse is not specified, 2 used methamphetamines, 1 used hallucinogens, and 2 used benzodiazepines.

**Chart 5: Number of Treatment Participants by Facility**



**Chart 6: Discharges by Reason**



## Section 4: Education Data

Table 13: Students Enrolled in School

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	55	55	40	39	35	35	42	42	30	15	14
<b>Harrisburg</b>	58	69	57	65	73	62	64	57	51	30	25
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	15	19	15	15	20	24	29	20	6	3	3
<b>St. Charles</b>	40	42	46	37	25	25	24	32	32	24	13
<b>Warrenville</b>	22	25	32	33	26	25	14	11	17	8	7
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>62</b>

Table 14: Teachers Employed

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	8	8	8	8	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	18	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	16	16	16
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	7	7	7	7	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>

Table 15: General Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5.3	5.3	3.9	3.6	4.0	3.7	5.0	3	4.3	1.4	1.5
<b>Harrisburg</b>	1.9	3.4	2	2.5	3.3	2.8	2.8	1.6	3.2	0.7	0.3
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3	2.4	3.4	2.6	1.8	2.4	3.2	2.2	1.0	0.6	0.4
<b>St. Charles</b>	3.2	3.5	4.4	3.8	2.4	2.4	2.8	4.0	4.5	1.6	1.2
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	3.4	4	3.4	4.8	5.3	2.5	2.3	3.4	1.8	1.5
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.8</b>

Table 16: Special Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	9	9	6.5	14	11	13	12	12	13	5.0	5.0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6.6	5.6	5.5	7	6.6	5.8	6.2	6.8	4.7	3.7	3.1
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2.5	3.5	6	5	11	12	13	4.5	3.0	3.0	1.0
<b>St. Charles</b>	5.3	5.3	8	9	6.5	6.5	5	6.0	3.0	8.0	3.5
<b>Warrenville</b>	3.5	4	4	8	7	4	4	2.0	5.0	2.0	1.0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.0</b>

According to the *RJ Consent Decree*, DJJ is required to have general education student to teacher ratios of 10 youth to 1 teacher and special education student to teacher ratios of 6 youth to 1 teacher. All DJJ facilities are in compliance with standards.

Table 17: Overall Diplomas Awarded

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	Total
<b>Chicago</b>	1	3	0	0	3	3	2	0	2	1	0	<b>15</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	9	5	4	4	4	3	4	3	0	5	<b>41</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	1	2	1	0	2	2	2	0	0	<b>10</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	4	2	5	4	4	2	2	3	2	7	<b>36</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	0	1	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	1	1	<b>10</b>
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>111</b>

Table 18: Percent of Special Education Students

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	33%	33%	33%	36%	31%	37%	29%	29%	43%	33%	35.7%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	57%	41%	58%	54%	45%	49%	48%	72%	65%	73%	88%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	33%	37%	40%	33%	55%	50%	45%	45%	50%	0%	33.3%
<b>St. Charles</b>	53%	50%	52%	49%	52%	52%	42%	38%	19%	67%	53.8%
<b>Warrenville</b>	32%	32%	38%	49%	27%	16%	29%	19%	29%	25%	14.3%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>58.1%</b>


Table 20: Youth in Continuing Education

	Post-Secondary	Collegiate
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	3	0
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	5	5
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	1	0
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	6	6
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>

Table 21: Number and Percent of Cancelled Whole School Days

	Number	Percent
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

**Chart 7: Student to Teacher Ratio by Facility**



## Section 5: Reportable Incident Data

Table 21a: Number of Reportable Incidents

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	28	20	26	6	11	7	11	9	7	9	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	26	19	24	42	24	32	15	19	12	15	4
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	5	6	2	11	22	11	5	3	4	1	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	49	55	72	104	47	17	24	20	18	10	10
<b>Warrenville</b>	28	30	22	18	10	8	6	12	4	2	4
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>18</b>

Table 21b: Rate of Reportable Incidents per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	50.9	32.3	57.8	13.2	23.9	15.3	27.5	24.2	17.4	36.1	0	<b>27.1</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	30.6	18.8	27.3	45.8	26.0	35.5	18.1	24.1	17.9	30.8	9.7	<b>25.9</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	20.0	28.6	10.0	60.8	87.6	43.7	17.1	11.1	21.7	15.6	0	<b>28.7</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	71.0	75.3	84.7	148.8	74.2	31.4	52.9	35.7	32.7	23.2	25.4	<b>59.6</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	93.3	93.8	57.9	49.5	34.0	32	27.4	66.7	19.8	16.1	36.4	<b>47.9</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>51.52</b>	<b>44.98</b>	<b>52.90</b>	<b>69.2</b>	<b>44.5</b>	<b>31.2</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>27.3</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>37.9</b>

Table 22a: Number of Youth on Youth Assaults

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	4	5	2	1	3	2	4	1	1	4	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5	11	11	17	13	17	9	7	7	5	3
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	4	1	3	3	3	2	1	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	9	29	15	31	10	3	6	6	8	3	1
<b>Warrenville</b>	5	4	2	1	1	2	3	3	2	1	3
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>

Table 22b: Rate of Youth on Youth Assaults per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	7.3	8.1	4.4	2.2	6.5	4.4	10	2.7	2.5	16.1	0	<b>5.8</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5.9	10.9	12.5	18.5	14.1	18.9	10.8	8.9	10.4	10.3	7.3	<b>11.7</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	4.0	19.0	5.0	16.6	12.0	11.9	6.8	3.7	0	0	0	<b>7.2</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	13.0	39.7	17.6	44.3	15.8	5.5	13.2	10.7	14.5	7.0	2.5	<b>16.7</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	16.7	12.5	5.3	2.7	3.4	8	13.7	16.7	9.9	8.1	27.3	<b>11.3</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>11.4</b>

Table 23a: Number of Youth Fights

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	12	4	14	5	8	3	5	7	4	2	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	13	3	8	18	10	13	6	7	5	10	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	4	1	3	10	4	2	1	4	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	13	23	60	25	7	13	12	7	5	3
<b>Warrenville</b>	11	2	9	11	3	5	2	2	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>



Table 23b: Rate of Youth Fights per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	21.8	6.5	31.1	11	17.4	6.5	12.5	18.8	9.9	3.0	0	<b>12.6</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	15.3	3.0	9.1	19.6	10.8	14.4	7.2	8.9	7.5	20.5	0	<b>10.6</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	4.0	19.0	5.0	16.6	39.8	15.9	6.8	3.7	21.7	0	0	<b>12.0</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	14.5	17.8	27.1	85.8	39.5	12.9	28.6	21.4	12.7	11.6	7.6	<b>25.4</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	36.7	6.3	23.7	30.2	10.2	20.0	9.1	11.1	0	0	0	<b>13.4</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>19.9</b>	<b>37.1</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>15.5</b>


Table 24a: Number of Youth on Staff Assaults

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5	2	3	0	0	2	2	1	2	3	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2	4	4	7	1	2	0	5	0	0	1
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	2	0	5	9	4	1	1	0	1	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	3	9	13	13	11	7	5	2	3	2	6
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	4	1	6	6	1	1	7	2	1	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>


Table 24b: Rate of Youth on Staff Assaults per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	9.1	3.2	6.7	0	0	4.4	5	2.7	5.0	12.0	0	<b>4.4</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2.4	4.0	4.5	7.6	1.1	2.2	0	6.3	0	0	2.4	<b>2.8</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	8.0	9.5	0.0	27.6	35.9	15.9	3.4	3.7	0	15.6	0	<b>10.9</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	4.3	12.3	15.3	18.6	17.4	12.9	11	3.6	5.5	4.6	15.2	<b>11.0</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	10.0	12.5	2.6	16.5	20.4	4	4.6	38.9	9.9	8.1	9.1	<b>12.4</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>11.8</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>7.0</b>

**Chart 9: Rate of Reportable Incidents Per 100 Youth**



**Chart 10: Rate of Youth on Staff Assault Per 100 Youth**



## Section 6: Indicator Data

Table 25: Uses of Chemical Restraints

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	0	2	2	7	3	0	0	2	0	1	1
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

Table 26: Uses of Mechanical Restraints

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	4	0	0	3	1	1	0	2	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6	4	7	9	7	3	5	6	6	1	4
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	2	8	4	1	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>		18	8	24	7	8	10	10	4	2	3
<b>Warrenville</b>	10	5	7	11	0	2	3	2	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>

Uses of chemical and mechanical restraints have varied throughout the year, although the use in the current year is much lower than years past. Numbers and rates of uses of restraints should be related to population size and number and types of incidents. More important than how frequent they are is whether they are used according to policy and for appropriate reasons.

## Section 7: Confinement Information

Table 28a: Use of Behavioral Holds

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	26	28	48	7	10	16	1	10	15	15	2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	87	66	77	74	58	112	66	77	67	36	21
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	3	0	4	12	5	1	1	2	1	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	36	48	40	46	68	34	43	70	45	21	29
<b>Warrenville</b>	30	17	31	35	16	19	14	23	13	10	7
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>60</b>

Table 28b: Rate of Behavioral Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	54	57	94	15	22	35	3	27	37	60	13
<b>Harrisburg</b>	116	78	109	81	63	124	80	98	100	74	51
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	10	0	22	48	20	3	4	11	16	24
<b>St. Charles</b>	35	49	39	66	107	63	95	125	82	49	74
<b>Warrenville</b>	115	59	119	96	54	76	64	128	64	81	64
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>54</b>

Table 28c: Average Length of Behavioral Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	78	82	88	73	62	143	98	89	94	78	155
<b>Harrisburg</b>	117	114	93	128	110	123	165	112	147	148	132
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	38	0	62	78	64	40	17	292	30	14
<b>St. Charles</b>	73	65	85	168	69	174	107	95	82	80	94
<b>Warrenville</b>	111	87	108	93	86	56	62	35	111	57	60
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>104</b>

Table 29: Use of Crisis Care

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	1	2	4	3	1	1	1	-	-	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	4	15	10	2	1	1	1	1	-	1	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	2	2	3	3	1	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

Table 30: Use of Medical Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	13	9
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	2	2	2	1	-	1	3	-	-	-	1
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10</b>


Table 31: Use of Administrative Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	18	-	1	5	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	1	0	1	19	0	1	6	0	0	0

Table 32: Use of Investigative Status

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0

Chart 12: Rate per 100 youth of Behavioral Holds



## Section 8: Aftercare Data

Table 33: Youth on Aftercare

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Total Number of Youth Assigned to Aftercare</b>	850	802	771	662	616
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	498	466	478	370	348
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	192	188	152	90	73
<b>Number of Youth with Pending Criminal Cases</b>	68	61	58	141	148
<b>Number of Youth with Warrants and Out of State</b>	92	87	83	61	47

Table 34: Caseloads in Aftercare (per Specialist)

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Number of Youth Assigned to Specialist</b>	15.7	14.9	14.3	10.5	9.6
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	11.3	10.6	10.9	8.4	7.9
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	4.4	4.3	3.4	2.1	1.7

Table 35: Average Specialist Caseload by Aftercare Office – May 2020

	Number of Specialists	Number of Youth	Average Caseload	Number of Youth in Community	Average Caseload in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	7	62	8.9	55	7.9
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	3	39	13	37	12.3
<b>Aurora</b>	3	26	8.7	25	8.3
<b>Rockford</b>	5	29	5.8	27	5.4
<b>Peoria</b>	4	32	8	28	7
<b>East St. Louis</b>	6	49	8.2	42	7
<b>Champaign</b>	3	22	7.3	20	6.7
<b>Springfield</b>	4	44	11	40	10
<b>Placement</b>	7	73	10.4	41	5.9
<b>Intensive</b>	2	45	22.5	33	16.5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>7.9</b>

Table 36: Specialist Contact with Youth by Aftercare Office – May 2020

	Number of Overall Contacts	Contacts per Youth	Contacts with Youth in Community	Contacts per Youth in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	136	2.2	132	2.4
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	85	2.2	85	2.3
<b>Aurora</b>	60	2.3	59	2.4
<b>Rockford</b>	92	3.2	91	3.4
<b>Peoria</b>	94	2.9	92	3.3
<b>East St. Louis</b>	99	2.0	97	2.3
<b>Champaign</b>	67	3.0	67	3.4
<b>Springfield</b>	77	1.8	76	1.9
<b>Placement</b>	151	2.1	132	3.2
<b>Intensive</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>861</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>831</b>	<b>2.4</b>

Table 37a: Parole Revocations

	Parole Revocations Heard	Revocations Approved	Revocations Denied	Hearings Continued
<i>July</i>	29	18	10	1
<i>August</i>	25	16	7	2
<i>September</i>	20	11	9	0
<i>October</i>	18	12	6	0
<i>November</i>	12	9	3	0
<i>December</i>	16	11	5	0
<i>January</i>	8	6	2	0
<i>February</i>	15	6	7	2
<i>March</i>	13	9	4	0
<i>April</i>	1	1	0	0
<i>May</i>	2	1	1	0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>0.5</b>

Table 37b: Parole Revocation Rates

	Percent of Revocations Approved	Percent of Revocations Denied	Percent of Hearings Continued
<i>July</i>	62.1%	34.5%	3.4%
<i>August</i>	64%	28%	8%
<i>September</i>	55%	45%	0%
<i>October</i>	66.7%	33.3%	0%
<i>November</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>December</i>	68.8%	31.3%	0%
<i>January</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>February</i>	40%	46.7%	13.3%
<i>March</i>	69.2%	30.8%	0%
<i>April</i>	100%	0%	0%
<i>May</i>	50%	50%	0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>31.8%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>

With lower numbers of admission for technical parole violators, the numbers of parole revocation hearings held monthly has greatly decreased compared to previous years.

## Section 9: Population Stock/Flow

Table 38: Institutional Stock/Flow

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Number of Admissions per Month</b>	73	67	51	50	51	36	49	40	25	0	12
<b>Percent of Admissions Parole Violators</b>	23.3%	19.4%	15.7%	14%	19.6%	13.9%	8.2%	25%	24%	0%	33.3%
<b>Number of Facility Exits per Month</b>	62	49	61	66	52	65	57	41	79	41	31
<b>Percent of Exits to Aftercare Supervision</b>	91.9%	87.7%	88.5%	86.4%	94.2%	92.3%	93%	90.2%	97.4%	90.2%	83.9%

Table 39: Aftercare Stock/Flow

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<b>Number of New Supervised Youth</b>	57	43	54	57	49	60	56	37	77	37	27
<b>Number of Exits from Aftercare</b>	47	37	40	32	42	46	33	39	41	39	46


Table 40: Admissions to Facilities by Type

	May 2020	
	Number	Percent
<b>Court Evaluation</b>	0	0%
<b>Court Evaluation Return</b>	0	0%
<b>Discharged and Recommitted</b>	2	16.7%
<b>Initial Commitment</b>	5	41.7%
<b>New Commitment</b>	1	8.3%
<b>Technical Parole Violator</b>	4	33.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	

The decrease in DJJ populations is a direct effect of both decreasing court admissions, decreasing admissions for technical violations, and decreases in length of stay during the fiscal year. Additionally, rates and numbers of discharges from Aftercare have increased as well, which has helped those numbers stay lower as well, which provides fewer youth to be readmitted into facilities. Looking at the types of admissions to DJJ, a greater percent of youth are initial commitments than in previous years.



**Chart 13: Admission Types to Facility, May 2020**



## Section 10: TRD Data for May 2020

Table 41: Adjustments by Facility

	Reductions	Extensions
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	54	14
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	59	0
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	44	1
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	68	1
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	72	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>16</b>

Table 42: Types of Adjustments Used

	CHI	HRG	PER	STC	WRV	DJJ Overall
<i>BARJ Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>Delinquent Program Reduction</i>	1	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>Ed/Voc Reduction</i>	3	0	0	12	14	<b>29</b>
<i>Grade Level Reduction</i>	1	5	2	4	2	<b>14</b>
<i>JSO Completion Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>No Maj. Sanc. Reductions</i>	3	16	2	10	4	<b>35</b>
<i>Other Tx Reduction</i>	3	2	0	0	16	<b>21</b>
<i>SA Completion Reduction</i>	6	6	3	5	1	<b>21</b>
<i>YASI Goal Reduction</i>	37	30	37	37	35	<b>176</b>
<i>Discipline Extension</i>	14	0	1	1	0	<b>16</b>

Chart 14: Types of Adjustments used by Agency




Table 43: Frequency of BARJ Adjustment

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	1	3	4	1	2	1	2	1	6	5	0
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 44: Average Length of BARJ Adjustment

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	10	7	6	4	7	5	10	7	8	10	-
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>


Table 45: Frequency of Discipline Extensions

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	46	46	10	41	14	41	5	20	18	43	14
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	30	13	21	18	14	37	24	22	22	9	0
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	5	11	5	6	6	22	24	10	0	1	1
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	9	28	36	46	21	21	9	4	36	15	1
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	33	11	19	20	3	5	5	3	1	1	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>16</b>

Table 46: Average Length of Discipline Extension

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	5/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	6	5	7	5	9	5	11	4	6	8	6
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	8	9	12	11	11	11	18	11	10	7	-
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	19	11	5	5	7	12	8	11	0	30	2
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	8	5	8	11	7	7	10	12	11	7	14
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	6	5	5	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>

Summed Total Adjustment Days by Month



## Section 11: YASI

Table 47: YASI Pre-Screens: April 2020

	Legal Risk	Social Risk	Protective	Overall Risk
<i>High</i>	91	70	8	85
<i>Moderate</i>	28	42	41	30
<i>Low</i>	1	8	71	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>120</b>

1


Table 48: YASI Full Assessments: Risk

	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	29	-	-
<i>High</i>	21	114	84
<i>Moderate-High</i>	29	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	26	2	29
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	9	-	-
<i>Low</i>	4	2	5
<i>None</i>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>118</b>

Table 49: YASI Full Assessments: Protective


	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	3	-	-
<i>High</i>	4	21	14
<i>Moderate-High</i>	28	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	38	23	47
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	22	-	-
<i>Low</i>	23	12	57
<i>None</i>	0	62	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>118</b>

**Chart 16: Risk and Protective Levels of Youth**




## Release Reviews

### Reviews by Type per Month



	Annual	Cont.	Director's Request	HSD/GED	Max Release Date	Substance Abuse	Target Release Date	<b>Total</b>
July	0	11	2	5	0	10	15	<b>43</b>
August	0	10	0	7	0	3	30	<b>50</b>
September	1	5	2	3	1	5	36	<b>53</b>
October	0	10	0	4	1	3	44	<b>62</b>
November	1	11	1	4	0	3	33	<b>53</b>
December	1	16	2	4	2	3	35	<b>63</b>
January	1	15	1	1	0	1	25	<b>44</b>
February	1	8	0	2	0	1	28	<b>40</b>
March	1	9	13	1	0	7	34	<b>65</b>
April	0	6	17	2	0	2	11	<b>38</b>
May	0	3	2	4	0	3	10	<b>22</b>

Percent of Release Reviews by Outcome and Month







**Monthly Report:  
April**

**FY2020**

## Section 1: Population and Staffing Data

Table 1a: Population by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	55	61	45	44	46	41	37	40	34	19
<b>Harrisburg</b>	82	101	87	97	91	90	79	71	57	46
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	25	21	20	17	28	23	30	27	10	3
<b>St. Charles</b>	72	63	78	61	60	48	50	65	46	41
<b>Warrenville</b>	30	32	33	32	28	23	20	16	17	11
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>120</b>

Table 1b: Average Daily Population by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	50.5	55.9	54.7	45.6	46.0	45.9	40.0	37.2	40.3	24.9
<b>Harrisburg</b>	79.5	91.1	93.0	91.7	92.2	90.1	83.0	78.8	67.0	48.7
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	21.4	22.9	19.0	18.1	25.1	25.2	29.2	27.0	18.4	6.4
<b>St. Charles</b>	76.2	66.6	70.7	69.9	63.3	54.1	45.4	56.0	55.0	43.1
<b>Warrenville</b>	28.7	29.7	33.9	36.4	29.4	25.0	21.9	18.0	20.2	12.4
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>256.2</b>	<b>266.2</b>	<b>271.2</b>	<b>261.7</b>	<b>256.1</b>	<b>240.3</b>	<b>219.6</b>	<b>218.0</b>	<b>200.8</b>	<b>135.5</b>

Table 2: Security Staff Headcount by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	90	89	84	95	96	94	91	92		
<b>Harrisburg</b>	150	151	143	143	142	140	143	141		
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	52	50	49	54	55	49	51	51		
<b>St. Charles</b>	169	163	152	164	164	162	175	167		
<b>Warrenville</b>	69	66	66	74	74	73	71	71		
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>522</b>		

**Chart 1: Facility Populations on Last Day of Month Last Five Fiscal Years**



## Section 2: Mental Health Data

Table 5: Percent of Youth Psychotropic Medication

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	32.7%	32.3%	33.3%	29.2%	25.6%	38.2%	28%	62.2%	50%	55%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	47.0%	41.6%	50.0%	52.6%	69.2%	67.4%	50.8%	56.1%	50.6%	43.5%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	44.0%	61.9%	60.0%	61.1%	42.9%	52.2%	38.6%	64.9%	65.5%	70%
<b>St. Charles</b>	57.9%	54.8%	51.8%	62.3%	65.5%	74%	60.1%	41.6%	51.9%	71.1%
<b>Warrenville</b>	60.0%	62.5%	60.2%	69.7%	67.9%	69.6%	64.2%	71.4%	68%	70.6%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>48.3%</b>	<b>50.6%</b>	<b>51.1%</b>	<b>53.3%</b>	<b>57.7%</b>	<b>63.1%</b>	<b>48.9%</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>54.2%</b>	<b>57.5%</b>

Table 6: Rate of Suicide Attempts by Severity per 100 Youth

	Threats w/o Intent or Action	Mild Suicide Attempts	Moderately Severe Suicide Attempts	Severe Suicide Attempts
<b>July</b>	4.54	1.13	0.00	0.00
<b>August</b>	5.53	1.38	0.34	0.00
<b>September</b>	4.30	2.90	0.00	0.00
<b>October</b>	2.67	1.91	1.15	0.00
<b>November</b>	4.69	0.78	0.00	0.00
<b>December</b>	3.33	1.66	0.83	0.42
<b>January</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>February</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>March</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>April</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a


Table 7: Distribution of Mental Health Levels

	Mental Health Level 0	Mental Health Level 1	Mental Health Level 2	Mental Health Level 3	Mental Health Level 3.5	Mental Health Level 4
<b>July</b>	13.2%	41.6%	39.1%	5.8%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>August</b>	13.1%	53.7%	29.7%	3.2%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>September</b>	16.9%	49.5%	27.1%	6.1%	0.0%	0.3%
<b>October</b>	14.0%	47.7%	31.8%	6.1%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>November</b>	13.6%	52.5%	28.3%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>December</b>	11.4%	54.7%	25.8%	7.2%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>January</b>	9.6%	53.5%	28.9%	7.5%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>February</b>	7.1%	53.5%	31.9%	6.6%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>March</b>	6.5%	50.6%	35.3%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>April</b>	7.4%	50.8%	33.6%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>11.3%</b>	<b>50.8%</b>	<b>31.2%</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>


Table 8: Distribution of DSM V Diagnoses

	Youth with No Diagnosis	Youth with One Diagnosis	Youth with Two Diagnoses	Youth with Three Diagnoses	Youth with Four or More Diagnoses
<i>July</i>	8.71%	9.09%	26.89%	31.06%	38.26%
<i>August</i>	8.99%	7.95%	22.49%	30.44%	35.64%
<i>September</i>	7.97%	6.88%	21.37%	31.52%	40.57%
<i>October</i>	7.01%	7.38%	20.30%	27.31%	38.01%
<i>November</i>	7.20%	6.40%	17.60%	29.60%	39.20%
<i>December</i>	9.76%	6.10%	17.07%	31.30%	35.77%
<i>January</i>	8.27%	7.3%	20.95%	30.21%	37.91%
<i>February</i>	6.93%	5.63%	16.45%	29.87%	41.13%
<i>March</i>	5%	3.89%	11.11%	33.89%	46.11%
<i>April</i>	5.47%	3.91%	13.28%	33.59%	43.75%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>7.53%</b>	<b>6.45%</b>	<b>18.75%</b>	<b>30.88%</b>	<b>39.63%</b>

**Chart 3: Percent of Youth on Psychotropic Medication**



**Chart 4: Rate of Suicide Attempts and Threats by Type**



### Section 3: Substance Abuse Treatment Data

Table 9: Number of Treatment Participants

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	17	15	14	16	15	12	14	8	8	6
<b>Harrisburg</b>	31	29	27	19	16	19	24	24	14	11
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	27	28	29	26	35	35	35	37	10	10
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	10	11	11	9	9	8	10	10
<b>Warrenville</b>	7	5	7	13	15	13	10	9	8	6
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>43</b>

Table 10: Average Length of Stay for Completers

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	98	107	95	98	99	83	101	101	94	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	90	94	109	97	96	71	97	56	99	49
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	96	87	115	100	65	117	147	110	-	76
<b>St. Charles</b>	94	91	94	91	92	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	60	60	-	-	-	7	-	-	60	60
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>56</b>

Table 11: Percent of Discharges by Reason


	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Successful Completion</b>	58.3%	73.9%	72.4%	36.4%	42.3%	33.3%	52%	40.9%	37.5%	32.1%
<b>Behavioral Discharge</b>	8.3%	8.7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.5%	18.8%	0%
<b>Youth Released</b>	12.5%	8.7%	20.7%	36.4%	30.8%	43.3%	40%	40.9%	31.2%	64.3%
<b>Other Discharge</b>	0%	0%	13.8%	27.3%	26.9%	23.3%	8%	13.6%	12.5%	3.6%

Table 12: Primary Substance Abused


	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Marijuana</b>	78.5%	79.8%	78.2%	68.2%	77.2%	76.1%	71.7%	76.7%	74%	77.6%
<b>Alcohol</b>	3.2%	4.5%	5.8%	3.5%	7.6%	6.8%	5.4%	7%	4%	6.1%
<b>Other Drugs</b>	18.3%	15.7%	14.9%	25.9%	14.1%	15.9%	20.7%	14%	22%	16.3%
<b>No Diagnosis</b>	0%	1.1%	1.2%	2.4%	1.1%	1.1%	2.2%	2.3%	0%	0%

For the youth whose primary substance abuse is not specified, 1 used opioids, 3 used methamphetamines, 1 used hallucinogens, 1 used benzodiazepines, and 2 other substances.

**Chart 5: Number of Treatment Participants by Facility**



**Chart 6: Discharges by Reason**





## Section 4: Education Data

Table 13: Students Enrolled in School

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	55	55	40	39	35	35	42	42	30	15
<b>Harrisburg</b>	58	69	57	65	73	62	64	57	51	25
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	15	19	15	15	20	24	29	20	6	3
<b>St. Charles</b>	40	42	46	37	25	25	24	32	32	13
<b>Warrenville</b>	22	25	32	33	26	25	14	11	17	7
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>62</b>

Table 14: Teachers Employed

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	8	8	8	8	7	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	18	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	16	16
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	7	7	7	7	5	5	5	5	5	5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>

Table 15: General Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5.3	5.3	3.9	3.6	4.0	3.7	5.0	3	4.3	1.4
<b>Harrisburg</b>	1.9	3.4	2	2.5	3.3	2.8	2.8	1.6	3.2	0.7
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3	2.4	3.4	2.6	1.8	2.4	3.2	2.2	1.0	0.6
<b>St. Charles</b>	3.2	3.5	4.4	3.8	2.4	2.4	2.8	4.0	4.5	1.6
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	3.4	4	3.4	4.8	5.3	2.5	2.3	3.4	1.8
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>

Table 16: Special Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	9	9	6.5	14	11	13	12	12	13	5.0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6.6	5.6	5.5	7	6.6	5.8	6.2	6.8	4.7	3.7
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2.5	3.5	6	5	11	12	13	4.5	3.0	3.0
<b>St. Charles</b>	5.3	5.3	8	9	6.5	6.5	5	6.0	3.0	8.0
<b>Warrenville</b>	3.5	4	4	8	7	4	4	2.0	5.0	2.0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>4.1</b>

According to the *RJ Consent Decree*, DJJ is required to have general education student to teacher ratios of 10 youth to 1 teacher and special education student to teacher ratios of 6 youth to 1 teacher.

Table 17: Overall Diplomas Awarded

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	Total
<b>Chicago</b>	1	3	0	0	3	3	2	0	2	1	15
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	9	5	4	4	4	3	4	3	0	36
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	1	2	1	0	2	2	2	0	10
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	4	2	5	4	4	2	2	3	2	29
<b>Warrenville</b>	0	1	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	1	9
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	2	17	8	10	14	14	11	8	10	4	98

Table 18: Percent of Special Education Students

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	33%	33%	33%	36%	31%	37%	29%	29%	43%	33%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	57%	41%	58%	54%	45%	49%	48%	72%	65%	73%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	33%	37%	40%	33%	55%	50%	45%	45%	50%	0%
<b>St. Charles</b>	53%	50%	52%	49%	52%	52%	42%	38%	19%	67%
<b>Warrenville</b>	32%	32%	38%	49%	27%	16%	29%	19%	29%	25%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	44%	39%	46%	47%	42%	42%	41%	47%	44%	56%


Table 20: Youth in Continuing Education

	Post-Secondary	Collegiate
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	2	0
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	5	8
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	0	0
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	4	4
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	11	13

Table 21: Number and Percent of Cancelled Whole School Days

	Number	Percent
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	12	63%
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	12	13%

**Chart 7: Student to Teacher Ratio by Facility**



## Section 5: Reportable Incident Data

Table 21a: Number of Reportable Incidents

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	28	20	26	6	11	7	11	9	7	9
<b>Harrisburg</b>	26	19	24	42	24	32	15	19	12	15
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	5	6	2	11	22	11	5	3	4	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	49	55	72	104	47	17	24	20	18	10
<b>Warrenville</b>	28	30	22	18	10	8	6	12	4	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>37</b>

Table 21b: Rate of Reportable Incidents per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	50.9	32.3	57.8	13.2	23.9	15.3	27.5	24.2	17.4	36.1	<b>29.9</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	30.6	18.8	27.3	45.8	26.0	35.5	18.1	24.1	17.9	30.8	<b>27.5</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	20.0	28.6	10.0	60.8	87.6	43.7	17.1	11.1	21.7	15.6	<b>31.6</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	71.0	75.3	84.7	148.8	74.2	31.4	52.9	35.7	32.7	23.2	<b>63.0</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	93.3	93.8	57.9	49.5	34.0	32	27.4	66.7	19.8	16.1	<b>49.1</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>51.52</b>	<b>44.98</b>	<b>52.90</b>	<b>69.2</b>	<b>44.5</b>	<b>31.2</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>27.3</b>	<b>40.1</b>

Table 22a: Number of Youth on Youth Assaults

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	4	5	2	1	3	2	4	1	1	4
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5	11	11	17	13	17	9	7	7	5
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	4	1	3	3	3	2	1	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	9	29	15	31	10	3	6	6	8	3
<b>Warrenville</b>	5	4	2	1	1	2	3	3	2	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>

Table 22b: Rate of Youth on Youth Assaults per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	7.3	8.1	4.4	2.2	6.5	4.4	10	2.7	2.5	16.1	<b>6.4</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5.9	10.9	12.5	18.5	14.1	18.9	10.8	8.9	10.4	10.3	<b>12.1</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	4.0	19.0	5.0	16.6	12.0	11.9	6.8	3.7	0	0	<b>7.9</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	13.0	39.7	17.6	44.3	15.8	5.5	13.2	10.7	14.5	7.0	<b>18.1</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	16.7	12.5	5.3	2.7	3.4	8	13.7	16.7	9.9	8.1	<b>9.7</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>12.0</b>

Table 23a: Number of Youth Fights

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	12	4	14	5	8	3	5	7	4	2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	13	3	8	18	10	13	6	7	5	10
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	4	1	3	10	4	2	1	4	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	13	23	60	25	7	13	12	7	5
<b>Warrenville</b>	11	2	9	11	3	5	2	2	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>

Table 23b: Rate of Youth Fights per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	21.8	6.5	31.1	11	17.4	6.5	12.5	18.8	9.9	3.0	<b>14.4</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	15.3	3.0	9.1	19.6	10.8	14.4	7.2	8.9	7.5	20.5	<b>11.6</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	4.0	19.0	5.0	16.6	39.8	15.9	6.8	3.7	21.7	0	<b>13.3</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	14.5	17.8	27.1	85.8	39.5	12.9	28.6	21.4	12.7	11.6	<b>27.2</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	36.7	6.3	23.7	30.2	10.2	20.0	9.1	11.1	0	0	<b>14.7</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>19.9</b>	<b>37.1</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>16.8</b>


Table 24a: Number of Youth on Staff Assaults

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5	2	3	0	0	2	2	1	2	3
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2	4	4	7	1	2	0	5	0	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	2	0	5	9	4	1	1	0	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	3	9	13	13	11	7	5	2	3	2
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	4	1	6	6	1	1	7	2	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>


Table 24b: Rate of Youth on Staff Assaults per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	9.1	3.2	6.7	0	0	4.4	5	2.7	5.0	12.0	<b>4.8</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2.4	4.0	4.5	7.6	1.1	2.2	0	6.3	0	0	<b>2.8</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	8.0	9.5	0.0	27.6	35.9	15.9	3.4	3.7	0	15.6	<b>12.0</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	4.3	12.3	15.3	18.6	17.4	12.9	11	3.6	5.5	4.6	<b>10.6</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	10.0	12.5	2.6	16.5	20.4	4	4.6	38.9	9.9	8.1	<b>12.7</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>11.8</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>7.0</b>

**Chart 9: Rate of Reportable Incidents Per 100 Youth**



**Chart 10: Rate of Youth on Staff Assault Per 100 Youth**



## Section 6: Indicator Data

Table 25: Uses of Chemical Restraints

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	0	2	2	7	3	0	0	2	0	1
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

Table 26: Uses of Mechanical Restraints

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	4	0	0	3	1	1	0	2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6	4	7	9	7	3	5	6	6	1
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	2	8	4	1	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>		18	8	24	7	8	10	10	4	2
<b>Warrenville</b>	10	5	7	11	0	2	3	2	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>

Uses of chemical and mechanical restraints have varied throughout the year, although the use in the current year is much lower than years past. Numbers and rates of uses of restraints should be related to population size and number and types of incidents. More important than how frequent they are is whether they are used according to policy and for appropriate reasons.

## Section 7: Confinement Information

Table 28a: Use of Behavioral Holds

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	26	28	48	7	10	16	1	10	15	15
<b>Harrisburg</b>	87	66	77	74	58	112	66	77	67	36
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	3	0	4	12	5	1	1	2	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	36	48	40	46	68	34	43	70	45	21
<b>Warrenville</b>	30	17	31	35	16	19	14	23	13	10
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>83</b>

Table 28b: Rate of Behavioral Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	54	57	94	15	22	35	3	27	37	60
<b>Harrisburg</b>	116	78	109	81	63	124	80	98	100	74
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	10	0	22	48	20	3	4	11	16
<b>St. Charles</b>	35	49	39	66	107	63	95	125	82	49
<b>Warrenville</b>	115	59	119	96	54	76	64	128	64	81
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>61</b>

Table 28c: Average Length of Behavioral Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	78	82	88	73	62	143	98	89	94	78
<b>Harrisburg</b>	117	114	93	128	110	123	165	112	147	148
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	38	0	62	78	64	40	17	292	30
<b>St. Charles</b>	73	65	85	168	69	174	107	95	82	80
<b>Warrenville</b>	111	87	108	93	86	56	62	35	111	57
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>94</b>

Table 29: Use of Crisis Care

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	1	2	4	3	1	1	1	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	4	15	10	2	1	1	1	1	-	1
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	2	2	3	3	1	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

Table 30: Use of Medical Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	13
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	2	2	2	1	-	1	3	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>




Table 31: Use of Administrative Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	18	-	1	5	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	1	0	1	19	0	1	6	0	0

Table 32: Use of Investigative Status

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0

Chart 12: Rate per 100 youth of Behavioral Holds



## Section 8: Aftercare Data

Table 33: Youth on Aftercare

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Total Number of Youth Assigned to Aftercare</b>	850	802	771	662
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	498	466	478	370
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	192	188	152	90
<b>Number of Youth with Pending Criminal Cases</b>	68	61	58	141
<b>Number of Youth with Warrants and Out of State</b>	92	87	83	61

Table 34: Caseloads in Aftercare (per Specialist)

	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Number of Youth Assigned to Specialist</b>	15.7	14.9	14.3	10.5
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	11.3	10.6	10.9	8.4
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	4.4	4.3	3.4	2.1

Table 35: Average Specialist Caseload by Aftercare Office – April 2020

	Number of Specialists	Number of Youth	Average Caseload	Number of Youth in Community	Average Caseload in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	7	74	10.6	63	9
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	3	38	12.7	34	11.3
<b>Aurora</b>	3	28	9.3	26	8.7
<b>Rockford</b>	5	34	6.8	31	6.2
<b>Peoria</b>	4	36	9	34	8.5
<b>East St. Louis</b>	6	48	8	39	6.5
<b>Champaign</b>	3	30	10	27	9
<b>Springfield</b>	4	51	12.8	47	11.8
<b>Placement</b>	7	72	10.3	36	5.1
<b>Intensive</b>	2	49	24.5	33	16.5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>8.4</b>

Table 36: Specialist Contact with Youth by Aftercare Office – April 2020

	Number of Overall Contacts	Contacts per Youth	Contacts with Youth in Community	Contacts per Youth in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	131	1.8	128	2.0
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	93	2.4	93	2.7
<b>Aurora</b>	65	2.3	64	2.5
<b>Rockford</b>	115	3.4	115	3.7
<b>Peoria</b>	135	3.8	130	3.8
<b>East St. Louis</b>	99	2.1	99	2.5
<b>Champaign</b>	95	3.2	95	3.5
<b>Springfield</b>	135	2.6	135	2.9
<b>Placement</b>	156	2.2	131	3.6
<b>Intensive</b>	0	0.0	0	0.0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>1024</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>990</b>	<b>2.7</b>

Table 37a: Parole Revocations

	Parole Revocations Heard	Revocations Approved	Revocations Denied	Hearings Continued
<i>July</i>	29	18	10	1
<i>August</i>	25	16	7	2
<i>September</i>	20	11	9	0
<i>October</i>	18	12	6	0
<i>November</i>	12	9	3	0
<i>December</i>	16	11	5	0
<i>January</i>	8	6	2	0
<i>February</i>	15	6	7	2
<i>March</i>	13	9	4	0
<i>April</i>	1	1	0	0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>15.7</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>0.5</b>

Table 37b: Parole Revocation Rates

	Percent of Revocations Approved	Percent of Revocations Denied	Percent of Hearings Continued
<i>July</i>	62.1%	34.5%	3.4%
<i>August</i>	64%	28%	8%
<i>September</i>	55%	45%	0%
<i>October</i>	66.7%	33.3%	0%
<i>November</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>December</i>	68.8%	31.3%	0%
<i>January</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>February</i>	40%	46.7%	13.3%
<i>March</i>	69.2%	30.8%	0%
<i>April</i>	100%	0%	0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>67.6%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>2.5%</b>

With lower numbers of admission for technical parole violators, the numbers of parole revocation hearings held monthly has greatly decreased compared to previous years.

## Section 9: Population Stock/Flow

Table 38: Institutional Stock/Flow

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Number of Admissions per Month</b>	73	67	51	50	51	36	49	40	25	0
<b>Percent of Admissions Parole Violators</b>	23.3%	19.4%	15.7%	14%	19.6%	13.9%	8.2%	25%	24%	0%
<b>Number of Facility Exits per Month</b>	62	49	61	66	52	65	57	41	79	41
<b>Percent of Exits to Aftercare Supervision</b>	91.9%	87.7%	88.5%	86.4%	94.2%	92.3%	93%	90.2%	97.4%	90.2%

Table 39: Aftercare Stock/Flow


	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<b>Number of New Supervised Youth</b>	57	43	54	57	49	60	56	37	77	37
<b>Number of Exits from Aftercare</b>	47	37	40	32	42	46	33	39	41	39

Table 40: Admissions to Facilities by Type

	April 2020	
	Number	Percent
<b>Court Evaluation</b>	0	0%
<b>Court Evaluation Return</b>	0	0%
<b>Discharged and Recommitted</b>	0	0%
<b>Initial Commitment</b>	0	0%
<b>New Commitment</b>	0	0%
<b>Technical Parole Violator</b>	0	0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	

The decrease in DJJ populations is a direct effect of both decreasing court admissions, decreasing admissions for technical violations, and decreases in length of stay during the fiscal year. Additionally, rates and numbers of discharges from Aftercare have increased as well, which has helped those numbers stay lower as well, which provides fewer youth to be readmitted into facilities. Looking at the types of admissions to DJJ, a greater percent of youth are initial commitments than in previous years.

**Chart 13: Admission Types to Facility, April 2020**



## Section 10: TRD Data for April 2020

Table 41: Adjustments by Facility

	Reductions	Extensions
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	93	43
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	104	9
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	77	1
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	113	15
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	22	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>409</b>	<b>69</b>

Table 42: Types of Adjustments Used

	CHI	HRG	PER	STC	WRV	DJJ Overall
<i>BARJ Reduction</i>	0	5	0	0	0	<b>5</b>
<i>Delinquent Program Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>Ed/Voc Reduction</i>	5	1	1	10	0	<b>17</b>
<i>Grade Level Reduction</i>	5	9	5	3	0	<b>22</b>
<i>JSO Completion Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>No Maj. Sanc. Reductions</i>	15	23	8	10	6	<b>62</b>
<i>Other Tx Reduction</i>	3	5	0	10	3	<b>21</b>
<i>SA Completion Reduction</i>	11	9	16	6	4	<b>46</b>
<i>YASI Goal Reduction</i>	54	52	47	74	9	<b>236</b>
<i>Discipline Extension</i>	43	9	1	15	1	<b>69</b>

Chart 14: Types of Adjustments used by Agency




Table 43: Frequency of BARJ Adjustment

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	1	3	4	1	2	1	2	1	6	5
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>

Table 44: Average Length of BARJ Adjustment

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	10	7	6	4	7	5	10	7	8	10
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	-	-
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>


Table 45: Frequency of Discipline Extensions

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	46	46	10	41	14	41	5	20	18	43
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	30	13	21	18	14	37	24	22	22	9
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	5	11	5	6	6	22	24	10	0	1
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	9	28	36	46	21	21	9	4	36	15
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	33	11	19	20	3	5	5	3	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>69</b>

Table 46: Average Length of Discipline Extension

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	4/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	6	5	7	5	9	5	11	4	6	8
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	8	9	12	11	11	11	18	11	10	7
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	19	11	5	5	7	12	8	11	0	30
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	8	5	8	11	7	7	10	12	11	7
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	6	5	5
<b>Average</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>

Summed Total Adjustment Days by Month





## Section 11: YASI

Table 47: YASI Pre-Screens: April 2020

	Legal Risk	Social Risk	Protective	Overall Risk
<i>High</i>	122	86	10	113
<i>Moderate</i>	32	60	51	40
<i>Low</i>	2	10	95	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>156</b>

1


Table 48: YASI Full Assessments: Risk

	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	31	-	-
<i>High</i>	28	153	113
<i>Moderate-High</i>	46	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	36	2	40
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	7	-	-
<i>Low</i>	8	1	3
<i>None</i>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>156</b>

Table 49: YASI Full Assessments: Protective


	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	5	-	-
<i>High</i>	11	25	20
<i>Moderate-High</i>	31	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	46	35	61
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	47	-	-
<i>Low</i>	16	20	75
<i>None</i>	0	76	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>156</b>

**Chart 16: Risk and Protective Levels of Youth**




## Release Reviews

### Reviews by Type per Month



	Annual	Cont.	Director's Request	HSD/GED	Max Release Date	Substance Abuse	Target Release Date	Total
July	0	11	2	5	0	10	15	<b>43</b>
August	0	10	0	7	0	3	30	<b>50</b>
September	1	5	2	3	1	5	36	<b>53</b>
October	0	10	0	4	1	3	44	<b>62</b>
November	1	11	1	4	0	3	33	<b>53</b>
December	1	16	2	4	2	3	35	<b>63</b>
January	1	15	1	1	0	1	25	<b>44</b>
February	1	8	0	2	0	1	28	<b>40</b>
March	1	9	13	1	0	7	34	<b>65</b>
April	0	6	17	2	0	2	11	<b>38</b>

Percent of Release Reviews by Outcome and Month





**Monthly Report:  
March**

**FY2020**

## Section 1: Population and Staffing Data

Table 1a: Population by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	55	61	45	44	46	41	37	40	34
<b>Harrisburg</b>	82	101	87	97	91	90	79	71	57
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	25	21	20	17	28	23	30	27	10
<b>St. Charles</b>	72	63	78	61	60	48	50	65	46
<b>Warrenville</b>	30	32	33	32	28	23	20	16	17
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>164</b>


Table 1b: Average Daily Population by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	50.5	55.9	54.7	45.6	46.0	45.9	40.0	37.2	40.3
<b>Harrisburg</b>	79.5	91.1	93.0	91.7	92.2	90.1	83.0	78.8	67.0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	21.4	22.9	19.0	18.1	25.1	25.2	29.2	27.0	18.4
<b>St. Charles</b>	76.2	66.6	70.7	69.9	63.3	54.1	45.4	56.0	55.0
<b>Warrenville</b>	28.7	29.7	33.9	36.4	29.4	25.0	21.9	18.0	20.2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>256.2</b>	<b>266.2</b>	<b>271.2</b>	<b>261.7</b>	<b>256.1</b>	<b>240.3</b>	<b>219.6</b>	<b>218.0</b>	<b>200.8</b>

Table 2: Security Staff Headcount by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	90	89	84	95	96	94	91	92	
<b>Harrisburg</b>	150	151	143	143	142	140	143	141	
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	52	50	49	54	55	49	51	51	
<b>St. Charles</b>	169	163	152	164	164	162	175	167	
<b>Warrenville</b>	69	66	66	74	74	73	71	71	
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>522</b>	

**Chart 1: Facility Populations on Last Day of Month Last Five Fiscal Years**



## Section 2: Mental Health Data

Table 5: Percent of Youth Psychotropic Medication

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	32.7%	32.3%	33.3%	29.2%	25.6%	38.2%	28%	62.2%	50%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	47.0%	41.6%	50.0%	52.6%	69.2%	67.4%	50.8%	56.1%	50.6%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	44.0%	61.9%	60.0%	61.1%	42.9%	52.2%	38.6%	64.9%	65.5%
<b>St. Charles</b>	57.9%	54.8%	51.8%	62.3%	65.5%	74%	60.1%	41.6%	51.9%
<b>Warrenville</b>	60.0%	62.5%	60.2%	69.7%	67.9%	69.6%	64.2%	71.4%	68%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>48.3%</b>	<b>50.6%</b>	<b>51.1%</b>	<b>53.3%</b>	<b>57.7%</b>	<b>63.1%</b>	<b>48.9%</b>	<b>54.1%</b>	<b>54.2%</b>

Table 6: Rate of Suicide Attempts by Severity per 100 Youth

	Threats w/o Intent or Action	Mild Suicide Attempts	Moderately Severe Suicide Attempts	Severe Suicide Attempts
<b>July</b>	4.54	1.13	0.00	0.00
<b>August</b>	5.53	1.38	0.34	0.00
<b>September</b>	4.30	2.90	0.00	0.00
<b>October</b>	2.67	1.91	1.15	0.00
<b>November</b>	4.69	0.78	0.00	0.00
<b>December</b>	3.33	1.66	0.83	0.42
<b>January</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>February</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>March</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Table 7: Distribution of Mental Health Levels


	Mental Health Level 0	Mental Health Level 1	Mental Health Level 2	Mental Health Level 3	Mental Health Level 3.5	Mental Health Level 4
<b>July</b>	13.2%	41.6%	39.1%	5.8%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>August</b>	13.1%	53.7%	29.7%	3.2%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>September</b>	16.9%	49.5%	27.1%	6.1%	0.0%	0.3%
<b>October</b>	14.0%	47.7%	31.8%	6.1%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>November</b>	13.6%	52.5%	28.3%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>December</b>	11.4%	54.7%	25.8%	7.2%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>January</b>	9.6%	53.5%	28.9%	7.5%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>February</b>	7.1%	53.5%	31.9%	6.6%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>March</b>	6.5%	50.6%	35.3%	7.6%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>11.7%</b>	<b>50.8%</b>	<b>30.9%</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>




Table 8: Distribution of DSM V Diagnoses

	Youth with No Diagnosis	Youth with One Diagnosis	Youth with Two Diagnoses	Youth with Three Diagnoses	Youth with Four or More Diagnoses
<b>July</b>	8.71%	9.09%	26.89%	31.06%	38.26%
<b>August</b>	8.99%	7.95%	22.49%	30.44%	35.64%
<b>September</b>	7.97%	6.88%	21.37%	31.52%	40.57%
<b>October</b>	7.01%	7.38%	20.30%	27.31%	38.01%
<b>November</b>	7.20%	6.40%	17.60%	29.60%	39.20%
<b>December</b>	9.76%	6.10%	17.07%	31.30%	35.77%
<b>January</b>	8.27%	7.3%	20.95%	30.21%	37.91%
<b>February</b>	6.93%	5.63%	16.45%	29.87%	41.13%
<b>March</b>	5%	3.89%	11.11%	33.89%	46.11%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>7.76%</b>	<b>6.74%</b>	<b>19.36%</b>	<b>30.58%</b>	<b>39.18%</b>

**Chart 3: Percent of Youth on Psychotropic Medication**



**Chart 4: Rate of Suicide Attempts and Threats by Type**



### Section 3: Substance Abuse Treatment Data

Table 9: Number of Treatment Participants

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	17	15	14	16	15	12	14	8	8
<b>Harrisburg</b>	31	29	27	19	16	19	24	24	14
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	27	28	29	26	35	35	35	37	10
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	10	11	11	9	9	8	10
<b>Warrenville</b>	7	5	7	13	15	13	10	9	8
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>50</b>

Table 10: Average Length of Stay for Completers

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	98	107	95	98	99	83	101	101	94
<b>Harrisburg</b>	90	94	109	97	96	71	97	56	99
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	96	87	115	100	65	117	147	110	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	94	91	94	91	92	-	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	60	60	-	-	-	7	-	-	60
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>82</b>

Table 11: Percent of Discharges by Reason


	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Successful Completion</b>	58.3%	73.9%	72.4%	36.4%	42.3%	33.3%	52%	40.9%	37.5%
<b>Behavioral Discharge</b>	8.3%	8.7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.5%	18.8%
<b>Youth Released</b>	12.5%	8.7%	20.7%	36.4%	30.8%	43.3%	40%	40.9%	31.2%
<b>Other Discharge</b>	0%	0%	13.8%	27.3%	26.9%	23.3%	8%	13.6%	12.5%

Table 12: Primary Substance Abused


	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Marijuana</b>	78.5%	79.8%	78.2%	68.2%	77.2%	76.1%	71.7%	76.7%	74%
<b>Alcohol</b>	3.2%	4.5%	5.8%	3.5%	7.6%	6.8%	5.4%	7%	4%
<b>Other Drugs</b>	18.3%	15.7%	14.9%	25.9%	14.1%	15.9%	20.7%	14%	22%
<b>No Diagnosis</b>	0%	1.1%	1.2%	2.4%	1.1%	1.1%	2.2%	2.3%	0%

For the youth whose primary substance abuse is not specified, 1 used opioids, 7 used methamphetamines, 1 used hallucinogens, 1 used benzodiazepines, and 1 other substances.

**Chart 5: Number of Treatment Participants by Facility**



**Chart 6: Discharges by Reason**



## Section 4: Education Data

Table 13: Students Enrolled in School

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	55	55	40	39	35	35	42	42	30
<b>Harrisburg</b>	58	69	57	65	73	62	64	57	51
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	15	19	15	15	20	24	29	20	6
<b>St. Charles</b>	40	42	46	37	25	25	24	32	32
<b>Warrenville</b>	22	25	32	33	26	25	14	11	17
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>136</b>

Table 14: Teachers Employed

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	8	8	8	8	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	18	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	16
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	7	7	7	7	5	5	5	5	5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>

Table 15: General Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5.3	5.3	3.9	3.6	4.0	3.7	5.0	3	4.3
<b>Harrisburg</b>	1.9	3.4	2	2.5	3.3	2.8	2.8	1.6	3.2
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3	2.4	3.4	2.6	1.8	2.4	3.2	2.2	1.0
<b>St. Charles</b>	3.2	3.5	4.4	3.8	2.4	2.4	2.8	4.0	4.5
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	3.4	4	3.4	4.8	5.3	2.5	2.3	3.4
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>

Table 16: Special Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	9	9	6.5	14	11	13	12	12	13
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6.6	5.6	5.5	7	6.6	5.8	6.2	6.8	4.7
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2.5	3.5	6	5	11	12	13	4.5	3.0
<b>St. Charles</b>	5.3	5.3	8	9	6.5	6.5	5	6.0	3.0
<b>Warrenville</b>	3.5	4	4	8	7	4	4	2.0	5.0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>5.5</b>

According to the *RJ Consent Decree*, DJJ is required to have general education student to teacher ratios of 10 youth to 1 teacher and special education student to teacher ratios of 6 youth to 1 teacher. As of the end of March, DJJ had an average of 3.3 general education youth for each general education teacher and 5.5 special education youth for each special education teacher. Therefore, the agency meets the consent decree requirements for general education and special education. At the facility level, Chicago did not meet the special education requirements.

Table 17: Overall Diplomas Awarded

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	Total
<b>Chicago</b>	1	3	0	0	3	3	2	0	2	14
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	9	5	4	4	4	3	4	3	36
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	1	2	1	0	2	2	2	10
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	4	2	5	4	4	2	2	3	27
<b>Warrenville</b>	0	1	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	8
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>94</b>

Table 18: Percent of Special Education Students

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	33%	33%	33%	36%	31%	37%	29%	29%	43%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	57%	41%	58%	54%	45%	49%	48%	72%	65%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	33%	37%	40%	33%	55%	50%	45%	45%	50%
<b>St. Charles</b>	53%	50%	52%	49%	52%	52%	42%	38%	19%
<b>Warrenville</b>	32%	32%	38%	49%	27%	16%	29%	19%	29%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>44%</b>


Table 20: Youth in Continuing Education

	Post-Secondary	Collegiate
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	4	0
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	10	10
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	1	0
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	2	2
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>13</b>

Table 21: Number and Percent of Cancelled Whole School Days

	Number	Percent
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

**Chart 7: Student to Teacher Ratio by Facility**



## Section 5: Reportable Incident Data

Table 21a: Number of Reportable Incidents

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	28	20	26	6	11	7	11	9	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	26	19	24	42	24	32	15	19	12
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	5	6	2	11	22	11	5	3	4
<b>St. Charles</b>	49	55	72	104	47	17	24	20	18
<b>Warrenville</b>	28	30	22	18	10	8	6	12	4
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>45</b>

Table 21b: Rate of Reportable Incidents per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	50.9	32.3	57.8	13.2	23.9	15.3	27.5	24.2	17.4	<b>29.2</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	30.6	18.8	27.3	45.8	26.0	35.5	18.1	24.1	17.9	<b>27.1</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	20.0	28.6	10.0	60.8	87.6	43.7	17.1	11.1	21.7	<b>33.4</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	71.0	75.3	84.7	148.8	74.2	31.4	52.9	35.7	32.7	<b>67.4</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	93.3	93.8	57.9	49.5	34.0	32	27.4	66.7	19.8	<b>52.7</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>51.52</b>	<b>44.98</b>	<b>52.90</b>	<b>69.2</b>	<b>44.5</b>	<b>31.2</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>41.5</b>

Table 22a: Number of Youth on Youth Assaults

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	4	5	2	1	3	2	4	1	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5	11	11	17	13	17	9	7	7
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	4	1	3	3	3	2	1	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	9	29	15	31	10	3	6	6	8
<b>Warrenville</b>	5	4	2	1	1	2	3	3	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>

Table 22b: Rate of Youth on Youth Assaults per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	7.3	8.1	4.4	2.2	6.5	4.4	10	2.7	2.5	<b>5.3</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5.9	10.9	12.5	18.5	14.1	18.9	10.8	8.9	10.4	<b>12.3</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	4.0	19.0	5.0	16.6	12.0	11.9	6.8	3.7	0	<b>8.8</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	13.0	39.7	17.6	44.3	15.8	5.5	13.2	10.7	14.5	<b>19.4</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	16.7	12.5	5.3	2.7	3.4	8	13.7	16.7	9.9	<b>9.9</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>12.2</b>

Table 23a: Number of Youth Fights

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	12	4	14	5	8	3	5	7	4
<b>Harrisburg</b>	13	3	8	18	10	13	6	7	5
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	4	1	3	10	4	2	1	4
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	13	23	60	25	7	13	12	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	11	2	9	11	3	5	2	2	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>



Table 23b: Rate of Youth Fights per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	21.8	6.5	31.1	11	17.4	6.5	12.5	18.8	9.9	<b>15.1</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	15.3	3.0	9.1	19.6	10.8	14.4	7.2	8.9	7.5	<b>10.6</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	4.0	19.0	5.0	16.6	39.8	15.9	6.8	3.7	21.7	<b>14.7</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	14.5	17.8	27.1	85.8	39.5	12.9	28.6	21.4	12.7	<b>28.9</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	36.7	6.3	23.7	30.2	10.2	20.0	9.1	11.1	0	<b>16.4</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>19.9</b>	<b>37.1</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>17.2</b>


Table 24a: Number of Youth on Staff Assaults

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5	2	3	0	0	2	2	1	2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2	4	4	7	1	2	0	5	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	2	0	5	9	4	1	1	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	3	9	13	13	11	7	5	2	3
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	4	1	6	6	1	1	7	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>


Table 24b: Rate of Youth on Staff Assaults per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	9.1	3.2	6.7	0	0	4.4	5	2.7	5.0	<b>4.0</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2.4	4.0	4.5	7.6	1.1	2.2	0	6.3	0	<b>3.1</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	8.0	9.5	0.0	27.6	35.9	15.9	3.4	3.7	0	<b>11.6</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	4.3	12.3	15.3	18.6	17.4	12.9	11	3.6	5.5	<b>11.2</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	10.0	12.5	2.6	16.5	20.4	4	4.6	38.9	9.9	<b>13.3</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>11.8</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>7.2</b>

**Chart 9: Rate of Reportable Incidents Per 100 Youth**



**Chart 10: Rate of Youth on Staff Assault Per 100 Youth**



## Section 6: Indicator Data

Table 25: Uses of Chemical Restraints

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	0	2	2	7	3	0	0	2	0
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 26: Uses of Mechanical Restraints

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	4	0	0	3	1	1	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6	4	7	9	7	3	5	6	6
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	2	8	4	1	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>		18	8	24	7	8	10	10	4
<b>Warrenville</b>	10	5	7	11	0	2	3	2	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10</b>

Uses of chemical and mechanical restraints have varied throughout the year, although the use in the current year is much lower than years past. Numbers and rates of uses of restraints should be related to population size and number and types of incidents. More important than how frequent they are is whether they are used according to policy and for appropriate reasons.

## Section 7: Confinement Information

Table 28a: Use of Behavioral Holds

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	26	28	48	7	10	16	1	10	15
<b>Harrisburg</b>	87	66	77	74	58	112	66	77	67
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	3	0	4	12	5	1	1	2
<b>St. Charles</b>	36	48	40	46	68	34	43	70	45
<b>Warrenville</b>	30	17	31	35	16	19	14	23	13
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>142</b>

Table 28b: Rate of Behavioral Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	54	57	94	15	22	35	3	27	37
<b>Harrisburg</b>	116	78	109	81	63	124	80	98	100
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	10	0	22	48	20	3	4	11
<b>St. Charles</b>	35	49	39	66	107	63	95	125	82
<b>Warrenville</b>	115	59	119	96	54	76	64	128	64
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>71</b>

Table 28c: Average Length of Behavioral Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	78	82	88	73	62	143	98	89	94
<b>Harrisburg</b>	117	114	93	128	110	123	165	112	147
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	38	0	62	78	64	40	17	292
<b>St. Charles</b>	73	65	85	168	69	174	107	95	82
<b>Warrenville</b>	111	87	108	93	86	56	62	35	111
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>116</b>

Table 29: Use of Crisis Care

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	1	2	4	3	1	1	1	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	4	15	10	2	1	1	1	1	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	2	2	3	3	1	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 30: Use of Medical Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	2	2	2	1	-	1	3	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>


Table 31: Use of Administrative Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	18	-	1	5	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	1	0	1	19	0	1	6	0

Table 32: Use of Investigative Status

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0

Chart 12: Rate per 100 youth of Behavioral Holds



## Section 8: Aftercare Data

Table 33: Youth on Aftercare

	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Total Number of Youth Assigned to Aftercare</b>	850	802	771
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	498	466	478
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	192	188	152
<b>Number of Youth with Pending Criminal Cases</b>	68	61	58
<b>Number of Youth with Warrants and Out of State</b>	92	87	83

Table 34: Caseloads in Aftercare (per Specialist)

	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Number of Youth Assigned to Specialist</b>	15.7	14.9	14.3
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	11.3	10.6	10.9
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	4.4	4.3	3.4

Table 35: Average Specialist Caseload by Aftercare Office – March 2020

	Number of Specialists	Number of Youth	Average Caseload	Number of Youth in Community	Average Caseload in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	7	70	10	56	8
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	3	33	11	27	9
<b>Aurora</b>	3	37	12.3	35	11.7
<b>Rockford</b>	5	34	6.8	35	7
<b>Peoria</b>	4	113	28.3	112	28
<b>East St. Louis</b>	6	46	7.7	41	6.8
<b>Champaign</b>	3	45	15	37	12.3
<b>Springfield</b>	4	46	11.5	46	11.5
<b>Placement</b>	7	157	22.4	37	5.3
<b>Intensive</b>	2	49	24.5	52	26
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>478</b>	<b>10.9</b>

Table 36: Specialist Contact with Youth by Aftercare Office – March 2020

	Number of Overall Contacts	Contacts per Youth	Contacts with Youth in Community	Contacts per Youth in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	106	1.5	98	1.8
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	48	1.5	44	1.6
<b>Aurora</b>	77	2.1	70	2
<b>Rockford</b>	85	2.5	86	2.5
<b>Peoria</b>	100	0.9	157	1.4
<b>East St. Louis</b>	74	1.6	66	1.6
<b>Champaign</b>	64	1.4	62	1.7
<b>Springfield</b>	82	1.8	77	1.7
<b>Placement</b>	342	2.2	101	2.7
<b>Intensive</b>	70	1.4	90	1.7
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>1048</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>851</b>	<b>1.8</b>

Table 37a: Parole Revocations

	Parole Revocations Heard	Revocations Approved	Revocations Denied	Hearings Continued
<i>July</i>	29	18	10	1
<i>August</i>	25	16	7	2
<i>September</i>	20	11	9	0
<i>October</i>	18	12	6	0
<i>November</i>	12	9	3	0
<i>December</i>	16	11	5	0
<i>January</i>	8	6	2	0
<i>February</i>	15	6	7	2
<i>March</i>	13	9	4	0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>17.3</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>0.6</b>

Table 37b: Parole Revocation Rates

	Percent of Revocations Approved	Percent of Revocations Denied	Percent of Hearings Continued
<i>July</i>	62.1%	34.5%	3.4%
<i>August</i>	64%	28%	8%
<i>September</i>	55%	45%	0%
<i>October</i>	66.7%	33.3%	0%
<i>November</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>December</i>	68.8%	31.3%	0%
<i>January</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>February</i>	40%	46.7%	13.3%
<i>March</i>	69.2%	30.8%	0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>33.3%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>

With lower numbers of admission for technical parole violators, the numbers of parole revocation hearings held monthly has greatly decreased compared to previous years.

## Section 9: Population Stock/Flow

Table 38: Institutional Stock/Flow

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Number of Admissions per Month</b>	73	67	51	50	51	36	49	40	25
<b>Percent of Admissions Parole Violators</b>	23.3%	19.4%	15.7%	14%	19.6%	13.9%	8.2%	25%	24%
<b>Number of Facility Exits per Month</b>	62	49	61	66	52	65	57	41	79
<b>Percent of Exits to Aftercare Supervision</b>	91.9%	87.7%	88.5%	86.4%	94.2%	92.3%	93%	90.2%	97.4%

Table 39: Aftercare Stock/Flow

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<b>Number of New Supervised Youth</b>	57	43	54	57	49	60	56	37	77
<b>Number of Exits from Aftercare</b>	47	37	40	32	42	46	33	39	41


Table 40: Admissions to Facilities by Type

	March 2020	
	Number	Percent
<b>Court Evaluation</b>	2	8%
<b>Court Evaluation Return</b>	1	4%
<b>Discharged and Recommitted</b>	3	12%
<b>Initial Commitment</b>	9	36%
<b>New Commitment</b>	4	16%
<b>Technical Parole Violator</b>	6	24%
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	

The decrease in DJJ populations is a direct effect of both decreasing court admissions, decreasing admissions for technical violations, and decreases in length of stay during the fiscal year. Additionally, rates and numbers of discharges from Aftercare have increased as well, which has helped those numbers stay lower as well, which provides fewer youth to be readmitted into facilities. Looking at the types of admissions to DJJ, a greater percent of youth are initial commitments than in previous years.



**Chart 13: Admission Types to Facility, March 2020**



**Section 10: TRD Data for March 2020**

Table 41: Adjustments by Facility

	Reductions	Extensions
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	197	18
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	97	22
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	99	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	83	36
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	43	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>77</b>

Table 42: Types of Adjustments Used

	CHI	HRG	PER	STC	WRV	DJJ Overall
<i>BARJ Reduction</i>	0	6	0	0	0	<b>6</b>
<i>Delinquent Program Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>Ed/Voc Reduction</i>	15	1	0	13	8	<b>37</b>
<i>Grade Level Reduction</i>	12	7	3	1	0	<b>23</b>
<i>JSO Completion Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>No Maj. Sanc. Reductions</i>	28	23	12	12	4	<b>79</b>
<i>Other Tx Reduction</i>	4	4	3	10	4	<b>25</b>
<i>SA Completion Reduction</i>	16	9	15	6	6	<b>52</b>
<i>YASI Goal Reduction</i>	122	47	66	41	21	<b>297</b>
<i>Discipline Extension</i>	18	22	0	36	1	<b>77</b>

**Chart 14: Types of Adjustments used by Agency**




Table 43: Frequency of BARJ Adjustment

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	1	3	4	1	2	1	2	1	6
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>

Table 44: Average Length of BARJ Adjustment

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	10	7	6	4	7	5	10	7	8
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	-
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>


Table 45: Frequency of Discipline Extensions

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	46	46	10	41	14	41	5	20	18
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	30	13	21	18	14	37	24	22	22
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	5	11	5	6	6	22	24	10	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	9	28	36	46	21	21	9	4	36
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	33	11	19	20	3	5	5	3	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>77</b>

Table 46: Average Length of Discipline Extension

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	3/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	6	5	7	5	9	5	11	4	6
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	8	9	12	11	11	11	18	11	10
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	19	11	5	5	7	12	8	11	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	8	5	8	11	7	7	10	12	11
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	6	5
<b>Average</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>

Summed Total Adjustment Days by Month



## Section 11: YASI

Table 47: New YASI Pre-Screens: March 2020

	Legal Risk	Social Risk	Protective	Overall Risk
<i>High</i>	132	87	8	113
<i>Moderate</i>	45	78	72	61
<i>Low</i>	0	12	97	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>177</b>


Table 48: New YASI Full Assessments: Risk

	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	26	-	-
<i>High</i>	30	166	110
<i>Moderate-High</i>	57	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	32	4	59
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	13	-	-
<i>Low</i>	14	2	3
<i>None</i>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>172</b>

Table 49: New YASI Full Assessments: Protective


	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	6	-	-
<i>High</i>	19	31	31
<i>Moderate-High</i>	36	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	56	44	71
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	39	-	-
<i>Low</i>	16	20	70
<i>None</i>	0	77	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>172</b>

**Chart 16: Risk and Protective Levels of Youth**




## Release Reviews

Reviews by Type per Month



	Annual	Cont.	Director's Request	HSD/GED	Max Release Date	Substance Abuse	Target Release Date	Total
July	0	11	2	5	0	10	15	<b>43</b>
August	0	10	0	7	0	3	30	<b>50</b>
September	1	5	2	3	1	5	36	<b>53</b>
October	0	10	0	4	1	3	44	<b>62</b>
November	1	11	1	4	0	3	33	<b>53</b>
December	1	16	2	4	2	3	35	<b>63</b>
January	1	15	1	1	0	1	25	<b>44</b>
February	1	8	0	2	0	1	28	<b>40</b>
March	1	9	13	1	0	7	34	<b>65</b>

Percent of Release Reviews by Outcome and Month







**Monthly Report:  
February**

**FY2020**

## Section 1: Population and Staffing Data

Table 1a: Population by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	55	61	45	44	46	41	37	40
<b>Harrisburg</b>	82	101	87	97	91	90	79	71
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	25	21	20	17	28	23	30	27
<b>St. Charles</b>	72	63	78	61	60	48	50	65
<b>Warrenville</b>	30	32	33	32	28	23	20	16
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>219</b>


Table 1b: Average Daily Population by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	50.5	55.9	54.7	45.6	46.0	45.9	40.0	37.2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	79.5	91.1	93.0	91.7	92.2	90.1	83.0	78.8
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	21.4	22.9	19.0	18.1	25.1	25.2	29.2	27.0
<b>St. Charles</b>	76.2	66.6	70.7	69.9	63.3	54.1	45.4	56.0
<b>Warrenville</b>	28.7	29.7	33.9	36.4	29.4	25.0	21.9	18.0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>256.2</b>	<b>266.2</b>	<b>271.2</b>	<b>261.7</b>	<b>256.1</b>	<b>240.3</b>	<b>219.6</b>	<b>218.0</b>

Table 2: Security Staff Headcount by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	90	89	84	95	96	94	91	92
<b>Harrisburg</b>	150	151	143	143	142	140	143	141
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	52	50	49	54	55	49	51	51
<b>St. Charles</b>	169	163	152	164	164	162	175	167
<b>Warrenville</b>	69	66	66	74	74	73	71	71
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>522</b>

**Chart 1: Facility Populations on Last Day of Month Last Five Fiscal Years**



## Section 2: Mental Health Data

Table 5: Percent of Youth Psychotropic Medication

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	32.7%	32.3%	33.3%	29.2%	25.6%	38.2%	28%	62.2%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	47.0%	41.6%	50.0%	52.6%	69.2%	67.4%	50.8%	56.1%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	44.0%	61.9%	60.0%	61.1%	42.9%	52.2%	38.6%	64.9%
<b>St. Charles</b>	57.9%	54.8%	51.8%	62.3%	65.5%	74%	60.1%	41.6%
<b>Warrenville</b>	60.0%	62.5%	60.2%	69.7%	67.9%	69.6%	64.2%	71.4%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>48.3%</b>	<b>50.6%</b>	<b>51.1%</b>	<b>53.3%</b>	<b>57.7%</b>	<b>63.1%</b>	<b>48.9%</b>	<b>54.1%</b>

Table 6: Rate of Suicide Attempts by Severity per 100 Youth

	Threats w/o Intent or Action	Mild Suicide Attempts	Moderately Severe Suicide Attempts	Severe Suicide Attempts
<b>July</b>	4.54	1.13	0.00	0.00
<b>August</b>	5.53	1.38	0.34	0.00
<b>September</b>	4.30	2.90	0.00	0.00
<b>October</b>	2.67	1.91	1.15	0.00
<b>November</b>	4.69	0.78	0.00	0.00
<b>December</b>	3.33	1.66	0.83	0.42
<b>January</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>February</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a


Table 7: Distribution of Mental Health Levels

	Mental Health Level 0	Mental Health Level 1	Mental Health Level 2	Mental Health Level 3	Mental Health Level 3.5	Mental Health Level 4
<b>July</b>	13.2%	41.6%	39.1%	5.8%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>August</b>	13.1%	53.7%	29.7%	3.2%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>September</b>	16.9%	49.5%	27.1%	6.1%	0.0%	0.3%
<b>October</b>	14.0%	47.7%	31.8%	6.1%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>November</b>	13.6%	52.5%	28.3%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>December</b>	11.4%	54.7%	25.8%	7.2%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>January</b>	9.6%	53.5%	28.9%	7.5%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>February</b>	7.1%	53.5%	31.9%	6.6%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>12.4%</b>	<b>50.8%</b>	<b>30.3%</b>	<b>6.0%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>


Table 8: Distribution of DSM V Diagnoses

	Youth with No Diagnosis	Youth with One Diagnosis	Youth with Two Diagnoses	Youth with Three Diagnoses	Youth with Four or More Diagnoses
<i>July</i>	8.71%	9.09%	26.89%	31.06%	38.26%
<i>August</i>	8.99%	7.95%	22.49%	30.44%	35.64%
<i>September</i>	7.97%	6.88%	21.37%	31.52%	40.57%
<i>October</i>	7.01%	7.38%	20.30%	27.31%	38.01%
<i>November</i>	7.20%	6.40%	17.60%	29.60%	39.20%
<i>December</i>	9.76%	6.10%	17.07%	31.30%	35.77%
<i>January</i>	8.27%	7.3%	20.95%	30.21%	37.91%
<i>February</i>	6.93%	5.63%	16.45%	29.87%	41.13%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>8.11%</b>	<b>7.09%</b>	<b>20.39%</b>	<b>30.16%</b>	<b>38.31%</b>

**Chart 3: Percent of Youth on Psychotropic Medication**



**Chart 4: Rate of Suicide Attempts and Threats by Type**



### Section 3: Substance Abuse Treatment Data

Table 9: Number of Treatment Participants

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	17	15	14	16	15	12	14	8
<b>Harrisburg</b>	31	29	27	19	16	19	24	24
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	27	28	29	26	35	35	35	37
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	10	11	11	9	9	8
<b>Warrenville</b>	7	5	7	13	15	13	10	9
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>86</b>

Table 10: Average Length of Stay for Completers

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	98	107	95	98	99	83	101	101
<b>Harrisburg</b>	90	94	109	97	96	71	97	56
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	96	87	115	100	65	117	147	110
<b>St. Charles</b>	94	91	94	91	92	-	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	60	60	-	-	-	7	-	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>84</b>

Table 11: Percent of Discharges by Reason


	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Successful Completion</b>	58.3%	73.9%	72.4%	36.4%	42.3%	33.3%	52%	40.9%
<b>Behavioral Discharge</b>	8.3%	8.7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.5%
<b>Youth Released</b>	12.5%	8.7%	20.7%	36.4%	30.8%	43.3%	40%	40.9%
<b>Other Discharge</b>	0%	0%	13.8%	27.3%	26.9%	23.3%	8%	13.6%

Table 12: Primary Substance Abused


	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Marijuana</b>	78.5%	79.8%	78.2%	68.2%	77.2%	76.1%	71.7%	76.7%
<b>Alcohol</b>	3.2%	4.5%	5.8%	3.5%	7.6%	6.8%	5.4%	7%
<b>Other Drugs</b>	18.3%	15.7%	14.9%	25.9%	14.1%	15.9%	20.7%	14%
<b>No Diagnosis</b>	0%	1.1%	1.2%	2.4%	1.1%	1.1%	2.2%	2.3%

For the youth whose primary substance abuse is not specified, 2 used opioids, 7 used methamphetamines, and 3 other substances.

**Chart 5: Number of Treatment Participants by Facility**



**Chart 6: Discharges by Reason**





## Section 4: Education Data

Table 13: Students Enrolled in School

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	55	55	40	39	35	35	42	57
<b>Harrisburg</b>	58	69	57	65	73	62	64	42
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	15	19	15	15	20	24	29	32
<b>St. Charles</b>	40	42	46	37	25	25	24	20
<b>Warrenville</b>	22	25	32	33	26	25	14	11
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>162</b>

Table 14: Teachers Employed

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	8	8	8	8	7	7	7	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	18	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	7	7	6	6	6	6	6	6
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	7	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	7	7	7	7	5	5	5	5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>

Table 15: General Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5.3	5.3	3.9	3.6	4.0	3.7	5.0	3
<b>Harrisburg</b>	1.9	3.4	2	2.5	3.3	2.8	2.8	1.6
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3	2.4	3.4	2.6	1.8	2.4	3.2	2.2
<b>St. Charles</b>	3.2	3.5	4.4	3.8	2.4	2.4	2.8	4.0
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	3.4	4	3.4	4.8	5.3	2.5	2.3
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>2.5</b>

Table 16: Special Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	9	9	6.5	14	11	13	12	12
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6.6	5.6	5.5	7	6.6	5.8	6.2	6.8
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2.5	3.5	6	5	11	12	13	4.5
<b>St. Charles</b>	5.3	5.3	8	9	6.5	6.5	5	6.0
<b>Warrenville</b>	3.5	4	4	8	7	4	4	2.0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6.3</b>

According to the *RJ Consent Decree*, DJJ is required to have general education student to teacher ratios of 10 youth to 1 teacher and special education student to teacher ratios of 6 youth to 1 teacher. As of the end of December, DJJ had an average of 2.5 general education youth for each general education teacher and 6.3 special education youth for each special education teacher. Therefore, the agency meets the consent decree requirements for general education overall, but not special education. At the facility level, Pere Marquette and Warrenville meet the special education ratio requirement. With special education resource coordinator support, all facilities meet special education requirements.

Table 17: Overall Diplomas Awarded

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	Total
<b>Chicago</b>	1	3	0	0	3	3	2	0	12
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	9	5	4	4	4	3	4	33
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	1	2	1	0	2	2	8
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	4	2	5	4	4	2	2	24
<b>Warrenville</b>	0	1	0	0	2	3	2	0	8
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	2	17	8	10	14	14	11	8	84

Table 18: Percent of Special Education Students

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	33%	33%	33%	36%	31%	37%	29%	29%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	57%	41%	58%	54%	45%	49%	48%	72%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	33%	37%	40%	33%	55%	50%	45%	45%
<b>St. Charles</b>	53%	50%	52%	49%	52%	52%	42%	38%
<b>Warrenville</b>	32%	32%	38%	49%	27%	16%	29%	19%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	44%	39%	46%	47%	42%	42%	41%	47%


Table 20: Youth in Continuing Education

	Post-Secondary	Collegiate
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	0	0
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	11	11
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	11	0
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	2	6
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	24	19

Table 21: Number and Percent of Cancelled Whole School Days

	Number	Percent
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	0%

**Chart 7: Student to Teacher Ratio by Facility**



## Section 5: Reportable Incident Data

Table 21a: Number of Reportable Incidents

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	28	20	26	6	11	7	11	9
<b>Harrisburg</b>	26	19	24	42	24	32	15	19
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	5	6	2	11	22	11	5	3
<b>St. Charles</b>	49	55	72	104	47	17	24	20
<b>Warrenville</b>	28	30	22	18	10	8	6	12
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>63</b>

Table 21b: Rate of Reportable Incidents per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	50.9	32.3	57.8	13.2	23.9	15.3	27.5	24.2	<b>30.6</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	30.6	18.8	27.3	45.8	26.0	35.5	18.1	24.1	<b>28.3</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	20.0	28.6	10.0	60.8	87.6	43.7	17.1	11.1	<b>34.9</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	71.0	75.3	84.7	148.8	74.2	31.4	52.9	35.7	<b>71.8</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	93.3	93.8	57.9	49.5	34.0	32	27.4	66.7	<b>56.8</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>51.52</b>	<b>44.98</b>	<b>52.90</b>	<b>69.2</b>	<b>44.5</b>	<b>31.2</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>43.9</b>

Table 22a: Number of Youth on Youth Assaults

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	4	5	2	1	3	2	4	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5	11	11	17	13	17	9	7
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	4	1	3	3	3	2	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	9	29	15	31	10	3	6	6
<b>Warrenville</b>	5	4	2	1	1	2	3	3
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>

Table 22b: Rate of Youth on Youth Assaults per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	7.3	8.1	4.4	2.2	6.5	4.4	10	2.7	<b>5.7</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5.9	10.9	12.5	18.5	14.1	18.9	10.8	8.9	<b>12.6</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	4.0	19.0	5.0	16.6	12.0	11.9	6.8	3.7	<b>9.9</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	13.0	39.7	17.6	44.3	15.8	5.5	13.2	10.7	<b>20.0</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	16.7	12.5	5.3	2.7	3.4	8	13.7	16.7	<b>9.9</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>12.6</b>

Table 23a: Number of Youth Fights

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	12	4	14	5	8	3	5	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	13	3	8	18	10	13	6	7
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	4	1	3	10	4	2	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	13	23	60	25	7	13	12
<b>Warrenville</b>	11	2	9	11	3	5	2	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>29</b>

Table 23b: Rate of Youth Fights per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	21.8	6.5	31.1	11	17.4	6.5	12.5	18.8	<b>15.7</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	15.3	3.0	9.1	19.6	10.8	14.4	7.2	8.9	<b>11.0</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	4.0	19.0	5.0	16.6	39.8	15.9	6.8	3.7	<b>13.9</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	14.5	17.8	27.1	85.8	39.5	12.9	28.6	21.4	<b>31.0</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	36.7	6.3	23.7	30.2	10.2	20.0	9.1	11.1	<b>18.4</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>19.9</b>	<b>37.1</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>18.1</b>


Table 24a: Number of Youth on Staff Assaults

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5	2	3	0	0	2	2	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2	4	4	7	1	2	0	5
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	2	0	5	9	4	1	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	3	9	13	13	11	7	5	2
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	4	1	6	6	1	1	7
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>


Table 24b: Rate of Youth on Staff Assaults per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	9.1	3.2	6.7	0	0	4.4	5	2.7	<b>3.9</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2.4	4.0	4.5	7.6	1.1	2.2	0	6.3	<b>3.5</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	8.0	9.5	0.0	27.6	35.9	15.9	3.4	3.7	<b>13.0</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	4.3	12.3	15.3	18.6	17.4	12.9	11	3.6	<b>11.9</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	10.0	12.5	2.6	16.5	20.4	4	4.6	38.9	<b>13.7</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>11.8</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>7.7</b>

**Chart 9: Rate of Reportable Incidents Per 100 Youth**



**Chart 10: Rate of Youth on Staff Assault Per 100 Youth**



## Section 6: Indicator Data

Table 25: Uses of Chemical Restraints

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	0	2	2	7	3	0	0	2
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>

Table 26: Uses of Mechanical Restraints

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	4	0	0	3	1	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6	4	7	9	7	3	5	6
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	2	8	4	1	0
<b>St. Charles</b>		18	8	24	7	8	10	10
<b>Warrenville</b>	10	5	7	11	0	2	3	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>

Uses of chemical and mechanical restraints have varied throughout the year, although the use in the current year is much lower than years past. Numbers and rates of uses of restraints should be related to population size and number and types of incidents. More important than how frequent they are is whether they are used according to policy and for appropriate reasons.

## Section 7: Confinement Information

Table 28a: Use of Behavioral Holds

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	26	28	48	7	10	16	1	10
<b>Harrisburg</b>	87	66	77	74	58	112	66	77
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	3	0	4	12	5	1	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	36	48	40	46	68	34	43	70
<b>Warrenville</b>	30	17	31	35	16	19	14	23
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>181</b>

Table 28b: Rate of Behavioral Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	54	57	94	15	22	35	3	27
<b>Harrisburg</b>	116	78	109	81	63	124	80	98
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	10	0	22	48	20	3	4
<b>St. Charles</b>	35	49	39	66	107	63	95	125
<b>Warrenville</b>	115	59	119	96	54	76	64	128
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>83</b>

Table 28c: Average Length of Behavioral Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	78	82	88	73	62	143	98	89
<b>Harrisburg</b>	117	114	93	128	110	123	165	112
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	38	0	62	78	64	40	17
<b>St. Charles</b>	73	65	85	168	69	174	107	95
<b>Warrenville</b>	111	87	108	93	86	56	62	35
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>107</b>

Table 29: Use of Crisis Care

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	1	2	4	3	1	1	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	4	15	10	2	1	1	1	1
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	2	2	3	3	1	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>

Table 30: Use of Medical Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	2	2	2	1	-	1	3	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>




Table 31: Use of Administrative Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	18	-	1	5
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	1	0	1	19	0	1	6

Table 32: Use of Investigative Status

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0

Chart 12: Rate per 100 youth of Behavioral Holds



## Section 8: Aftercare Data

Table 33: Youth on Aftercare\*

	1/20	2/20
<b>Total Number of Youth Assigned to Aftercare</b>	850	802
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	498	466
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	192	188
<b>Number of Youth with Pending Criminal Cases</b>	68	61
<b>Number of Youth with Warrants and Out of State</b>	92	87

Table 34: Caseloads in Aftercare (per Specialist)\*

	1/20	2/20
<b>Number of Youth Assigned to Specialist</b>	15.7	14.9
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	11.3	10.6
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	4.4	4.3

Table 35: Average Specialist Caseload by Aftercare Office – February 2020

	Number of Specialists	Number of Youth	Average Caseload	Number of Youth in Community	Average Caseload in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	7	71	10.1	55	7.9
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	3	34	11	28	9.7
<b>Aurora</b>	3	37	12.7	33	11
<b>Rockford</b>	5	35	7	34	6.8
<b>Peoria</b>	4	118	29.5	109	27.3
<b>East St. Louis</b>	6	48	8.2	40	6.7
<b>Champaign</b>	3	47	15.7	36	12
<b>Springfield</b>	4	48	12	45	11.3
<b>Placement</b>	7	163	23.4	36	5.1
<b>Intensive</b>	2	51	25.5	50	24.5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>654</b>	<b>14.9</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>10.6</b>

Table 36: Specialist Contact with Youth by Aftercare Office – February 2020

	Number of Overall Contacts	Contacts per Youth	Contacts with Youth in Community	Contacts per Youth in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	163	2.3	143	2.6
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	73	2.2	64	2.2
<b>Aurora</b>	99	2.6	102	3.1
<b>Rockford</b>	130	3.7	126	3.7
<b>Peoria</b>	153	1.3	229	2.1
<b>East St. Louis</b>	113	2.3	96	2.4
<b>Champaign</b>	99	2.1	90	2.5
<b>Springfield</b>	125	2.6	113	2.5
<b>Placement</b>	525	3.2	148	4.1
<b>Intensive</b>	107	2.1	132	2.7
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>1587</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>1243</b>	<b>2.4</b>

Table 37a: Parole Revocations

	Parole Revocations Heard	Revocations Approved	Revocations Denied	Hearings Continued
<i>July</i>	29	18	10	1
<i>August</i>	25	16	7	2
<i>September</i>	20	11	9	0
<i>October</i>	18	12	6	0
<i>November</i>	12	9	3	0
<i>December</i>	16	11	5	0
<i>January</i>	8	6	2	0
<i>February</i>	15	6	7	2
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>17.9</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>0.6</b>

Table 37b: Parole Revocation Rates

	Percent of Revocations Approved	Percent of Revocations Denied	Percent of Hearings Continued
<i>July</i>	62.1%	34.5%	3.4%
<i>August</i>	64%	28%	8%
<i>September</i>	55%	45%	0%
<i>October</i>	66.7%	33.3%	0%
<i>November</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>December</i>	68.8%	31.3%	0%
<i>January</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>February</i>	40%	46.7%	13.3%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>63.3%</b>	<b>33.6%</b>	<b>3.1%</b>

With lower numbers of admission for technical parole violators, the numbers of parole revocation hearings held monthly has greatly decreased compared to previous years.

## Section 9: Population Stock/Flow

Table 38: Institutional Stock/Flow

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Number of Admissions per Month</b>	73	67	51	50	51	36	49	40
<b>Percent of Admissions Parole Violators</b>	23.3%	19.4%	15.7%	14%	19.6%	13.9%	8.2%	25%
<b>Number of Facility Exits per Month</b>	62	49	61	66	52	65	57	41
<b>Percent of Exits to Aftercare Supervision</b>	91.9%	87.7%	88.5%	86.4%	94.2%	92.3%	93%	90.2%

Table 39: Aftercare Stock/Flow


	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<b>Number of New Supervised Youth</b>	57	43	54	57	49	60	56	37
<b>Number of Exits from Aftercare</b>	47	37	40	32	42	46	33	39

Table 40: Admissions to Facilities by Type

	February 2020	
	Number	Percent
<b>Court Evaluation</b>	3	7.5%
<b>Court Evaluation Return</b>	2	5%
<b>Discharged and Recommitted</b>	4	10%
<b>Initial Commitment</b>	19	47.5%
<b>New Commitment</b>	2	5%
<b>Technical Parole Violator</b>	10	25%
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	

The decrease in DJJ populations is a direct effect of both decreasing court admissions, decreasing admissions for technical violations, and decreases in length of stay during the fiscal year. Additionally, rates and numbers of discharges from Aftercare have increased as well, which has helped those numbers stay lower as well, which provides fewer youth to be readmitted into facilities. Looking at the types of admissions to DJJ, a greater percent of youth are initial commitments than in previous years.

**Chart 13: Admission Types to Facility, February 2020**



## Section 10: TRD Data for February 2020

Table 41: Adjustments by Facility

	Reductions	Extensions
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	119	20
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	127	22
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	148	10
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	75	4
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	37	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>59</b>

Table 42: Types of Adjustments Used

	CHI	HRG	PER	STC	WRV	DJJ Overall
<i>BARJ Reduction</i>	0	1	0	0	0	1
<i>Delinquent Program Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Ed/Voc Reduction</i>	15	2	0	24	12	53
<i>Grade Level Reduction</i>	8	8	8	4	2	30
<i>JSO Completion Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>No Maj. Sanc. Reductions</i>	21	37	17	11	6	92
<i>Other Tx Reduction</i>	11	8	7	0	4	30
<i>SA Completion Reduction</i>	12	13	16	4	5	50
<i>YASI Goal Reduction</i>	52	58	100	32	8	250
<i>Discipline Extension</i>	20	22	10	4	3	59

Chart 14: Types of Adjustments used by Agency




Table 43: Frequency of BARJ Adjustment

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	1	3	4	1	2	1	2	1
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>

Table 44: Average Length of BARJ Adjustment

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	10	7	6	4	7	5	10	7
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	-
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>


Table 45: Frequency of Discipline Extensions

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	46	46	10	41	14	41	5	20
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	30	13	21	18	14	37	24	22
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	5	11	5	6	6	22	24	10
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	9	28	36	46	21	21	9	4
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	33	11	19	20	3	5	5	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>59</b>

Table 46: Average Length of Discipline Extension

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	2/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	6	5	7	5	9	5	11	4
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	8	9	12	11	11	11	18	11
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	19	11	5	5	7	12	8	11
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	8	5	8	11	7	7	10	12
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	4	5	4	4	4	5	6
<b>Average</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>

Summed Total Adjustment Days by Month





## Section 11: YASI

Table 47: New YASI Pre-Screens: February 2020

	Legal Risk	Social Risk	Protective	Overall Risk
<i>High</i>	116	75	10	98
<i>Moderate</i>	32	64	56	48
<i>Low</i>	1	10	83	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>149</b>


Table 48: New YASI Full Assessments: Risk

	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	25	-	-
<i>High</i>	22	124	90
<i>Moderate-High</i>	46	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	27	6	38
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	9	-	-
<i>Low</i>	2	1	3
<i>None</i>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>131</b>

Table 49: New YASI Full Assessments: Protective


	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	2	-	-
<i>High</i>	5	22	11
<i>Moderate-High</i>	30	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	47	29	57
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	36	-	-
<i>Low</i>	10	18	62
<i>None</i>	1	62	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>131</b>

**Chart 16: Risk and Protective Levels of Youth**




## Release Reviews

Reviews by Type per Month



	Annual	Cont.	Director's Request	HSD/GED	Max Release Date	Substance Abuse	Target Release Date	Total
July	0	11	2	5	0	10	15	<b>43</b>
August	0	10	0	7	0	3	30	<b>50</b>
September	1	5	2	3	1	5	36	<b>53</b>
October	0	10	0	4	1	3	44	<b>62</b>
November	1	11	1	4	0	3	33	<b>53</b>
December	1	16	2	4	2	3	35	<b>63</b>
January	1	15	1	1	0	1	25	<b>44</b>
February	1	8	0	2	0	1	28	<b>40</b>

Percent of Release Reviews by Outcome and Month





**Monthly Report:  
January**

**FY2020**

## Section 1: Population and Staffing Data

Table 1a: Population by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	55	61	45	44	46	41	37
<b>Harrisburg</b>	82	101	87	97	91	90	79
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	25	21	20	17	28	23	30
<b>St. Charles</b>	72	63	78	61	60	48	50
<b>Warrenville</b>	30	32	33	32	28	23	20
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>216</b>


Table 1b: Average Daily Population by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	50.5	55.9	54.7	45.6	46.0	45.9	40.0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	79.5	91.1	93.0	91.7	92.2	90.1	83.0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	21.4	22.9	19.0	18.1	25.1	25.2	29.2
<b>St. Charles</b>	76.2	66.6	70.7	69.9	63.3	54.1	45.4
<b>Warrenville</b>	28.7	29.7	33.9	36.4	29.4	25.0	21.9
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>256.2</b>	<b>266.2</b>	<b>271.2</b>	<b>261.7</b>	<b>256.1</b>	<b>240.3</b>	<b>219.6</b>

Table 2: Security Staff Headcount by Facility

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	90	89	84	95	96	94	91
<b>Harrisburg</b>	150	151	143	143	142	140	143
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	52	50	49	54	55	49	51
<b>St. Charles</b>	169	163	152	164	164	162	175
<b>Warrenville</b>	69	66	66	74	74	73	71
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>531</b>

**Chart 1: Facility Populations on Last Day of Month Last Five Fiscal Years**



## Section 2: Mental Health Data

Table 5: Percent of Youth Psychotropic Medication

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	32.7%	32.3%	33.3%	29.2%	25.6%	38.2%	28%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	47.0%	41.6%	50.0%	52.6%	69.2%	67.4%	50.8%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	44.0%	61.9%	60.0%	61.1%	42.9%	52.2%	38.6%
<b>St. Charles</b>	57.9%	54.8%	51.8%	62.3%	65.5%	74%	60.1%
<b>Warrenville</b>	60.0%	62.5%	60.2%	69.7%	67.9%	69.6%	64.2%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>48.3%</b>	<b>50.6%</b>	<b>51.1%</b>	<b>53.3%</b>	<b>57.7%</b>	<b>63.1%</b>	<b>48.9%</b>

Table 6: Rate of Suicide Attempts by Severity per 100 Youth

	Threats w/o Intent or Action	Mild Suicide Attempts	Moderately Severe Suicide Attempts	Severe Suicide Attempts
<b>July</b>	4.54	1.13	0.00	0.00
<b>August</b>	5.53	1.38	0.34	0.00
<b>September</b>	4.30	2.90	0.00	0.00
<b>October</b>	2.67	1.91	1.15	0.00
<b>November</b>	4.69	0.78	0.00	0.00
<b>December</b>	3.33	1.66	0.83	0.42
<b>January</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Table 7: Distribution of Mental Health Levels


	Mental Health Level 0	Mental Health Level 1	Mental Health Level 2	Mental Health Level 3	Mental Health Level 3.5	Mental Health Level 4
<b>July</b>	13.2%	41.6%	39.1%	5.8%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>August</b>	13.1%	53.7%	29.7%	3.2%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>September</b>	16.9%	49.5%	27.1%	6.1%	0.0%	0.3%
<b>October</b>	14.0%	47.7%	31.8%	6.1%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>November</b>	13.6%	52.5%	28.3%	5.7%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>December</b>	11.4%	54.7%	25.8%	7.2%	0.4%	0.4%
<b>January</b>	9.6%	53.5%	28.9%	7.5%	0.4%	0.0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>13.1%</b>	<b>50.5%</b>	<b>30.1%</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>




Table 8: Distribution of DSM V Diagnoses

	Youth with No Diagnosis	Youth with One Diagnosis	Youth with Two Diagnoses	Youth with Three Diagnoses	Youth with Four or More Diagnoses
<i>July</i>	8.71%	9.09%	26.89%	31.06%	38.26%
<i>August</i>	8.99%	7.95%	22.49%	30.44%	35.64%
<i>September</i>	7.97%	6.88%	21.37%	31.52%	40.57%
<i>October</i>	7.01%	7.38%	20.30%	27.31%	38.01%
<i>November</i>	7.20%	6.40%	17.60%	29.60%	39.20%
<i>December</i>	9.76%	6.10%	17.07%	31.30%	35.77%
<i>January</i>	8.27%	7.3%	20.95%	30.21%	37.91%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>					

**Chart 3: Percent of Youth on Psychotropic Medication**



**Chart 4: Rate of Suicide Attempts and Threats by Type**



### Section 3: Substance Abuse Treatment Data

Table 9: Number of Treatment Participants

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	17	15	14	16	15	12	14
<b>Harrisburg</b>	31	29	27	19	16	19	24
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	27	28	29	26	35	35	35
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	10	11	11	9	9
<b>Warrenville</b>	7	5	7	13	15	13	10
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>92</b>

Table 10: Average Length of Stay for Completers

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	98	107	95	98	99	83	101
<b>Harrisburg</b>	90	94	109	97	96	71	97
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	96	87	115	100	65	117	147
<b>St. Charles</b>	94	91	94	91	92	-	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	60	60	-	-	-	7	-
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>110</b>

Table 11: Percent of Discharges by Reason


	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Successful Completion</b>	58.3%	73.9%	72.4%	36.4%	42.3%	33.3%	52%
<b>Behavioral Discharge</b>	8.3%	8.7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Youth Released</b>	12.5%	8.7%	20.7%	36.4%	30.8%	43.3%	40%
<b>Other Discharge</b>	0%	0%	13.8%	27.3%	26.9%	23.3%	8%

Table 12: Primary Substance Abused


	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Marijuana</b>	78.5%	79.8%	78.2%	68.2%	77.2%	76.1%	71.7%
<b>Alcohol</b>	3.2%	4.5%	5.8%	3.5%	7.6%	6.8%	5.4%
<b>Other Drugs</b>	18.3%	15.7%	14.9%	25.9%	14.1%	15.9%	20.7%
<b>No Diagnosis</b>	0%	1.1%	1.2%	2.4%	1.1%	1.1%	2.2%

For the youth whose primary substance abuse is not specified, 2 used opioids, 8 used methamphetamines, 3 used benzodiazepines, and 6 other substances.

**Chart 5: Number of Treatment Participants by Facility**



**Chart 6: Discharges by Reason**



## Section 4: Education Data

Table 13: Students Enrolled in School

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	55	55	40	39	35	35	42
<b>Harrisburg</b>	58	69	57	65	73	62	64
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	15	19	15	15	20	24	29
<b>St. Charles</b>	40	42	46	37	25	25	24
<b>Warrenville</b>	22	25	32	33	26	25	14
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>173</b>

Table 14: Teachers Employed

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	8	8	8	8	7	7	7
<b>Harrisburg</b>	18	17	17	17	17	17	17
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	7	7	6	6	6	6	6
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	10	7	7	7	7	7
<b>Warrenville</b>	7	7	7	7	5	5	5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>42</b>

Table 15: General Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5.3	5.3	3.9	3.6	4.0	3.7	5.0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	1.9	3.4	2	2.5	3.3	2.8	2.8
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	3	2.4	3.4	2.6	1.8	2.4	3.2
<b>St. Charles</b>	3.2	3.5	4.4	3.8	2.4	2.4	2.8
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	3.4	4	3.4	4.8	5.3	2.5
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.2</b>

Table 16: Special Education Student to Teacher Ratio

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	9	9	6.5	14	11	13	12
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6.6	5.6	5.5	7	6.6	5.8	6.2
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2.5	3.5	6	5	11	12	13
<b>St. Charles</b>	5.3	5.3	8	9	6.5	6.5	5
<b>Warrenville</b>	3.5	4	4	8	7	4	4
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>7</b>

According to the *RJ Consent Decree*, DJJ is required to have general education student to teacher ratios of 10 youth to 1 teacher and special education student to teacher ratios of 6 youth to 1 teacher. As of the end of December, DJJ had an average of 3.2 general education youth for each general education teacher and 7 special education youth for each special education teacher. Therefore, the agency meets the consent decree requirements for general education overall, but not special education. At the facility level, St. Charles and Warrenville meet the special education ratio requirement.

Table 17: Overall Diplomas Awarded

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	Total
<b>Chicago</b>	1	3	0	0	3	3	2	<b>12</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	9	5	4	4	4	3	<b>29</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	1	2	1	0	2	<b>6</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	1	4	2	5	4	4	2	<b>22</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	0	1	0	0	2	3	2	<b>8</b>
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>76</b>

Table 18: Percent of Special Education Students

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	32.7%	32.7%	32.5%	35.9%	31.4%	37.1%	28.6%
<b>Harrisburg</b>	56.9%	40.6%	57.9%	53.8%	45.2%	46.8%	48.4%
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	33.3%	36.8%	40%	33.3%	55%	50%	44.8%
<b>St. Charles</b>	52.5%	50%	52.2%	48.7%	52%	52%	41.7%
<b>Warrenville</b>	31.8%	32%	37.5%	48.5%	26.9%	16%	28.6%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44.2%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>46.3%</b>	<b>46.6%</b>	<b>41.9%</b>	<b>41.5%</b>	<b>40.5%</b>


Table 20: Youth in Continuing Education

	Post-Secondary	Collegiate
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	9	0
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	10	10
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	19	0
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	6	6
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>17</b>

Table 21: Number and Percent of Cancelled Whole School Days

	Number	Percent
<b>IYC Chicago</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Harrisburg</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Pere Marquette</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC St. Charles</b>	0	0%
<b>IYC Warrenville</b>	0	0%
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

**Chart 7: Student to Teacher Ratio by Facility**



## Section 5: Reportable Incident Data

Table 21a: Number of Reportable Incidents

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	28	20	26	6	11	7	11
<b>Harrisburg</b>	26	19	24	42	24	32	15
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	5	6	2	11	22	11	5
<b>St. Charles</b>	49	55	72	104	47	17	24
<b>Warrenville</b>	28	30	22	18	10	8	6
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>62</b>

Table 21b: Rate of Reportable Incidents per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	50.9	32.3	57.8	13.2	23.9	15.3	27.5	<b>31.6</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	30.6	18.8	27.3	45.8	26.0	35.5	18.1	<b>28.9</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	20.0	28.6	10.0	60.8	87.6	43.7	17.1	<b>38.3</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	71.0	75.3	84.7	148.8	74.2	31.4	52.9	<b>76.9</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	93.3	93.8	57.9	49.5	34.0	32	27.4	<b>55.4</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>51.52</b>	<b>44.98</b>	<b>52.90</b>	<b>69.2</b>	<b>44.5</b>	<b>31.2</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>46.1</b>

Table 22a: Number of Youth on Youth Assaults

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	4	5	2	1	3	2	4
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5	11	11	17	13	17	9
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	4	1	3	3	3	2
<b>St. Charles</b>	9	29	15	31	10	3	6
<b>Warrenville</b>	5	4	2	1	1	2	3
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>24</b>

Table 22b: Rate of Youth on Youth Assaults per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	7.3	8.1	4.4	2.2	6.5	4.4	10	<b>6.1</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	5.9	10.9	12.5	18.5	14.1	18.9	10.8	<b>13.1</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	4.0	19.0	5.0	16.6	12.0	11.9	6.8	<b>10.8</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	13.0	39.7	17.6	44.3	15.8	5.5	13.2	<b>21.3</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	16.7	12.5	5.3	2.7	3.4	8	13.7	<b>8.9</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>11.7</b>	<b>11.2</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>13.2</b>

Table 23a: Number of Youth Fights

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	12	4	14	5	8	3	5
<b>Harrisburg</b>	13	3	8	18	10	13	6
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	1	4	1	3	10	4	2
<b>St. Charles</b>	10	13	23	60	25	7	13
<b>Warrenville</b>	11	2	9	11	3	5	2
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>28</b>



Table 23b: Rate of Youth Fights per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	21.8	6.5	31.1	11	17.4	6.5	12.5	<b>15.3</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	15.3	3.0	9.1	19.6	10.8	14.4	7.2	<b>11.3</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	4.0	19.0	5.0	16.6	39.8	15.9	6.8	<b>15.3</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	14.5	17.8	27.1	85.8	39.5	12.9	28.6	<b>32.3</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	36.7	6.3	23.7	30.2	10.2	20.0	9.1	<b>19.5</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>17.8</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>19.9</b>	<b>37.1</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>12.8</b>	<b>18.8</b>


Table 24a: Number of Youth on Staff Assaults

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	5	2	3	0	0	2	2
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2	4	4	7	1	2	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	2	2	0	5	9	4	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	3	9	13	13	11	7	5
<b>Warrenville</b>	3	4	1	6	6	1	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10</b>


Table 24b: Rate of Youth on Staff Assaults per 100 Youth

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20	Avg.
<b>Chicago</b>	9.1	3.2	6.7	0	0	4.4	5	<b>4.1</b>
<b>Harrisburg</b>	2.4	4.0	4.5	7.6	1.1	2.2	0	<b>3.1</b>
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	8.0	9.5	0.0	27.6	35.9	15.9	3.4	<b>14.3</b>
<b>St. Charles</b>	4.3	12.3	15.3	18.6	17.4	12.9	11	<b>13.1</b>
<b>Warrenville</b>	10.0	12.5	2.6	16.5	20.4	4	4.6	<b>10.1</b>
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>11.8</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>7.7</b>

**Chart 9: Rate of Reportable Incidents Per 100 Youth**



**Chart 10: Rate of Youth on Staff Assault Per 100 Youth**



## Section 6: Indicator Data

Table 25: Uses of Chemical Restraints

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	0	0	2	1	0	0	0
<b>Harrisburg</b>	0	0	1	0	2	0	0
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>St. Charles</b>	0	2	2	7	3	0	0
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

Table 26: Uses of Mechanical Restraints

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	1	1	4	0	0	3	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	6	4	7	9	7	3	5
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	0	0	2	8	4	1
<b>St. Charles</b>		18	8	24	7	8	10
<b>Warrenville</b>	10	5	7	11	0	2	3
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>

Uses of chemical and mechanical restraints have varied throughout the year, although the use in the current year is much lower than years past. Numbers and rates of uses of restraints should be related to population size and number and types of incidents. More important than how frequent they are is whether they are used according to policy and for appropriate reasons.

## Section 7: Confinement Information

Table 28a: Use of Behavioral Holds

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	26	28	48	7	10	16	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	87	66	77	74	58	112	66
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	3	0	4	12	5	1
<b>St. Charles</b>	36	48	40	46	68	34	43
<b>Warrenville</b>	30	17	31	35	16	19	14
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>135</b>

Table 28b: Rate of Behavioral Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	54	57	94	15	22	35	3
<b>Harrisburg</b>	116	78	109	81	63	124	80
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	10	0	22	48	20	3
<b>St. Charles</b>	35	49	39	66	107	63	95
<b>Warrenville</b>	115	59	119	96	54	76	64
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>61</b>

Table 28c: Average Length of Behavioral Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	78	82	88	73	62	143	98
<b>Harrisburg</b>	117	114	93	128	110	123	165
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	0	38	0	62	78	64	40
<b>St. Charles</b>	73	65	85	168	69	174	107
<b>Warrenville</b>	111	87	108	93	86	56	62
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>130</b>

Table 29: Use of Crisis Care

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	1	2	4	3	1	1
<b>Harrisburg</b>	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	4	15	10	2	1	1	1
<b>Warrenville</b>	1	-	2	2	3	3	1
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>

Table 30: Use of Medical Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	2	-	-	-	-	1	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	2	2	2	1	-	1	3
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>


Table 31: Use of Administrative Hold

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	1	1	-	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	18	-	1
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	1	0	1	19	0	1

Table 32: Use of Investigative Status

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Chicago</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Harrisburg</b>	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
<b>Pere Marquette</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<b>St. Charles</b>	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<b>Warrenville</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	0	0	0	1	0	2	0

Chart 12: Rate per 100 youth of Behavioral Holds



## Section 8: Aftercare Data

Table 33: Youth on Aftercare\*

	1/20
<b>Total Number of Youth Assigned to Aftercare</b>	850
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	498
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	192
<b>Number of Youth with Pending Criminal Cases</b>	68
<b>Number of Youth with Warrants and Out of State</b>	92

Table 34: Caseloads in Aftercare (per Specialist)\*

	1/20
<b>Number of Youth Assigned to Specialist</b>	15.7
<b>Number of Youth in Community</b>	11.3
<b>Number of Youth in Facilities</b>	4.4

Table 35: Average Specialist Caseload by Aftercare Office – January 2020

	Number of Specialists	Number of Youth	Average Caseload	Number of Youth in Community	Average Caseload in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	7	75	10.7	59	8.4
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	3	36	12	30	10
<b>Aurora</b>	3	39	13	35	11.7
<b>Rockford</b>	5	37	7.4	36	7.2
<b>Peoria</b>	4	125	31.3	117	29.3
<b>East St. Louis</b>	6	51	8.5	43	7.2
<b>Champaign</b>	3	50	16.7	39	13
<b>Springfield</b>	4	51	12.8	48	12
<b>Placement</b>	7	172	24.6	38	5.4
<b>Intensive</b>	2	54	27	53	26.5
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>15.7</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>11.3</b>

Table 36: Specialist Contact with Youth by Aftercare Office – January 2020

	Number of Overall Contacts	Contacts per Youth	Contacts with Youth in Community	Contacts per Youth in Community
<b>Chicago</b>	161	2.1	156	2.6
<b>Chicago Heights</b>	78	2.2	68	2.3
<b>Aurora</b>	105	2.7	101	2.9
<b>Rockford</b>	134	3.6	132	3.7
<b>Peoria</b>	165	1.3	158	1.4
<b>East St. Louis</b>	116	2.3	104	2.4
<b>Champaign</b>	107	2.1	96	2.5
<b>Springfield</b>	130	2.5	119	2.5
<b>Placement</b>	521	3.0	161	4.2
<b>Intensive</b>	85	1.6	84	1.6
<b>IDJJ Total</b>	<b>1602</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>1179</b>	<b>2.4</b>

Table 37a: Parole Revocations

	Parole Revocations Heard	Revocations Approved	Revocations Denied	Hearings Continued
<i>July</i>	29	18	10	1
<i>August</i>	25	16	7	2
<i>September</i>	20	11	9	0
<i>October</i>	18	12	6	0
<i>November</i>	12	9	3	0
<i>December</i>	16	11	5	0
<i>January</i>	8	6	2	0
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0.4</b>

Table 37b: Parole Revocation Rates

	Percent of Revocations Approved	Percent of Revocations Denied	Percent of Hearings Continued
<i>July</i>	62.1%	34.5%	3.4%
<i>August</i>	64%	28%	8%
<i>September</i>	55%	45%	0%
<i>October</i>	66.7%	33.3%	0%
<i>November</i>	75%	25%	0%
<i>December</i>	68.8%	31.3%	0%
<i>January</i>	75%	25%	0%
<b>IDJJ Average</b>	<b>66.7%</b>	<b>31.7%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>

With lower numbers of admission for technical parole violators, the numbers of parole revocation hearings held monthly has greatly decreased compared to previous years.

**Section 9: Population Stock/Flow**

Table 38: Institutional Stock/Flow

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Number of Admissions per Month</b>	73	67	51	50	51	36	49
<b>Percent of Admissions Parole Violators</b>	23.3%	19.4%	15.7%	14%	19.6%	13.9%	8.2%
<b>Number of Facility Exits per Month</b>	62	49	61	66	52	65	57
<b>Percent of Exits to Aftercare Supervision</b>	91.9%	87.7%	88.5%	86.4%	94.2%	92.3%	93%

Table 39: Aftercare Stock/Flow

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<b>Number of New Supervised Youth</b>	57	43	54	57	49	60	56
<b>Number of Exits from Aftercare</b>	47	37	40	32	42	46	33


Table 40: Admissions to Facilities by Type

	January 2020	
	Number	Percent
<b>Court Evaluation</b>	1	2%
<b>Court Evaluation Return</b>	4	8.2%
<b>Discharged and Recommitted</b>	4	8.2%
<b>Initial Commitment</b>	26	53.1%
<b>New Commitment</b>	10	20.4%
<b>Technical Parole Violator</b>	4	8.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>49</b>	

The decrease in DJJ populations is a direct effect of both decreasing court admissions, decreasing admissions for technical violations, and decreases in length of stay during the fiscal year. Additionally, rates and numbers of discharges from Aftercare have increased as well, which has helped those numbers stay lower as well, which provides fewer youth to be readmitted into facilities. Looking at the types of admissions to DJJ, a greater percent of youth are initial commitments than in previous years.



**Chart 13: Admission Types to Facility, January 2020**



## Section 10: TRD Data for January 2020

Table 41: Adjustments by Facility

	Reductions	Extensions
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	119	5
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	109	24
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	129	24
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	109	9
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	47	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>67</b>

Table 42: Types of Adjustments Used

	CHI	HRG	PER	STC	WRV	DJJ Overall
<i>BARJ Reduction</i>	0	2	0	4	0	<b>6</b>
<i>Delinquent Program Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>Ed/Voc Reduction</i>	19	0	0	19	16	<b>54</b>
<i>Grade Level Reduction</i>	6	8	2	7	2	<b>25</b>
<i>JSO Completion Reduction</i>	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<i>No Maj. Sanc. Reductions</i>	23	38	15	17	6	<b>99</b>
<i>Other Tx Reduction</i>	5	1	3	7	6	<b>22</b>
<i>SA Completion Reduction</i>	12	8	28	4	3	<b>55</b>
<i>YASI Goal Reduction</i>	54	52	81	51	14	<b>252</b>
<i>Discipline Extension</i>	5	24	24	9	5	<b>67</b>

Chart 14: Types of Adjustments used by Agency




Table 43: Frequency of BARJ Adjustment

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	1	3	4	1	2	1	2
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>

Table 44: Average Length of BARJ Adjustment

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	10	7	6	4	7	5	10
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	-	14	-	-	-	-	-
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	15
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Average</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>


Table 45: Frequency of Discipline Extensions

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	46	46	10	41	14	41	5
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	30	13	21	18	14	37	24
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	5	11	5	6	6	22	24
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	9	28	36	46	21	21	9
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	33	11	19	20	3	5	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>67</b>

Table 46: Average Length of Discipline Extension

	7/19	8/19	9/19	10/19	11/19	12/19	1/20
<i>IYC Chicago</i>	6	5	7	5	9	5	11
<i>IYC Harrisburg</i>	8	9	12	11	11	11	18
<i>IYC Pere Marquette</i>	19	11	5	5	7	12	8
<i>IYC St. Charles</i>	8	5	8	11	7	7	10
<i>IYC Warrenville</i>	5	4	5	4	4	4	5
<b>Average</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>

Summed Total Adjustment Days by Month



## Section 11: YASI

Table 47: New YASI Pre-Screens: January 2020

	Legal Risk	Social Risk	Protective	Overall Risk
<i>High</i>	156	110	12	142
<i>Moderate</i>	45	87	69	59
<i>Low</i>	2	6	122	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>203</b>


Table 48: New YASI Full Assessments: Risk

	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	37	-	-
<i>High</i>	33	194	137
<i>Moderate-High</i>	56	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	51	1	57
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	11	-	-
<i>Low</i>	8	1	2
<i>None</i>	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>196</b>

Table 49: New YASI Full Assessments: Protective


	Dynamic	Static	Overall
<i>Very High</i>	3	-	-
<i>High</i>	17	39	24
<i>Moderate-High</i>	42	-	-
<i>Moderate</i>	68	39	93
<i>Low-Moderate</i>	41	-	-
<i>Low</i>	25	22	79
<i>None</i>	0	96	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>196</b>

**Chart 16: Risk and Protective Levels of Youth**



## Release Reviews

### Reviews by Type per Month



	Annual	Cont.	Director's Request	HSD/GED	Max Release Date	Substance Abuse	Target Release Date	Total
July	0	11	2	5	0	10	15	<b>43</b>
August	0	10	0	7	0	3	30	<b>50</b>
September	1	5	2	3	1	5	36	<b>53</b>
October	0	10	0	4	1	3	44	<b>62</b>
November	1	11	1	4	0	3	33	<b>53</b>
December	1	16	2	4	2	3	35	<b>63</b>
January	1	15	1	1	0	1	25	<b>44</b>

Percent of Release Reviews by Outcome and Month

